

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1608/11-12
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/DEV/1

Panel on Development

Minutes of meeting
held on Monday, 16 January 2012, at 9:00 am
in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex

Members present : Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Chairman)
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, GBS, JP
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, BBS, JP
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip

Member attending : Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH

Members absent : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)

Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, JP

**Public officers
attending**

: Agenda item IV

Mrs Carrie LAM CHENG Yuet-ngor, GBS, JP
Secretary for Development

Mr WAI Chi-sing, JP
Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)

Mr LING Kar-kan, JP
Deputy Director of Planning/Territorial

Agenda item V

Mrs Carrie LAM CHENG Yuet-ngor, GBS, JP
Secretary for Development

Mr Laurie LO Chi-hong, JP
Head of the Development Opportunities Office
Development Bureau

Agenda item VI

Mrs Carrie LAM CHENG Yuet-ngor, GBS, JP
Secretary for Development

Mr Laurie LO Chi-hong, JP
Head of the Development Opportunities Office
Development Bureau

Ms Judy CHUNG Sui-kei
Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning & Lands)¹
Development Bureau

Agenda item VII

Mrs Carrie LAM CHENG Yuet-ngor, GBS, JP
Secretary for Development

Mr Jimmy CHAN Pai-ming
Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)³
Development Bureau

Mr MA Lee-tak, JP
Director of Water Supplies

Mr Bobby NG Mang-tung, JP
Assistant Director/Development
Water Supplies Department

Mr CHIN Chu-sum, JP
Assistant Director/Customer Services
Water Supplies Department

Mr CHAN Kin-man
Chief Waterworks Chemist
Water Supplies Department

Mr LI Kwok-keung
Assistant Director/Electricity and Energy Efficiency
Electrical and Mechanical Services Department

Agenda item VIII

Mr Enoch LAM Tin-sing, JP
Deputy Secretary (Works)²
Development Bureau

Mr CHAN Kin-kwong
Assistant Director/Projects and Development
Drainage Services Department

Mr LUK Wai-hung
Chief Engineer/Drainage Projects
Drainage Services Department

Clerk in attendance : Ms Connie SZETO
Chief Council Secretary (1)4

Staff in attendance : Ms Sharon CHUNG
Senior Council Secretary (1)4

Mr Simon CHEUNG
Senior Council Secretary (1)9

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant (1)4

Action

I Confirmation of minutes

(LC Paper No. CB(1)798/11-12 -- Minutes of special meeting on 14 October 2011)

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2011 were confirmed.

II Information papers issued since the last meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)628/11-12(01) -- Referral memorandum dated 9 December 2011 from the Complaints Division regarding proposed amendments to the Town Planning Ordinance

LC Paper No. CB(1)665/11-12(01) -- Referral memorandum dated 16 December 2011 from the Complaints Division regarding energizing Kowloon East

LC Paper No. CB(1)718/11-12(01) -- Submission on the proposal to create a supernumerary Chief Building Surveyor/Chief Structural Engineer post in the Buildings

- Department from the Buildings Department Local Building Surveyors' Association dated 23 December 2011
- LC Paper No. CB(1)761/11-12(01) -- Administration's paper on the funding proposal for "PWP Item No. 237WF -- Mainlaying along Fanling Highway and near She Shan Tsuen -- Stage 2"
- LC Paper No. CB(1)836/11-12(01) -- Administration's paper on enforcement against unauthorized building works in New Territories Exempted Houses: Staff consultation on the proposed creation of a supernumerary Chief Building Surveyor/Chief Structural Engineer post (D1))

2. Members noted that the above information papers had been issued since the meeting on 19 December 2011.

III Items for discussion at the next meeting

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)797/11-12(01) -- List of outstanding items for discussion
- LC Paper No. CB(1)797/11-12(02) -- List of follow-up actions
- LC Paper No. CB(1)840/11-12(01) -- Letter dated 5 January 2012 from Hon Tanya CHAN on reclamation outside Victoria Harbour and rock cavern development)

Regular meeting in February 2012

3. Members agreed that the following items would be discussed at the regular meeting scheduled for 28 February 2012 and the meeting be held from 2:30 pm to 5:30 pm --

- (a) Progress report on heritage conservation initiatives;
- (b) Legislative amendments for inclusion of works related to subdivision of flat units into the Minor Works Control System; and
- (c) Building (Standards of Sanitary Fitments, Plumbing, Drainage Works and Latrines) Regulations

Public hearing on the Government's strategy to increase land supply through reclamation outside Victoria Harbour and rock cavern development

4. The Chairman referred members to Miss Tanya CHAN's letter (LC Paper No. CB(1)840/11-12(01)) proposing the Panel to hold a public hearing on the Government's strategy to increase land supply through reclamation outside Victoria Harbour and rock cavern development. Members agreed to Miss CHAN's proposal after discussion. Miss Tanya CHAN suggested placing a notice on the LegCo website to invite the public and interested parties to provide written submissions on the subject and/or attend the public hearing.

5. In response to the Chairman's enquiry about the timing for holding the public hearing, the Secretary for Development ("SDEV") said that she welcomed the Panel's initiative to gauge public views on the subject. She advised that although the stage 1 public engagement exercise for this subject would complete at the end of February 2012, the Administration would continue to listen to public views. Hence, it would be unnecessary to hold the public hearing before the end of February and there would be time for Panel to make the necessary arrangements.

(Post-meeting note: With the concurrence of the Chairman, a special meeting of the Panel was scheduled for 10 March 2012 to receive deputations' views on reclamation outside Victoria Harbour and rock cavern development. The stage 1 public engagement was subsequently extended to end March 2012 in light of more active discussions in society.)

6. Mr Albert CHAN held the view that the Administration's announcement in January 2012 of the 25 possible sites outside Victoria Harbour for reclamation did not follow the proper planning procedure and deviated from the recommendations of the Hong Kong 2030: Planning Vision and Strategy ("the HK2030 Study"). He considered that the Panel should follow up on related issues and examine relevant records to find out whether there was any discussion on proposed reclamation at the 25 possible sites during the conduct of the HK2030 Study.

