

To: 土木工程拓展署 <landsupply@cedd.gov.hk>
From: Ken Lo
Date: 06/06/2013 11:16AM
Cc: 發展事務委員會 <panel_dev@legco.gov.hk>
Subject: Re: Fwd: Fwd: [優化土地供應策略 - 坪洲喜靈洲連島方案]意見
Dear Sirs,

I attach a copy of an article (Chinese only) criticizing the way that the current consultation is being handled. This is another example of what speaker(s) from Shatin had criticized on 1 June 2013.

The matter goes to the core of the basic integrity and trust in our system. We cannot allow these problems to go on anymore; otherwise our system will fail. Please let the public including the people in Peng Chau have an official answer and (if applicable) a good apology without further delay.

Yours faithfully,
Kenneth Lo

<http://hk.apple.nextmedia.com/realtime/news/20130606/51459171>

「優化土地策略第二階段諮詢」即將在六月底結束，在去年的第一階段諮詢中，明顯地有半數人不支持填海拓地，但政府依然強行第二階段諮詢。

在兩次的諮詢中，政府都「做了很多事」及「做少了很多事」去減低反對聲音，尤其是減低離島居民的聲音，這些小動作都反映出政府是如何刻意營造諮詢效果，大力壓低反對聲音，營造社會上大多數人都支持填海及填海是何其有理據。

是次填海選址，有不少是位於離島區，其中所謂「中部水域」人工島方案更涉及 1,400 至 2,400 公頃，可是在是次諮詢中，卻從不提及「中部水域」附近離島的名字，包括坪洲、喜靈洲、交椅洲、南丫島及長洲等，試問離島居民又如何得知是次諮詢原來已影響數個離島？

第二，這樣長遠又龐大的計劃，在此諮詢階段中只是舉行了兩次公眾論壇，而且沒有一個是在上述離島內舉行，試問這次諮詢中又可以多大反映離島居民意見？去年亦都是因為應島上關注組要求下，政府才派出代表出席居民大會。而兩次所謂的公眾巡迴展覽，亦欠缺在坪洲舉行，但在兩次諮詢中，方案規模最大的卻均在坪洲。（第一次是「坪洲喜靈洲」連島方案，第二次則是「中部水域」人工島方案）

第三，回到去年的諮詢結果，政府延遲了數月才公佈有關報告，該報告卻只提供英文版本，而且不理會反對填海聲音佔半數的結果，仍強行推第二階段諮詢！試問在這不公的諮詢過程、低透明度的填海方案下，離島居民在是次諮詢中被蒙在鼓裏，日後政府落實離島填海大計時，政府便大可以指在諮詢過程中沒有收到離島居民的反對。

一場政府已預設好結果的偽諮詢，離島居民如何可獲足夠資訊，繼而對填海表達意見？

【蘋果論壇網上版現已推出！除收錄《蘋果日報》論壇版的足本全文外，更開設網上論壇刊登更多讀者投稿，請瀏覽 <http://hk.apple.nextmedia.com/feature/onlineforum>，投稿網上論壇可電郵到 onlineforum@appledaily.com】

On 2 June 2013 15:10, Ken Lo wrote:

Dear Mr. Yeung,

Thank you for your last email. I have watched the meeting of the Development Panel at Legco on 1 June 2013. There are numerous objections to reclamation, etc., and our Legco members voiced several concerns, questions and criticisms. The Chairman had also expressed certain views that are similar to my last email enquiries about reclamation in Central Waters.

The Government has the duty to come to Peng Chau to explain to all parties concerned the reclamation in Central Waters and how it will, might and/or would possibly affect Peng Chau. Last year, our Rural Committee asked representatives from CEDD to come and all of us had voiced objections, which seems to have been entirely ignored. I do not understand why the Government does not come to meet us again.

As the deadline for objections and comments to CEDD is 20 June 2013, I fear that most if not all of the people in Peng Chau will be wrongfully deemed to have consented to the reclamation. Although you must be aware that letters of objection and comments from concerned groups and individuals have already been submitted, the way that the authority is handling the consultation is being publicly challenged as evidenced by the Legco meeting yesterday. Please confirm that such wrongful view is not taken by the CEDD or anyone in the Government.

