

## Panel on Development

### List of follow-up actions (Position as at 22 May 2013)

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
1. North East New Territories New Development Areas and Engineering Study (Development Bureau)	8 December 2012	<p>Regarding the proposals under the Recommended Outline Development Plans to designate the core area of Long Valley within the Kwu Tung North New Development Area (NDA) (37 hectares) as a Nature Park for farmers to continue agricultural activities, in particular wet agriculture, and maintain two pieces of land to the north and south of the Nature Park (45 hectares) and an area in Fu Tei Au (9 hectares) as "Agriculture" zones, members noted some deputations were concerned that (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)243/12-13(11) to (13) &amp; (15)) --</p> <p>(i) the proposal to convert the dry agricultural land in Long Valley into wetlands to compensate for the loss of existing wetlands due to the NDAs development would not only reduce the ecological value of Long Valley and undermine the efforts of some</p>	Administration's response awaited

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>farmers and organizations made in nature conservation, but also force some existing farmers to move out from Long Valley; and</p> <p>(ii) the proposal to designate the existing good-quality agricultural land in the three NDAs, including wet agricultural land and active agricultural land, as non-agricultural uses would deprive farmers of the opportunities to continue their farming practices in these areas.</p> <p>In this connection, the Administration was requested to provide information on --</p> <p>(a) its policies/plans to address the above concerns; and</p> <p>(b) whether the existing/affected farmers would be allowed to continue their current agricultural practices on the farmland mentioned in (ii) above and to build houses/structures on the land; if yes, the details.</p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
2. North East New Territories New Development Areas and Engineering Study (Development Bureau)	15 December 2012	<p>The Administration was requested to provide --</p> <p>(A) the following information to address members' and deputations' concerns --</p> <p><u>Visits by the Secretary for Development</u></p> <p>(a) whether the incumbent Secretary for Development ("SDEV") had visited the areas to be affected by the proposed North East New Territories New Development Areas ("NENT NDAs") project ("the proposed project") and listened to the views of residents in these areas; if yes, the date of each visit, the locations/villages visited and the major views collected during the visits;</p> <p><u>Land resumption</u></p> <p>(b) the total area of land to be resumed by the Administration for the proposed project; the total estimated amount of</p>	Administration's response awaited

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>funds required for the land resumption and compensation; and whether the Administration would handle claims for compensation for disturbance to "fung shui" arising from the NENT NDAs proposals, if yes, the estimated amount of funds to be involved;</p> <p><u>Land acquisition</u></p> <p>(c) the number of households who had been forced to move out from their homes in the proposed project areas as a result of land acquisition/resumption actions by private developers/land owners since the Administration had indicated that it would develop NENT; whether and in what way the Administration had offered assistance to these households;</p> <p><u>Agricultural activities</u></p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>(d) the number of farmers in Hong Kong who were currently on the Administration's waiting list for agricultural rehabilitation; the total area and locations of arable land in Hong Kong that are suitable and ready for agricultural rehabilitation;</p> <p>(e) the number of farmers in the areas to be affected by the proposed project who would not be allowed to continue their agricultural practices in-situ following the implementation of the project; and, among these farmers, the number of them who had indicated their requests for agricultural rehabilitation;</p> <p>(f) among the 91 hectares of land (including the core area of Long Valley within the Kwu Tung North NDA (37 hectares) as well as two pieces of land to its north and south (45 hectares), and an area in Fu Tei Au (9 hectares)) reserved for</p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>agricultural rehabilitation, the respective proportion/size of the land which was currently (i) under cultivation, (ii) occupied by squatter huts, (iii) fish ponds; and (iv) brownfield sites;</p> <p><u>Expansion of Village-type Development Areas</u></p> <p>(g) whether the planning for the Kwu Tung North NDA included a proposal to provide land for indigenous villagers to expand the areas zoned for Village-type Development ("V"-Zones); if yes, the justifications for the expansion, and whether it was undertaken by the Administration in exchange for the support of indigenous villagers to the NENT NDAs proposals;</p> <p><u>Compensation issues</u></p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>(h) regarding the connecting road for the proposed Liantang/Heung Yuen Wai Boundary Control Point, a comparison of the government funds that would have been needed to be committed for land resumption and compensation under each of the three alignment options; and the reasons for selecting the preferred option (the alignment leading to Tolo Highway); and</p> <p>(B) written response to the following views/requests of members and deputations --</p> <p><u>Rural living</u></p> <p>(i) that land resumption/clearance following the implementation of the NENT NDAs proposals should not disrupt the villagers' years of efforts in establishing their homes as well as their community networks; that it would be difficult for villagers, in</p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>particular the elderly, to adapt to living outside the village and they should be allowed to continue their rural living in-situ;</p> <p><u>Agricultural activities</u></p> <p>(j) that the proposed NENT NDAs development should not lead to loss of agricultural land and adversely affect the livelihood of the existing farmers;</p> <p>(k) that the existing farmers should be allowed to continue their agricultural practices in-situ, in view of the difficulties for them, in particular the elder ones, to rehabilitate their agricultural practices in a new location;</p> <p>(l) that the Administration should formulate agricultural policies to support/promote local agriculture including urban agriculture, taking</p>	