7. The Permanent Secretary for Development (Works) ("PS(W)") said that during the consultation meetings of the stage 1 public engagement, members of the public had indicated that the site selection criteria were difficult to understand and asked the Administration to give examples of reclamation sites for illustration. After conducting a preliminary assessment and excluding no-go areas and highly constrained areas, the Administration identified 25 possible reclamation sites. PS(W) emphasized that the 25 possible reclamation sites were released to facilitate the public to discuss and deliberate the various site selection criteria, and the announcement of these sites had not violated the proper planning procedure.

8. SDEV also said that the Administration's strategy in land development and associated planning work followed the direction of the HK2030 Study and there was no conflict between the option of reclamation outside Victoria Harbour to increase land supply and the direction. While the HK2030 Study promulgated in 2007 concluded that Hong Kong should utilize the available development potential of the Metro Area, further development of new towns and developing new areas in the northern New Territories in making available land to meet housing and economic development needs up to 2030, increasing housing demand in recent years and the Chief Executive's initiative in the 2011-2012 Policy Address to meet new housing supply targets and build up a land reserve had made it necessary for the Administration to explore innovative land supply options. She stressed that there was ample time for public discussions on the measures to expand land resources. The option of reclamation outside Victoria Harbour deserved a priority study as it had the benefits of re-using surplus public fills and handling contaminated sediments, the amount of which had been growing as a result of construction activities and fairway maintenance.

Other issues for follow-up

9. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming said that among the subjects concerning planning and lands matters discussed at the recent meeting between members of Heung Yee Kuk and LegCo Members, the Panel should consider giving priority to follow up the subject relating to development restrictions at 54 pieces of private land within the existing country park area. He added that to facilitate deliberation on this subject, the Panel should request the Research Division of the LegCo Secretariat to undertake a research on related issues including the practices and legislation in overseas countries in protecting rights of private owners in developing their land situated within areas with conservation value. The Chairman said that a number of subjects discussed at the meeting between members of Heung Yee Kuk and LegCo Members might need follow-up by the Panel and he would consider how to deal with these subjects when they were referred to the Panel.

10. Mr LEE Wing-tat referred to his letter dated 9 January 2012 to the Chairman about unauthorized extension of rentable areas at the Stanley Plaza without the approval of the Lands Department. He was concerned that developers could ignore development restrictions by paying waiver fees and suggested that the Panel should discuss the policy issues involved. The Chairman said that the Administration had been requested to provide written response to the questions raised in Mr LEE's letter and the Panel could consider further follow-up action after perusing the Administration's response.

IV Kowloon East Development Office

(LC Paper No. CB(1)797/11-12(03) -- Administration's paper on Kowloon East Development Office

LC Paper No. CB(1)797/11-12(04) -- Paper on energizing Kowloon East prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Background brief)

11. SDEV briefed members on the Administration's proposal of setting up a dedicated Kowloon East Development Office ("KEDO") to take forward the initiative of Energizing Kowloon East in the 2011-2012 Policy Address with a view to facilitating the transformation of Kowloon East into an attractive, alternative Central Business District ("CBD") to support Hong

Kong's economic development. She said that the Administration had received overwhelming support for the initiative from almost all sectors in society. The public had urged the Administration to take forward the initiative expeditiously with determination and to extensively engage the public during the process. Major views expressed by the public and relevant stakeholders included that the Administration should provide strong policy steer and effective coordinated efforts, adopt a holistic, innovative and creative institutional framework in implementing the initiative. There should be capacity for public-private partnership taking into account that vast majority of land in the old industrial areas of Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay was under private ownership. Reference should be made to the successful experience of providing one-stop coordinated advisory service by the Development Opportunities Office to land development proposals in recent years. Some "quick wins" projects should be delivered to improve the environment in the former industrial areas, particularly in terms of traffic, landscape and greening. Furthermore, the successful precedent of public engagement adopted in the Kai Tak Development ("KTD") planning to involve the community should be followed.

12. SDEV added that overseas experiences collated by the Development Bureau ("DEVB") all pointed to the need for a dedicated, multi-disciplinary office with a clear vision and mandate from a high level within the Government to take charge of an area-based transformation. Against the above considerations, the Administration proposed to create a new KEDO in DEVB to steer, supervise, oversee and monitor the development of Kowloon East. The PS(W) would supervise the operation of KEDO, which would be headed by a Principal Government Town Planner (D3) and a Government Architect (D2) and supported by 16 civil servants/non-civil service contract staff. Details on the proposed structure of KEDO and job descriptions of the Head and Deputy Head were given in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)797/11-12(03)).

13. As to the interface between KEDO and the established Kai Tak Office ("KTO") under the Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CEDD"), SDEV advised that KTO would continue to assume its role in delivering infrastructural projects under KTD, while KEDO would be under the direct steer of DEVB and focus on strategic issues in transforming Kowloon East. Each with a clearly defined ambit of work, KEDO and KTO would closely collaborate in taking forward various important tasks in energizing Kowloon East. Subject to the approval of the Establishment Subcommittee ("ESC") and the Finance Committee ("FC"), the Administration would set up an initial KEDO for one year with effect from

1 July 2012. During its initial year, KEDO would conduct consultation with stakeholders, and develop the long-term institutional set-up for energizing Kowloon East including the best mix of talents in the team and the most appropriate mode of development to cater for the special characteristics of the area, in particular the highly developed areas in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay. The Administration would brief the Panel on the work of the initial KEDO and consult members on the proposal for a longer-term set-up for the Office before the end of the first-year period, and then seek the approval of LegCo on the long-term set-up of KEDO. In order that actions could be taken immediately, a preparatory team would be set up in February 2012 prior to the establishment of the KEDO.

The need for a dedicated Kowloon East Development Office

14. Mr Albert CHAN said he was opposed to the setting up of KEDO. He pointed out that there had been no precedent of establishing a new office with additional resources for implementing a district-based development project. The proposal of setting up a dedicated KEDO had reflected that the Administration had put undue emphasis on the Energizing Kowloon East initiative at the expense of development in other districts and areas. He remarked that a proposal of setting up a dedicated office to take forward the recommendations of the HK2030 Study might be more worthy of the Panel's consideration and support.