If I have correctly heard what the Secretary said at the Legco meeting yesterday, at the next stage of the consultation, you will officially announce the location or locations of the artificial island or islands in Central Waters involving basically Peng

Chau, Hei Ling Chau, Lamma Island and Cheung Chau. This will come very soon this year as the decision is already made pending certain studies that are, frankly, incomprehensible to layman like me. No information has been officially released about the shipping routes and the harbour operations mentioned at the meeting. All I can remember is a tiny drawing with tiny prints in a certain puzzle-like PowerPoint slide that does not tell me anything about what those studies are. Please give us and the public of Hong Kong a clear picture of what those studies are about. What purposes will they serve? Are these studies that would require public funding? If so, how much?

I hope I am wrong but I have a very strong impression that the Government has made its own decision on reclamation in Central Waters before the expiry of the 2nd stage consultation.

In the circumstances, as a resident in Peng Chau and a nature lover, I have no choice but to notify you by this email that again I have the strongest objection to the option of creating artificial island or islands in Central Waters as proposed by the Government in March 2013. I will submit a full objection document in due course.

Yours faithfully,
Kenneth Lo

On 9 May 2013 09:12, <landsupply@cedd.gov.hk> wrote:
Dear Mr Lo,

Thank you for your email. I would like to respond to your questions collectively as follows:

In January 2012 when the stage 1 public engagement was half-way conducted, in response to stakeholder suggestions, the government announced 25 illustrative possible reclamation sites outside Victoria Harbour which were divided into four categories comprising artificial islands, reclamation to connect islands, reclamation upon artificial or disturbed shoreline and reclamation on sites close to natural but not protected shoreline. When publicizing these sites, the government had emphasized that they did not constitute a list of selected sites confirmed for implementation but were specific examples to facilitate the public to consider the eight initial site selection criteria for reclamation. Therefore, the previous proposal for reclamation to connect Peng Chau and Hei Ling Chau (B1) in stage 1 PE is only an illustrative example.

The public opinions on reclamation outside the Victoria Harbour collected from stage 1 public engagement were mixed with supporting and objecting views. Most of the objecting views came from signature campaigns organised in the local communities and focused on several illustrative reclamation sites among the 25 sites that might cause greater impacts on the environment and the community. Separately, members

of the public generally agreed on the eight site selection criteria with guiding principles in accordance with the social, environmental and economic benefits, and with particular emphasis on the criteria relating to the environmental, marine ecological and social impacts.

Having regard to the criteria for selecting reclamation sites, we propose five potential near shore reclamation sites comprising Lung Kwu Tan, Ma Liu Shui, Siu Ho Wan and Sunny Bay at Lantau North, as well as Tsing Yi Southwest. The total area of these reclamation sites is about 600 ha. For Lung Kwu Tan, Siu Ho Wan and Sunny Bay, there are more convenient land and marine transport and less impacts on the environment and the community, whilst Ma Liu Shui and Tsing Yi Southwest could be implemented as extensions to the current new towns of Sha Tin and Tsuen Wan/Tsing Yi as the two reclamation sites are close to existing new towns and strategic highways.

Apart from the near shore reclamation sites, we have also considered the option of artificial islands, and reviewed the eastern waters, the central waters and the western waters of Hong Kong outside the Victoria Harbour. The eastern waters are bound by extensive shorelines of high ecological value and remote from existing infrastructure whilst the western waters are already heavily constrained by a number of major infrastructure projects. The central waters (between Hong Kong Island and Lantau) however can generally avoid shorelines of high ecological value and if artificial islands are provided with suitable transport infrastructure, they could be extended as new development areas from the current urban areas. The total area of potential reclamation sites including both the near shore reclamation and possible artificial islands in the central waters is about 2 000 to 3 000 ha which could be used for land reserve and other uses in future.

Despite the fact that there is opportunity to build an artificial island in the central waters, the size and location of the which are yet to be determined. We shall carry out strategic studies to assess this initiative's impact on marine traffic safety, port operations, water quality and marine ecology, and examine the engineering feasibility, external transport links, possible land uses, etc.

We are now conducting stage 2 PE. Among others, we would like the public to advise us on what they wish the artificial islands in the central waters to be used. After the stage 2 PE, we will carry out the above mentioned strategic studies to identify potential sites in the area for further consideration and public consultation.