<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>into account that local agricultural development would be beneficial to Hong Kong by providing job opportunities, avoiding over-reliance on imported food supply and reducing carbon emission;</p> <p><u>Preservation of existing green belts</u></p> <p>(m) that the NENT NDAs should focus on green and sustainable development and the existing green belt areas should be retained;</p> <p><u>Damage of farmland</u></p> <p>(n) that the Administration should introduce measures to monitor/control the so-called "damaging the farmland and making it deserted" scenario arising from developers'/land owners' acts on the farmland in the areas to be covered by the proposed project;</p> <p><u>Housing development</u></p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>(o) that the proportion of the land allocated to public housing should not be much smaller than that for private residential development in the proposed NENT NDAs;</p> <p>(p) that the proposed project should not mainly provide luxurious residential units which would only be affordable by the rich, including the Mainlanders, while the existing grassroot residents in the areas affected would be evicted and would not enjoy the benefits from the development at all;</p> <p>(q) that the Administration should provide land for constructing private residential units with limited floor areas in the proposed NENT NDAs and implement the policy of "Hong Kong property for Hong Kong residents" in the areas;</p> <p><u>Rehousing</u></p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>(r) that if the proposed project was to proceed, the Administration should adopt the "rehouse first, develop later" approach so that the villagers, including those who were not eligible for public housing or interim housing, would not have to be worried about rehousing;</p> <p>(s) that, as the deputations said that developers/land owners had been forcing the existing residents to move out, the Administration should conduct surveys as early as possible to ascertain the actual number and the circumstances/requests of the affected households in the proposed development areas, and should not wait until the completion of the NENT NDAs planning stage or commencement of the implementation stage;</p> <p>(t) that public housing units should be provided in the Ping Che/Ta Kwu</p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>Ling NDA for rehousing the local residents;</p> <p><u>Use of land</u></p> <p>(u) that Fu Tei Au should be designated as an "Agriculture" zone and conservation area, not to be reserved for building police training facilities (including the police driving training complex and weapon training field), taking into consideration that the provisioning of such facilities would disrupt the natural environment;</p> <p><u>Urban design</u></p> <p>(v) that, as regards urban design for NENT NDAs, the Administration should control building height and density to avoid the creation of "walled effects", and allow small food premises as well as street-level shops to serve the nearby residents;</p> <p><u>Job opportunities</u></p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>(w) that the employment opportunities offered by special industries in the proposed NENT NDAs might not be suitable for residents with lower education or skills, and they might be required to pay high transport fares and commute a long way to work in urban areas;</p> <p><u>Wah Shan Tsuen</u></p> <p>(x) that the proposed project should exclude Wah Shan Tsuen, of which seven households would be singled out and affected by the latest plan for the project but the majority would not;</p> <p><u>Tin Ping Shan Tsuen</u></p> <p>(y) that the proposed project should cover Tin Ping Shan Tsuen, otherwise, the village would be surrounded by new tall buildings following the implementation of the project, thus giving rise to a "walled effect" in the</p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>village; land should be reserved for local reprovisioning of the village; and the proposed road construction/improvement works in the vicinity of the village should not be carried out prior to the clearance of the village;</p> <p><u>Removal of ancestral graves</u></p> <p>(z) that the NENT NDAs proposals should not lead to removal of villagers' ancestral graves/urns in some of the areas to be affected;</p> <p><u>Consultation</u></p> <p>(aa) that, since SDEV had not attended the meetings of 8 and 15 December 2012, he should meet with villagers to be affected by the proposed project in person to listen and respond to their views/concerns; and the Administration should also send personnel to visit individual households in the areas to be affected</p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>to collect their views on the proposed project and see for themselves the villagers' circumstances;</p> <p><u>Assessment of the benefits of the project</u></p> <p>(bb) that the Administration should clarify how it assessed the benefits of the proposed project to the overall interest of Hong Kong (question raised in a submission -- LC Paper No. CB(1)334/12-13(10));</p> <p><u>Impact on existing residents and businesses</u></p> <p>(cc) that in planning the proposed project, the Administration had put its focus on the integration between Hong Kong and Shenzhen and allowed the large consortia/major developers to benefit exclusively from the development at the expense of the interests of the existing squatters, farmers, as well as small-scale rural industries (such as soya source factories) which currently offered</p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>employment opportunities in the areas;</p> <p><u>Golf course</u></p> <p>(dd) whether the Administration would take forward the suggestion of resuming part (say, one-third) of the golf course located to the south of Kwu Tung for the purpose of developing public housing, in view of the site's size and its proximity to the Sheung Shui railway station; if not, the justifications;</p> <p><u>Withdrawal of the project</u></p> <p>(ee) the request for "no removal, no demolition, withdrawal of the "bad" project";</p> <p>(ff) that there was no imminent need for developing NENT NDAs, taking into account that the projected Hong Kong</p>	