15. SDEV said that various offices under CEDD such as the New Territories East Development Office, the New Territories North and West Office and the Kowloon Development Office, were dedicated offices set up for implementing development projects in various districts, new towns and new development areas. Moreover, KTO had been established under CEDD to lead and oversee the coordination and implementation of the huge and highly complex development project of KTD. The work of CEDD's Hong Kong Island and Islands Office in achieving facelifts of Tai O and Mui Wo had demonstrated that the Administration had not neglected the development needs of other districts. As regards the transformation of Kowloon East into a CBD, the Administration envisaged that there would be complicated problems arising from processing land development proposals from the private sector and facilitating public-private partnership in land development which were totally different from those encountered in developing new towns. Therefore, it would be necessary to set up a dedicated office with new resources to focus on such tasks and resolve problems. Given the complicated and important tasks to be undertaken by KEDO, it was not feasible to absorb the workload through redeployment of existing resources.

The public had also expressed support for the proposal of setting up a dedicated KEDO.

Role of the Kowloon East Development Office in taking forward the Energizing Kowloon East initiative

16. Mr CHAN Kam-lam welcomed the Administration's initiative to transform Kowloon East into an alternative CBD and set up a dedicated office to take charge of the work. He stressed the need for KEDO to effectively lead all concerned Government departments in achieving the goal of energizing Kowloon East and removing barriers arising from different priorities of departments in the process, and the need for the Head of KEDO to have sufficient power in playing a commanding role.

17. SDEV said that the transformation of Kowloon East involved concerted efforts from various bureaux and departments. The KEDO would take a coordinating role in soliciting cooperation and supports to take forward the initiative. Apart from acting as an effective coordinator among the relevant bureaux and departments, the KEDO would also provide an effective communication platform for all to discuss and resolve the issues that might arise. For problems that could not be tackled by KEDO, SDEV, as the director of the supervising bureau, would take up the matter, and where necessary, would seek steer from higher level including the Policy Committee chaired by the Chief Secretary for Administration. She believed that once a clear common goal for an initiative was set for all concerned bureaux and departments, such as the case of Energizing Kowloon East, concerted efforts would be made to pursue the goal.

The work of Kowloon East Development Office and its relation with counterparts

18. Ms Starry LEE opined that the geographical areas covered by the Energizing Kowloon East initiative should be expanded to include nearby areas such as To Kwa Wan and Kowloon City where there were under-utilized industrial buildings, so that the residents in these older areas could share the benefits. She asked whether KEDO would handle suggestions for energizing the nearby areas and gauge the views of the Kowloon City District Council.

19. SDEV replied that the Energizing Kowloon East initiative had a clear objective, i.e. to transform KTD and the former industrial areas in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay into an alternative CBD. For the older

residential areas in Kowloon City, including To Kwa Wan, Hung Hom and Ma Tau Wai, the Urban Renewal Authority was formulating redevelopment proposals through a "bottom-up, public participatory, district-based" approach under the new urban renewal strategy. The Government had set up the first District Urban Renewal Forum in Kowloon City to solicit local views on the formulation of redevelopment proposals. The Panel would be consulted on these proposals when they were drawn up at a later stage. While focusing on the work to transform Kowloon East into an attractive and vibrant CBD, if KEDO, through its discussions with District Councils and other stakeholders, came across any views and suggestions about redevelopment of nearby areas, it would refer them to the relevant authorities for consideration and follow-up.

20. The Chairman stressed the importance of adopting a holistic approach at the district level in undertaking urban planning for the improvement of living environment of individual areas in the same district, and enquired about the role of the Planning Department in this respect. In response, SDEV advised that in Kowloon City lots of work in urban planning, design and renewal was in progress to improve the living environment in the district. Moreover, both KEDO and the secretariat of the Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum were led by Government Town Planners. Both offices were involved in land use and planning matters. The key role of the Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum was to facilitate urban renewal in Kowloon City, whereas that of KEDO was to transform Kowloon East into Hong Kong's alternative CBD.

21. Mr Alan LEONG enquired about plans and timetables for completing "quick-wins" projects in Kowloon East to improve the district's traffic and landscape, and how different views of KEDO and KTO on improvement projects would be resolved.

22. SDEV advised that transport and connectivity issues that were confined to the former industrial areas of Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay would be under the purview of KEDO, while those straddling Kwun Tong, Kowloon Bay and KTD would involve both KEDO and KTO. Where necessary, SDEV would decide which one of the two offices should lead a study or project. While KTO was an engineering-oriented office, KEDO would be planning-oriented. Under this broad principle, KTO would take charge of the development of the Environmental Friendly Linkage System in Kowloon East which would link with the existing Mass Transit Railway Kwun Tong Line and the future Shatin to Central Line. On the "quick-wins" projects to be delivered in Kowloon East, SDEV advised that they included:

the Open Space cum Zero Carbon Building in Kowloon Bay to be developed by the Construction Industry Council to showcase state-of-the-art eco-building designs and technologies, which was expected to open in mid-2012; the site office cum information kiosk of KEDO underneath the Kwun Tong Bypass at Hoi Bun Road to serve as a focal point for visitors, provide venues for exhibits, publicity materials and public engagement activities related to the Energizing Kowloon East initiative, also expected to open in mid-2012; Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2 to extend the Stage 1 Promenade by 700 metres at the former Kwun Tong Public Cargo Working Area, with works to start in late 2012; and studies for improving the traffic conditions in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay, to be commenced as soon as possible once the preparatory team for KEDO was formed.

23. Mr Alan LEONG further enquired about the role of the non-civil service contract staff in KEDO and division of work between the civil servants and non-civil service contract staff in the office. SDEV said that the non-civil service contract staff to be employed for KEDO would be estate surveyors and lawyers who would bring in working experience in the private sector to complement the knowledge and experience of town planners, architects and engineers drawn from the civil service. The experience of the Development Opportunities Office had demonstrated the benefits of a mix of civil service and non-civil service professional staff in facilitating land development projects initiated by the private sector.

Duration of the operation of the initial Kowloon East Development Office

24. Given the heavy workload and complexity of the issues to be tackled in transforming Kowloon East as well as the lead-time to deliver desired results, Mr CHAN Kam-lam considered that the proposed one-year duration for the initial KEDO would be insufficient for the Office to achieve visible accomplishments. He strongly recommended that the Administration should consider seeking funding approval from ESC and FC for a two-year operation for the initial KEDO, with a mid-term review of the effectiveness of its work to be reported to the Panel. He considered that a longer duration for the operation of KEDO would demonstrate the Administration's determination in taking forward the Energizing Kowloon East initiative.