Regards,
Ricky Yeung
Engineer, Port Works Division, CEDD

From: Ken Lo
To: "landsupply@cedd.gov.hk" <landsupply@cedd.gov.hk>
Date: 28/04/2013 22:29
Subject: Re: Fwd: Fwd: [優化土地供應策略 - 坪洲喜靈洲連島方案]意見
EDMS No.: Doc. Src. :

Dear Mr. Yeung,

How are you? Since the 2nd stage of the consultation has started, I am trying to clarify how far Peng Chau is still caught by the proposed reclamation under the category of "Artificial Islands in Central Water." In this connection, I should be grateful if you would kindly advise:

1. Whether the previous proposal for "reclamation to connect Peng Chau and Hei Ling Chau" (B1) in Stage 1 of the consultation has become entirely abortive and is to be ignored?
2. Whether Peng Chau may still be caught by the newly proposed "Artificial Islands in Central Water" in Stage 2, notwithstanding that Peng Chau has never been included in the previous 3 proposals for artificial islands, A1-Hei Ling Chau West, A2-South Cheung Chau, and A3-Lamma North?

You are aware that Peng Chau is a very small island with an area of 99 hectares (0.99 sq. km) only. The new proposal for "Artificial Islands in Central Waters" would produce land amounting to 2,400 hectares (in addition to the 600 hectares from the reclamation in the other 5 locations), i.e., over 24 times of the size of Peng Chau. Would such island or islands be a new piece(s) of land erected independently on the sea? Or would the island(s) be attached or anchored to any or some or all of the existing outlying islands, Lamma, Cheung Chau, Hei Ling Chau or Peng Chau?

In Stage 1 of the consultation, you have listed a number of development concerns in each proposal. Now, what are the main development concerns in respect of the new proposal for Artificial Islands in Central Waters?

I cannot guess what the Government has on its mind and must ask for your kind enlightenment.

Before commenting on the 2nd stage consultation, I hope I may have your kind reply to the above enquiries and questions. Thank you for your attention.

Yours faithfully,
Kenneth Lo

On 15 November 2012 11:33, landsupply@cedd.gov.hk <landsupply@cedd.gov.hk> wrote:

Dear Mr Lo,

Thanks for your email.

In January 2012, the Government announced 25 possible reclamation sites in response to the feedback of the public during consultation. The purpose is to give the public a list of possible reclamation sites to allow more substantive discussions on the criteria for selecting reclamation sites. In fact, the Government has not decided the location of reclamation sites outside Victoria Harbour so far.

As mentioned in our earlier email, the Government has collected about 50,000 comments/views, both quantitative and qualitative, from the public during Stage 1 Public Engagement (PE1). The consultants are conducting a broad technical assessment of possible reclamation sites. The above process takes a time longer than we expected. At the moment, we have scheduled to announce the PE1 results and kick off the Stage 2 Public Engagement in the first quarter of 2013. Please be assured that we would attach importance to the comments of the public in selecting reclamation sites. Thank you!

Best regards,

CS Yeung

Engineer

Civil Engineering and Development Department

-----Original Message-----

From:

Date: Nov 6, 2012 11:53

To: "landsupply@cedd.gov.hk" <landsupply@cedd.gov.hk>

Subj: Re: Fwd: Fwd: [優化土地供應策略 - 坪洲喜靈洲連島方案]意見

Dear Mr. Yeung,

I note from the news that the whole consultation will be deferred to the end of the 1st quarter of 2013 (correct me if I am wrong as news can't be reliable nowadays). Unfortunately, there is no cancellation of the 25 reclamation sites selected by CEDD, and poor Peng Chau remains on the list!

The problems are very serious. Soon after the CEDD put Peng Chau on the reclamation list, speculators have come here to drive up property prices, and rental also follows. A flat with a roof top in Tung Wan Garden is now asking for HK\$3.5 million (previously it must be only half). Rental for a small unit here jumps from \$3-4000 to \$6000 or more! These are asking prices, of course, and may be entirely unreliable or unrealistic. But the sole effect of the proposed reclamation, to me, is nothing more than greater unbearable hardship to the ordinary people of HK as evidenced by what has been happening in Peng Chau. If, as some media and political parties have claimed, the purpose of the reclamation proposed by our

Government is to benefit landlords and developers, speculators, etc., I really can't comment.

The situation of deferring your decision and cancelling the 25 reclamation sites is the worst that I can imagine. For buyers or actual users, they simply cannot conduct their affairs and family planning, If they choose to buy now or to stay in Peng Chau, the CEDD decision on Peng Chau's future in 2013 may cause them serious losses and harms. If they don't, such decision in 2013 may further inflate prices here and they will have absolutely no chance to have a home here. I am talking about those who might, despite the inflated price and rental now, or might still be able to buy or reside here. Frankly, even some experienced banks have difficulties in assessing the value of properties here due to the deferral to 2013. Worst affected are the poor tenants who need a shelter in Peng Chau, and those who wish to stay in a peaceful environment. They don't even know whether the conditions here are suitable for them to stay if in the first quarter of 2013 the reclamation in Peng Chau is to go ahead.

The above are very practical and down-to-earth matters to the public and everyone concerned including developers (big or small). Please do review this matter and take out Peng Chau from the selected reclamation list latest by the end of Dec 2012. It is too obvious that no one supports such action or is sincere in supporting such action! There must be no further delay in this very crucial and critical matter that affects the basic livelihood and the accommodation of ordinary people in Hong Kong.

Please let me have your kind reply and please understand the anxiety caused to all those affected by your decision.

Regards,
Kenneth Lo

2012/10/3 Ken Lo

Dear Mr. Yeung,

Thank you very much for your reply. While I understand the complexities involved in proposing the potential reclamation sites, I strongly wish that Peng Chau will be excluded and an announcement by the Government to confirm this be made as soon as possible.

About the Peng Chau reclamation, many other residents here are as anxious as (if not more anxious than) myself. The future of our peaceful island will be determined by your proposed list of reclamation sites.

Thanks again for your kind attention.

Yours faithfully,

Kenneth Lo

2012/10/3 landsupply@cedd.gov.hk <landsupply@cedd.gov.hk>

Dear Mr Lo,

Thank you for your emails expressing views on the possible reclamation proposal to connect Peng Chau with Hei Ling Chau.

We would like to advise you of the progress of our study as follows.

The Government launched Stage 1 Public Engagement (“PE1”) on “Enhancing Land Supply Strategy” in November 2011. PE1 was completed in March 2012. We have collected about 50,000 comments/views, both quantitative and qualitative, from the public during PE1.

The Social Sciences Research Centre of the University of Hong Kong and consultants are now collating and analyzing the data. The consultants have also conducted a broad technical assessment of possible reclamation sites. It takes time to complete the collation and analysis of the huge data that we have collected. After concluding PE1 results, we will put forward several potential reclamation and rock cavern development sites for further public consultation. We understand that members of the public have strong views on individual reclamation sites. In technical studies and site selection exercise, we will attach importance to the selection criteria regarding community impact, taking public views into full consideration. We intend to announce the PE1 results and kick off the Stage 2 Public Engagement (“PE2”) in the final quarter of 2012. Thank you.

CS Yeung
Engineer
Civil Engineering and Development Department

-----Original Message-----

From:

Date: Sep 24, 2012 10:07

To: "土木工程拓展署" <landsupply@cedd.gov.hk>

Subj: Fwd: Fwd: [優化土地供應策略 - 坪洲喜靈洲連島方案]意見

Dear Sirs,

I refer to the captioned matter and forward a copy of my email to the office of our newly elected Chief Executive for your perusal and further action.

Regards,

Kenneth Lo

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ken Lo**

Date: 2012/9/24

Subject: Re: Fwd: [優化土地供應策略 - 坪洲喜靈洲連島方案]意見

To: ceeo@ce-elect-office.hk

Dear Sirs,

I refer to our previous emails concerning the Government's proposed reclamation to connect Peng Chau and Hei Ling Chau.

I fully support Mr. C.Y. Leung's new policy of developing the north-eastern part of the New Territories. This is the correct course of action for furthering the interest of Hong Kong as a whole. In this connection, I believe the exclusion or deletion of the above proposed reclamation affecting Peng Chau from the intended list of reclamation sites announced by the CEDD in Jan is soon to be confirmed by the Government before the end of September (i.e. by the end of this 3rd quarter as announced previously).