25. Noting that during the first year, one of the major tasks for the initial KEDO was to develop the long-term institutional set-up for energizing Kowloon East, Mr Alan LEONG held the view that, if the Administration put up a proposal for a two-year operation of the initial KEDO, details on the projected long-term organizational structure, functions and manpower mix

of the Office should be provided in the proposal for the consideration of ESC and FC.

26. SDEV said that she held an open attitude to the duration of the initial KEDO, though she was inclined to exercising tighter control of resources before the long-term need and institutional set-up of the Office had been worked out. She would give consideration to a proposal for a two-year operation of the initial KEDO if this was generally supported by members. No matter the Office would be set up for one year or two years as eventually be approved by FC, the Administration would follow the original plan to report the progress of work of the initial KEDO to the Panel and consult members on the longer-term set-up of the office in 2013. She remarked that it would be important to work out the long-term plan for KEDO no later than mid-2013, so that the initiative to transform Kowloon East could be completed in 2021 to tie in with the full development of KTD in the same year. SDEV assured members that the preparatory work for transforming Kowloon East would be commenced as soon as possible. To this end, a preparatory team headed by two directorate officers would be set up under delegated authority in February 2012 to embark on the immediate tasks pertaining to the Energizing Kowloon East initiative.

27. The Chairman concluded the discussion on the item. He remarked that members in general supported the Administration's proposal to seek funding approval of ESC and FC in February and April 2012 respectively for setting up KEDO and some members invited the Administration to consider putting forward a proposal for the Office to have a two-year operation period.

V Review on the work of the Development Opportunities Office under the Development Bureau

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)797/11-12(05) -- Administration's paper on review on the work of the Development Opportunities Office under the Development Bureau
- LC Paper No. CB(1)797/11-12(06) -- Paper on Development Opportunities Office prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Updated

background brief))

28. SDEV reported the results of the review on the work progress and effectiveness of the Development Opportunities Office ("DOO") and the Administration's recommendations on the way forward for DOO upon the expiry of its three-year tenure by end of June 2012. She said that DOO was established in mid 2009 as a Government response to the slow-down in private sector investment in land development projects after the financial tsunami in late 2008. It was hoped that by encouraging private as well as non-government organization ("NGO") land development projects and facilitating their early implementation, the initiative would help create jobs. Since its establishment, DOO had been providing one-stop consultation and coordination service to non-government land development proposals that carried broader social and economic merits. DOO had been helping project proponents overcome obstacles associated with land development projects straddling different policy areas and involving various technical assessments.

29. On the work of DOO, SDEV advised that over the past two and a half years, the Administration had been submitting regular reports to the Panel and received positive comments as well as constructive suggestions from members. By the end of December 2011, 32 out of 51 eligible land development proposals handled by DOO had made substantial progress, and DOO had submitted these proposals to the Land and Development Advisory Committee ("LDAC") for advice or information. Of these 32 proposals, LDAC had advised the Administration to support 21 of them, some of which had actually started work on site. Details about the latest progress of the development proposals submitted to LDAC were given in Annex C to the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)797/11-12(05)).

30. Considering that DOO had achieved the stated objective in providing useful assistance to facilitate land development projects as a Government response to the economic situation following the financial tsunami and taking account of the current priorities of DEVB vis-à-vis resources available as well as the changing economic situation, SDEV said that the Administration would not seek an extension of DOO beyond end of June 2012. DOO would strive to complete the processing of its outstanding projects as far as possible, and the Administration recommended the following arrangements upon the discontinuation of DOO --

- (a) Policy issues relating to revitalization of industrial buildings, area-based transformation of former industrial areas, and

provision of secretariat support to the Steering Committee on Housing Land Supply and LDAC would be transferred to the Planning and Lands Branch ("PLB") of DEVB. The necessary changes in manpower provision and organization of work in PLB would be discussed in a separate paper under the next agenda item.

- (b) The current facilitation service for meritorious land development proposals provided by DOO would be taken up by the relevant policy units in DEVB and its group of departments, where appropriate. For example, KEDO would provide one-stop facilitation service for land development projects in Kowloon East; the policy units with special advocacy roles (e.g. the Harbour Unit, the Commissioner for Heritage's Office) would facilitate land development projects in line with their policy objectives; and other departments, in particular the Planning Department, would facilitate meritorious development projects in the same way as it was before the establishment of DOO.

31. SDEV added that DOO would share its experience in facilitating land development proposals from the private sector with other bureaux/departments. One of the most useful points to note from the experience of DOO was that even if individual bureaux/departments had different priorities and encountered constraints in processing a development proposal, once a clear common goal was agreed and a platform for discussion and working out solutions was established, hurdles could be removed and the proposal could be taken forward. It was hoped that DOO's successful experience in facilitating private and NGO development projects, coupled with high transparency maintained over the process, would reinforce public confidence in the Administration's determination in promoting land development projects for the social and economic benefits of Hong Kong.

Future facilitation service for land development proposals

32. Mr CHAN Kam-lam expressed appreciation for the effective work of DOO. He agreed to the future arrangements proposed by the Administration for providing facilitation service for meritorious land development proposals, and the proposal of creating an Administrative Officer Staff Grade C post in PLB of DEVB to take on some of the existing duties of DOO upon the cessation of the Office, which would be discussed under the next

agenda item. He opined that the Administration's initiatives to establish DOO on a time-limited basis in 2009 and to set up KEDO in 2012 were timely actions to address the development needs of Hong Kong at different times.

33. Miss Tanya CHAN pointed out that before the establishment of DOO, project proponents had raised concerns about difficulties in identifying and approaching the relevant bureaux/departments in taking forward land development projects on their own, and the long time spent and uncertainties faced during such process which had inhibited innovative development projects. She was concerned that these concerns could recur with DOO ceasing operation and how the new arrangements could help increase efficiency in processing private land development proposals.

34. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that when the Administration put forward the proposal in 2009 for establishing DOO, he had expressed concern that the proposal would only benefit real estate development projects from the private sector by reducing regulatory control on the projects. However, his concern was allayed by the successful work of DOO work in past two years in facilitating the implementation of development proposals from NGOs, which had proved the merit of setting up a dedicated office to provide one-stop consultation and coordination service to non-government land development projects. He was concerned that without the coordination of DOO, individual bureaux/department might be less enthusiastic in assisting meritorious land development proposals. He asked whether the Administration would consider other mode of operation for DOO instead of winding up the Office.

35. SDEV re-iterated that the operation of DOO was intended to be a time-limited measure to contribute to the economy and create job opportunities as a Government response to the adverse economic climate after the financial tsunami in 2008. While she acknowledged the concerns expressed by the relevant stakeholders when they learnt about the Administration's proposal of winding up DOO, the Administration did not propose extending the operation of the Office. She stressed that DOO would endeavour to complete the processing of the outstanding projects it had received before ceasing operation by end of June 2012. She re-iterated that after the cessation of DOO, facilitation of the implementation of meritorious land development proposals relating to the Energizing Kowloon East initiative would be taken up by KEDO while the relevant policy units/departments under DEVB would assist in other meritorious land development proposals under their respective purviews. Moreover, DOO

would share its experience with other bureaux/departments in facilitating land development projects with a view to enhancing their understanding of land policy, land resources management and related procedures and issues, so that they could be better prepared in facilitating private land development proposals. In future, depending on the nature of a particular land development proposal, the concerned bureau and its relevant departments would take the lead in facilitating its implementation. For instance, the Education Bureau would take the lead in facilitating education-related development projects, with the participation of concerned departments.

36. Mr Alan LEONG said that the Civic Party had expressed reservation on the proposal to set up DOO. He pointed out that the effective work of DOO did not necessarily justify its continuation. That said, he agreed that the useful experience of DOO in facilitating land development proposals should be systematically recorded and made known to the public and bureaux/departments in the form of "frequently asked questions" or flow charts illustrating the procedures and important points to note for the benefits of potential project proponents and processing authorities in future. The Chairman suggested that DOO should share its experience with not only other Government departments, but also building professionals in the private sector, including architects and surveyors. Mr LEE Wing-tat remarked that the Government of the next term should seriously consider the merits of re-launching DOO's service. SDEV noted members' views and suggestions.

Land development proposals presented by the Development Opportunities Office to the Land and Development Advisory Committee for advice

37. Referring to two proposed projects relating to development of columbaria in the list of development proposals submitted to LDAC (Proposals No. 23 and No. 24 in Annex C of the Administration's paper), Miss Tanya CHAN enquired why DOO had assisted the two projects since she noted that the public had expressed planning and land use concerns over the projects.

38. SDEV explained that in order to be eligible for DOO's facilitation service, private-sector development proposals had to meet certain criteria. For the two columbaria development proposals, the proponents did meet the criteria, including that the land required for the proposed projects was readily available and the projects were not exclusively residential but carried broader social and economic merits. In handling the two proposals, DOO had assisted the proponents in liaising with the relevant bureaux and departments to identify possible challenges and solutions for the proposals.

The merits and problems associated with the proposals were then submitted to LDAC for advice. Due to complicated problems relating to planning, land and transport access in the two proposed columbaria projects, LDAC eventually advised that the projects should not be supported and DOO should cease providing one-stop consultation service to them. She added that since DOO and LDAC were not the approving authorities for land development proposals, the project proponents could submit their proposals to the relevant approving authorities direct, such as the Town Planning Board, in accordance with the relevant statutory or administrative procedures.

39. Referring to the proposal on Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui's in-situ redevelopment of its compound in Central (Proposal No.4 in Annex C of the Administration's paper) which had been supported by LDAC, Miss Tanya CHAN said that residents in Wan Chai had expressed concern about insufficient public consultation on the project, which involved relocating some of the existing facilities in Sheng Kung Hui's compound in Central to Mount Butler in Wan Chai. Miss CHAN emphasized that in concluding DOO's experience, it should be highlighted that all the proper planning procedures, including comprehensive consultation, should be followed.

40. SDEV advised that the project proposed by Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui had the support of LDAC, which comprised representatives from various sectors of the community. She took note of Miss CHAN's views and agreed that views and concerns of the local community which would be affected by a development project should be well taken into account during the planning and development process.

VI Creation of post in Lands Unit of Planning and Lands Branch of Development Bureau

(LC Paper No. CB(1)797/11-12(07) -- Administration's paper on proposed creation of an Administrative Officer Staff Grade C post in Planning and Lands Branch of Development Bureau)

41. SDEV briefed members on the Administration's proposal to create an Administrative Officer Staff Grade C ("AOSGC")(D2) post to strengthen support at the directorate level in PLB of DEVB. She explained that the new

post would be designated as Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands) 7 ("PAS(PL)7") and the officer for the post would take over a number of key on-going or emerging tasks relating to policy matters on planning and land use currently shouldered by DOO, including --

- (a) formulating and overseeing implementation of measures to encourage revitalization of older industrial buildings;
- (b) coordinating policy measures to promote district-based regeneration of former industrial areas; and
- (c) providing secretariat support to LDAC.

42. While the existing Head/DOO was pitched at D3 level, which reflected the level of policy and practical experience required to lead DOO in handling wide-ranging project proposals, SDEV said that the Administration considered that it would be appropriate to pitch the proposed new AOSGC post at D2 level, as the officer holding the new post would no longer handle highly complicated and sensitive development proposals.

43. SDEV said that PAS(PL)7 would take over from PAS(PL)1 policy matters relating to land administration. At present, PAS(PL)1 headed the existing Lands Unit that handled all policy matters relating to land administration and the housekeeping of Lands Department. Specifically, PAS(PL)1 was responsible for formulating land supply policy and strategy as well as implementing various land supply initiatives. With the Administration pressing ahead the initiatives to expand land resources for housing and office developments and to create land reserve in recent years, coupled with growing workload in other land administration policy matters, the existing workload of PAS(PL)1 had become too heavy for her effective discharge of the duties. As such, PAS(PL)7, in addition to inheriting the duties from Head/DOO as mentioned above, would take over some policy matters relating to land administration from PAS(PL)1, including providing policy inputs relating to private treaty grants, lease modification, short term tenancies, etc. While PAS(PL)1 could focus on formulating and implementing policies and initiatives relating to increasing land supply for housing and office uses, he would take over from Head/DOO the duties to serve the Steering Committee on Housing Land Supply chaired by the Financial Secretary and co-ordinate the follow-up actions on the Committee's decisions with the relevant bureaux/departments. The Administration hoped that the division of responsibilities between PAS(PL)1 and PAS(PL)7 would help sustain the smooth operation of the

Lands Unit and enhance its directorate support. She appealed to members for their support to the creation of the new D2 post.