I should be grateful if our newly elected CE, Mr. C.Y. Leung, would kindly confirm the happy news to all those who are concerned with the proposed reclamation affecting Peng Chau.

Best regards,
Kenneth Lo,
a resident in Peng Chau

2012/4/27 Ken Lo

Thank you for your attention.

2012/4/27 <ceeo@ce-elect-office.hk>

Kenneth :

四月二十五日致候任行政長官的電郵，內容備悉。

候任行政長官辦公室

Ken Lo

25/04/2012 23:23

To ceeo@ce-elect-office.hk

cc

Subject Fwd: [優化土地供應策略 - 坪洲喜靈洲連島方案]意見

致：候任行政長官
梁振英先生

恭喜梁先生當選為新行政長官！我與其他朋友是你 Facebook 的 fans.

有關上述填海問題，傳媒早已報導過梁先生的意見。我相信有不少居坪洲人士反對該連島方案，而於 3 月尾前已交了意見書。希望梁先生能在百忙中關注這些平民聲音。在此 forward 一份我本人的[反對坪洲喜靈洲連島方案]意見書以便參考。

Best regards,
Kenneth Lo

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ken Lo**

Date: 2012/3/20

Subject: [優化土地供應策略 - 坪洲喜靈洲連島方案]意見

To: devbenq@devb.gov.hk, sdev@devb.gov.hk, landsupply@cedd.gov.hk,
ckhon@cedd.gov.hk, robinkblee@cedd.gov.hk, tspd@pland.gov.hk,
jcflung@pland.gov.hk, panel_dev@legco.gov.hk

Cc: pengchaurc@yahoo.com, pcrchkwong@yahoo.com, info@pengchau.hk,
isdcdm@isdcd.had.gov.hk

致：香港九龍何文田公主道 101 號土木工程拓展署大樓 4 樓

註明：『優化土地供應策略』 電郵：landsupply@cedd.gov.hk 傳真：2714 2054

| 收件部門 | 電郵 | 電話 | 傳真 | 地址 |
|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| 發展局 林鄭月娥局長 | devbenq@devb.gov.hk sdev@devb.gov.hk | 3509 8800 2810 3961 | 2845 3489 | 香港添馬添美道二號政府 總部西翼十八樓 |
| 土木工程拓展署 韓志強處長 副處長(海港及土地)李鉅標先生 | landsupply@cedd.gov.hk ckhon@cedd.gov.hk robinkblee@cedd.gov.hk | 2762 5111 2762 5000 | 2714 0140 | 九龍何文田公主道 101 號 土木工程拓展署大樓 |
| 規劃署 梁焯輝處長 | tspd@pland.gov.hk jcflung@pland.gov.hk | 2231 4766 2231 | 2116 0751 | 香港渣華道 333 號北角政 府合署 17 樓 |

| | | | | |
|---------|--|------|--|---------|
| | | 4600 | | |
| 發展事務委員會 | panel_dev@legco.gov.hk | | | 立法會綜合大樓 |

敬啟者：

就『優化土地供應策略』

發表意見

反對「坪洲 · 喜靈洲連島方案」(B1)

本人反對「坪洲 · 喜靈洲連島方案」(B1)，原因如下：

A. 工程施工期間引發災難性禍害:

1. 這巨大工程開始施工後，必製造大量噪音，空氣、水與土地污染，嚴重傷害坪洲居民的身體及精神健康，破壞及摧毀大自然環境，海、陸、空生態，珍貴天然資源，及坪洲一帶的寧靜與迷人美景。
2. 現時往來中環坪洲渡輪必受工程阻礙，碼頭要遷移去坪洲東面或北面，減少班次，變更航線，加長航行時間，又再加已甚難負擔的票價。往來其他地方的渡輪與『街渡』也必同時要作相應改變。居民生活，交通及開支一定更苦不堪言。
3. 因居住環境惡化，坪洲人口必不斷減少，傷害物業交易、租務及其他經濟活動。
4. 旅遊觀光必減少，嚴重傷害已十分艱苦經營的坪洲中小型企業。
5. 不知工程會否需時十年八載或更長，但此『人工連島』未填完，恐怕坪洲或已變了廢墟。