44. Ir Dr Raymond HO expressed appreciation for the work of DOO in providing one-stop consultation and coordination service to land development proposals and assisting many of them in obtaining the support of LDAC and the approval of relevant authorities. Although he would prefer DOO to continue its service, he supported the proposed creation of the new AOSGC post to take over some of the key tasks of the existing DOO in view of the Administration's decision to wind up the Office.

45. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that he supported the Administration's proposal to create the new D2 post in principle. Nonetheless, he re-iterated his concern that the enthusiasm and effectiveness of relevant bureau/departments in facilitating land development proposals could not sustain after the discontinuation of DOO. He stressed the need for the Administration to continue to provide one-stop consultation and coordination service for meritorious land development proposals in assisting project proponents, in particular NGOs and small developers, in taking forward the proposals. In the absence of a dedicated office like DOO to facilitate the processing of such proposals, it was doubtful how PAS(PL)7 could effectively offer the same facilitation service to project proponents. Mr LEE was of the view that the Administration should bring solutions to address his concern when putting forward the proposal to create the new D2 post for consideration by ESC.

46. SDEV said that PAS(PL)7 would only inherit some of the existing key tasks of DOO as explained in the Administration's paper. She clarified that PAS(PL)7 would not take over DOO's function of providing one-stop consultation and coordination service for land development proposals from the private sector and NGOs. After the winding up of DOO, individual policy bureaux would act as the lead bureaux for coordinating land development proposals under their respective policy portfolios. She emphasized that the procedures would be similar to the existing practice for handling development proposals. For instance, the Education Bureau would be responsible for coordinating proposals on development of international schools and DEVB would take charge of heritage conservation projects. She assured members that DOO would share its experience with bureaux/departments so that they would be better prepared for providing the same facilitation service to project proponents.

47. Mr LEE Wing-tat re-iterated his concerns. SDEV said that it would be practically difficult for the future PAS(PL)7, who would share PAS(PL)1's current duties related to land administration and without the professional support as in the current DOO set-up, to provide the same facilitation service as Head/DOO did. Nevertheless, she noted Mr LEE's concern and would study the issue.

48. The Chairman concluded the discussion on the item. He said that members in general supported the Administration's proposal to seek funding approval of ESC and FC for the creation of the AOSGC post.

VII Issues relating to water supply systems in new buildings arising from the recent detection of Legionella bacteria in the Central Government offices and the Legislative Council Complex

(LC Paper No. CB(1)797/11-12(09) -- Letter dated 5 January 2012 from Hon WONG Kwok-hing on the recent detection of Legionella bacteria in the Central Government Offices and the Legislative Council Complex

LC Paper No. CB(1)852/11-12(01) -- Administration's paper on monitoring of the drinking water quality in buildings

LC Paper No. FS14/11-12 -- Paper on issues relating to water supply systems in buildings arising from the detection of Legionella bacteria in the Central Government Offices and the Legislative Council Complex prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Fact sheet)

49. Director of Water Supplies ("DWS") briefed members on the work of the Water Supplies Department ("WSD") in monitoring the quality of drinking water in buildings. He highlighted the following points --

- (a) Hong Kong enjoyed one of the safest drinking water supply in the world which complied fully with the standards stipulated in the World Health Organization's "Guidelines for Drinking-water Quality" ("WHO's Guidelines"). The Water Science Division of WSD had been monitoring Hong Kong's entire water supply system to assure the quality of water through conducting of physical, chemical, bacteriological, biological and radiological tests on a continuous basis. The number of water samples taken by WSD exceeded a hundred thousands every year. As free residual chlorine would effectively prohibit the growth of bacteria including Legionella bacteria in water, in order to safeguard public health, it had been the practice of WSD in maintaining a suitable amount of free residual chlorine in water supplied to households.
- (b) WSD had prescribed a set of procedures for approval of inside service of new buildings, which was applicable to both government and private construction projects. As part of the approval process, WSD would check to ensure that the vertical plumbing line diagram would comply with specific requirements under the Waterworks Ordinance ("WO") (Cap. 102). Moreover, in accordance with WO, the inside service of a building should be constructed, installed and maintained by a licensed plumber. Before connecting the newly installed inside service to the public water supply network, the plumber should clean and sterilize the inside service thoroughly so as to avoid contamination to the public water supply. WSD had issued guidelines on the cleaning and disinfection of fresh water mains of inside service for plumbers to follow. Where necessary, plumbers would be required to submit to WSD the test results of water samples taken at the connection point and WSD would commission water supply only when it was satisfied with the test results.
- (c) The principal tests on a water sample covered colour, conductivity, pH value, turbidity, free residual chlorine, total coliforms and E. Coli. At present, Legionella bacteria test was not required as it was not specified under WHO's Guidelines. To avoid any possibility of contamination, consumers should put newly installed water mains into active use as soon as possible after cleaning and disinfection.

- (d) According to the Waterworks Regulations (Cap. 102A), the consumers should be responsible for keeping the inside service of water supply system clean. In order to ensure that they could enjoy water of good quality from their taps, consumers had to maintain their water supply systems properly. WSD had issued relevant guidelines to consumers in this regard.
- (e) To encourage consumers to properly taking care of the water quality of the inside service, WSD had launched the "Fresh Water Plumbing Quality Maintenance Recognition Scheme" in July 2002, which was renamed later as the "Quality Water Recognition Scheme for Buildings" ("QWRSB"). QWRSB was a voluntary scheme with the aim to encourage consumers to clean the water tanks and inspect the plumbing systems once every three months. As at the end of 2011, there were some 1.04 million households joining QWRSB, including about 580 000 households for private housing and 460 000 households for public housing.

Detection of Legionella bacteria in the new Central Government Offices and Legislative Council Complex at Tamar

50. Mr LEE Wing-tat enquired whether the Administration's contractors had followed WSD's guidelines in cleaning and disinfecting the water supply systems in the new Central Government Offices ("CGO") and Legislative Council ("LegCo") Complex at Tamar, and whether WSD had received the test results of the water samples taken for the project before commissioning water supply for the buildings. He further expressed concern about news reports revealing that about 15% of the water samples taken and tested in Hong Kong every year had contained Legionella bacteria.

51. DWS advised that the cleaning and disinfecting of water mains of inside service of government and private buildings should be performed by licensed plumbers following the WSD's guidelines. One of the possible causes for the presence of Legionella bacteria in water samples taken in the new CGO and LegCo Complex was the phased occupation schedule of the new buildings and resulting in some of the water mains not put in active use after connection of water supply. He re-iterated that test of Legionella bacteria in water sample was not required under WHO's Guidelines currently, and there was no scientific basis in support of a direct correlation between Legionnaires' disease ("LD") and a specific level of concentration of Legionella bacteria in water sample. In local context, for examination of

Legionella bacteria in cooling water towers of air conditioning system, a standard of 1 000 Colony-forming Units per millilitre ("1 000 cfu/ml") was adopted as upper control limit for fresh water cooling tower control whereas for epidemiological investigation for each confirmed case of LD, a far more stringent standard of 0.1 - 1.0 cfu/ml was adopted for potable water by the Department of Health. As for Mr LEE Wing-tat's question on the 15% discovery rate of Legionella bacteria, DWS advised that since the tests performed by WSD on collected water samples did not cover Legionella bacteria, the figure quoted by Mr LEE might relate to the tests on LD in water samples taken in ordinary households done by Professor YUEN Kwok-yung recently after the Tamar incident.

Review of Water Supplies Department's guidelines for licensed plumbers

52. Miss Tanya CHAN said that she was shocked by the findings of the latest study conducted by Professor YUEN Kwok-yung and his team on Legionella bacteria found in water samples. Although there was no scientific correlation between LD and the concentration of Legionella bacteria in water samples, she was worried that there might be gap in control between the commissioning of water supply and the occupation of the premises with active use of water. In the light of the recent LD incident in CGO and LegCo Complex, she considered it necessary for WSD to review and update its existing guidelines to cover any gap in assuring the quality of water and hence protecting the health of owners/tenants of newly occupied buildings. For instance, consumers should be advised to conduct thorough cleaning and disinfection of the water mains of the inside service again immediately before occupation of the buildings if the water supply system had been left idle for some time after completion of the buildings. She also asked whether WSD's guidelines covered regular cleansing of the water tanks installed in buildings, and whether the presence of free residual chlorine in water would have negative impact on health despite chlorine was useful in killing Legionella bacteria.

53. DWS advised that Legionella bacteria grew well in water of 25 to 45 degrees Celsius. Probably due to low utilization of some water outlets in the new CGO, the water in the water pipes connecting to these outlets was kept in stagnant condition for a long period of time. Stagnant water was more prone to breeding Legionella bacteria. Moreover, insulated pipe work in hot water supply system could keep warm water inside the pipe for a longer period of time. These two factors combined could provide a favourable breeding environment for Legionella bacteria. He said it was the responsibility of consumers to keep the inside service of water supply system

clean, and inside service included water tanks and water mains. He added that the guidelines provided by WSD included the regular cleaning and maintenance of the inside service, active use of the plumbing system for preventing stagnation of water and maintaining of a suitable level of free residual chlorine in water. If the steps in cleaning and maintenance of the plumbing system be followed, fresh water from public supply should be safe for use by individual households. Moreover, WHO had guideline on free residual chlorine level in drinking water. He however agreed to review the existing guidelines in consultation with the relevant trade associations to examine the need for necessary amplification. He also agreed that public education on related subjects should be enhanced.

Views for consideration of the Prevention of Legionnaire's Disease Committee

54. Mr LEE Wing-tat pointed out that although WHO had not established correlation between the level of Legionella bacteria found in water and the infection of LD by individuals, in view of widespread public concern, it was advisable for the Prevention of LD Committee ("PLDC") to strengthen preventive measures against LD, and the Administration should take the lead in implementing the measures in setting a good example. DWS assured Mr LEE that his views would be relayed to PLDC for consideration in the upcoming meeting to be held on 8 February 2012. The likely direction to be taken by PLDC was to enhance preventive measures at areas of water supply systems which were more prone to the breeding of Legionella bacteria.

55. Mr WONG Kwok-hing urged that advice and recommendations put forward by experts at the PLDC meeting should be incorporated into WSD's guidelines, as well as the requirements for QWRSB. Moreover, noting that only 460 000 public housing households of the total of some existing 600 000 had joined QWRSB, he enquired whether the Administration would consider promoting the scheme to all public housing households as well as all government premises and buildings of statutory bodies.

56. DWS explained that QWRSB was targeting at households of private and public residential buildings and commercial premises. For government buildings, the Architectural Services Department ("ArchSD") had adopted a similar practice for cleaning and maintenance of the plumbing systems. As he understood, ArchSD was considering the inclusion of government buildings under QWRSB. DWS thanked Mr WONG for his support of the

QWRSB and advised that WSD would further liaise with ArchSD and Housing Department to promote participation in the scheme.

57. The Chairman was of the view that one of the possible causes for the LD incident in CGO was the presence of stagnant hot water inside the under-utilized hot-water pipes. He considered that prevention of LD in water supply systems in buildings was a matter for the building management, and that PLDC should look into the matter and strengthen preventive measures against LD. He also stressed the need for the Administration to prevent the spread of LD by enhancing proper construction, cleaning and maintenance of fresh water cooling tower systems and other water systems in buildings.