B. 連島填海完成後，新島上的建設工程亦會繼續不停製造類似的災難性禍害。

C. 最後於此合併『坪洲填海關注組』的5項反對原因，請見附錄。

另外，本人對『優化土地供應策略』及『坪洲與喜靈洲連島填海』尚有其他意見及問題如下：

1 填海選址，應以『該建設工程及發展不能傷害有關地區居民的身體及精神健康』為『最重要及決定性準則』。這點於政府資料及諮詢中好像被完全忽略。

2 『喜靈洲懲教署』會否被搬到坪洲？

3 此『人工連島』有沒有陸路交通連接香港島或大嶼山市區？

4 政府會否就此連島填海而同時在坪洲『收地』、『更改土地用途及規劃』、『重建』等？

5 何時為『坪洲連島填海』在坪洲作有規範的認真諮詢？

6 政府如何保證此『人工連島』建成後能安全抵禦『自然災難(如地震，龍捲風，海嘯，颶風)』，『大火』及『地下沉』等？

7 政府指此『人工連島』面積會有700公頃，但其實最多只能增加400公頃土地，因喜靈洲已佔200公頃而坪洲亦佔100。如是必要於這一帶選址，何不考慮先發展喜靈洲？喜靈洲與緊貼它東邊的『周公島』之總面積『超過兩個鴨脷洲』，近大嶼山，已有基本設施、道路、碼頭及避風塘，若『優化』配套即可於島上建設發展，不須填海，省時又減少開支！

8 除了坪洲與喜靈洲連島填海，是否同時亦於『喜靈洲西填海連接大嶼山』(即 A1 方案)?

姓名：盧建榮 KENNETH LO 日期：2012 年 3 月 20 日 聯絡方法：

電話： 電郵：地址：居坪洲(若須要住址詳情，請 email 聯絡我)

副本抄送：

坪洲鄉事委員會暨黃漢權議員辦事處 坪洲元嶺仔 1 號

電話：29830790 傳真：29830220 電郵：pengchaurc@yahoo.com/
pcrchkwong@yahoo.com

安慶英議員辦事處 坪洲永興街 12 號地下

電話：29830088 傳真：29830033 電郵：info@pengchau.hk

離島區議會 中環統一碼頭道 38 號海港政府中樓 20 字樓

電話：28524325 傳真：25420183 電郵：isdcdm@isdcdm.gov.hk

上述之附錄

反對坪洲-喜靈洲連島方案 (街坊聯署的意見書) - 坪洲填海關注組

坪洲人口較少，鮮為人關注。居民上班下課，追船趕車，持守著簡樸的環境和寧恬的生活。最近，政府公佈土地優化策略，要坪洲變臉。我們對此深表擔憂，希望政府慎而重之，不要在沒有充分資料和嚴謹分析的研究調查、認真廣泛的討論、基本的人口政策和土地優化使用以及相關策略就緒前，魯莽推行這個規劃。原因如下：

1. 政府的人口預測數據令人生疑：這包括對非本地孕婦來港產子的人數預測；政府所謂「人口增加」及「土地需要」，必須以更嚴謹的分析和研究作為大前題，並需要制定清晰的人口策略；然後，才可以討論土地需要和供應問題。
2. 政府提出的規劃原則粗疏抽象而虛空，缺乏具體細節及參考價值。
3. 坪洲是一個生態環境和社會文化都非常多元的鄉郊社區，填海及大規模發展將嚴重威脅甚至破壞這個小島的自然和文化資源及社區特色。
4. 應先優化土地使用，做好土地資源調配，再談增加土地多年來，坪洲數幅官地閒置丟荒、完備的村校遭廢置、多層空調街市十室九空、還有許多「吉屋」。像整個香港一樣，我們有地，只是沒有使用或資源錯配。
5. 政府以填海比其他方法增加土地來得便宜為由，說填海增地不可缺。這個說法既短視又無知：所謂便宜只是收地賠償和地價等數字遊戲，其中沒有計算對多元社區文化和生態環境的破壞；這些人類社會和自然資源，是文明不可或缺的部分，價值不能以金錢計量。