58. Assistant Director/Electricity and Energy Efficiency ("AD/E&EE") pointed out that Legionella bacteria were commonly found in aqueous environment, such as fresh water cooling towers, water tanks, hot and cold water systems, whirlpool and spas, water fountains, etc., and grew well in water with temperature from 25 to 45 degree Celsius. Certain susceptible groups of people in particular might get infected when they inhaled contaminated droplets and mist generated by the artificial water systems. As sea water, instead of fresh water, was used in the air-conditioning systems for CGO and the LegCo Complex, the risk of LD spread from the air-conditioning systems was extremely low. Proper design, installation, operation and maintenance of water supply systems and fresh water cooling towers could help prevent LD. PLDC had published a Code of Practice on prevention of LD. To prevent breeding of Legionella bacteria in heaters and hot-water pipes which had been identified as a likely source of Legionella bacteria in the recent LD incident in CGO, concerned government departments, experts had been taking on remedial actions and follow up measures. It was hoped that recommendations would be drawn up at the PLDC meeting scheduled for 8 February 2012.

59. At the request of Mr WONG Kwok-hing, DWS and AD/E&EE agreed to relay views and concerns expressed by members for consideration by PLDC, and report the outcome of the PLDC meeting to be held on 8 February 2012 to the Panel.

Tests for detection of Legionella bacteria

60. Mr Albert CHAN enquired whether rapid test kits were available in the market so that the public could test the level of Legionella bacteria in their tap water.

61. DWS said that rapid test kits for LD only worked on areas with a high concentration of Legionella bacteria, and were not sensitive for detection of Legionella bacteria of low concentration. A more practicable way to check against proliferation of Legionella bacteria in water was to conduct rapid tests on free residual chlorine in the water. As free residual chlorine depleted very quickly in warm and stagnant water, the water supply system should be put into active use for preventing stagnation. Also, the conducting of proper cleaning and regular maintenance for the systems was essential. Mr Albert CHAN stressed the importance for the Administration to strengthen education and publicity on effective measures to reduce Legionella bacteria in fresh water supply in order to prevent LD. DWS took note of the view and said that the Administration would step up publicity and educate the public on prevention of LD through appropriate means.

VIII PWP Item No. 4152CD -- Drainage improvement works in upper Lam Tsuen River, She Shan River, upper Tai Po River, Ping Long and Kwun Hang

(LC Paper No. CB(1)797/11-12(08) -- Administration's paper on PWP Item No. 152CD -- Drainage improvement works in upper Lam Tsuen River, She Shan River, upper Tai Po River, Ping Long and Kwun Hang)

62. Deputy Secretary (Works)2 ("DS(W)2") briefed members on the Administration's proposal which sought to increase the approved project estimate ("APE") of project 152CD by \$141.9 million, i.e. from \$426.3 million to \$568.2 million, for implementing the drainage improvement works in upper Lam Tsuen River, She Shan River, upper Tai Po River, Ping Long and Kwun Hang. He pointed out that the increase in APE was due to --

- (a) increase in provision for price adjustment which amounted to \$88.2 million;
- (b) additional works to overcome unforeseen site constraint and implement design enhancements amounting to \$74.4 million; and
- (c) additional site supervision costs amounting to \$13 million.

The increase in cost was partly offset by the lower-than-expected tender price for the drainage and ancillary works and the drawdown from contingencies which amounted to \$33.7 million in total.

63. The Chairman reminded members that in accordance with rules 83A and 84 of the Rules of Procedure of LegCo, they should disclose direct or indirect pecuniary interests, if any, relating to the subjects under discussion at the meeting as appropriate.

Flooding incident in Sha Po Tsai Village, Tai Po in July 2010

64. Mr Albert CHAN enquired about the drainage improvement works being implemented in upper Tai Po River and whether the works would address flooding problems near Sha Po Tsai Village where a serious flash flood occurred in July 2010 leading to one fatal incident. He said that he had different views on the causes of the flooding incident with those revealed in the investigation conducted by the government consultant and the inquiry of the Coroner's Court. He believed that the tragedy could have been avoided if more had been done by the Administration in improving the project designs and enhancing onsite works supervision. To prevent recurrence of similar incident, he called on the Administration to learn from the incident and strengthen the monitoring work during implementation of the project. In order to avoid blockage of the river by rocks, rubbles and garbage washed downstream during heavy downpours, drainage improvement works which aimed to improve the flow capacity of the river downstream should be considered. The Chairman shared Mr CHAN's views.

65. DS(W)2 advised that in the wake of the flooding incident at Sha Po Tsai Village happened in July 2010, the Drainage Services Department had conducted an investigation into the incident. Subsequently, the Administration commissioned a professor of a local university to carry out an independent study to review the investigation of the incident. Tai Po District Council had been briefed on the findings and recommended

improvement measures of the investigation and the independent study. The investigation and independent study reports had also been considered by the Coroner's Court in its death inquiry of the fatal incident. DS(W)2 added that based on the recommendations of the independent study, the Administration had enhanced the design of the drainage improvement works to incorporate additional flood protection measures, such as boulder traps, stilling basins and baffle blocks, with a view to further optimizing the hydraulic performance of the river. In pursuance of the recommendations of the death inquiry of the Coroner's Court, the Administration had commissioned a separate consultancy study to assess the flooding risks of similar rivers, which was expected to complete in 2012.

Designs and greening of the proposed drainage improvement works

66. Mr Albert CHAN opined that in undertaking improvement works for the rivers covered in the project, the Administration should step up its effort to maintain the natural outlook of the rivers and incorporate greening works such as planting trees of suitable species along the rivers. He considered that besides improving the environment, trees could help stabilize the riverbank and prevent flooding. Furthermore, he noticed that plants, such as Mikania (薇甘菊), which were harmful to other local plants had been growing rapidly along rivers in Mui Wo, Lantau Island. He urged the Administration to take appropriate action to remove such plants.

67. DS(W)2 and Assistant Director/Projects and Development, Drainage Services Department advised that the Administration was mindful of the need to combat flooding risk for public safety and enhance greening elements in drainage improvement works as far as possible. To this end, the Administration had been maintaining contact with green groups for views and suggestions in these aspects. Moreover, the Drainage Services Department carried out regular maintenance for rivers and streams in the territory, which included the removal of harmful plants along rivers and streams. The Administration would take note of Mr CHAN's suggestions and views. As requested by Mr CHAN, the Administration would provide drawing and plan showing the proposed typical design and greening works of the drainage project for the concerned rivers in its submission to the Public Works Subcommittee.

Admin

Submission to Public Works Subcommittee

68. Members agreed that the Administration's funding proposal should be forwarded to the Public Works Subcommittee for consideration.

IX Any other business

69. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 11:46 am.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
18 April 2012