<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>resident population would not increase to 8.4 million until 2041 and vacant land was available in the developed areas of Hong Kong for residential developments;</p> <p><u>Withdrawal of the Announcement of Public Interests</u></p> <p>(gg) whether and when the Administration would discontinue broadcasting the Announcement of Public Interests ("API") on the proposed project in view of some members' and deputations' requests made at the meeting; if not, the justifications.</p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
<p>3. Policy relating to a recent case of sale of hotel rooms by a developer (Development Bureau)</p>	<p>26 February 2013</p>	<p>As regards hotel room units which are not disallowed to be sold per se under the land lease, the Administration was requested to provide information about --</p> <p>(a) the particulars (such as name, address, owner/proprietor/developer etc.) of the hotels that provide these room units; and</p> <p>(b) the gross floor area and number of these room units in each of the hotels in (a).</p>	<p>Administration's response awaited</p>
<p>4. Regulatory control over lift and escalator safety and related issues (Development Bureau)</p>	<p>26 March 2013</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information --</p> <p>(a) a list showing the number of lifts maintained by each registered lift contractor as well as the number of personnel (with breakdown on registered lift workers, registered lift engineers, etc.) maintained by the contractor for carrying out lift works;</p> <p>(b) with respect to the Administration's advice that the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("EMSD") had 23 staff</p>	<p>Administration's response awaited</p>

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<p>members to conduct 750 inspections on lifts and escalators a month (i.e. approximately 25 inspections daily), (i) the number of EMSD staff members required to conduct an inspection; (ii) the daily number of inspections conducted by a team; and (iii) the average time taken by a team to complete an inspection;</p> <p>(c) whether there was an assessment of the correlation between the number of warning letters issued by EMSD to a registered lift/escalator contractor and the number of incidents involving the lift(s)/escalator(s) being maintained by the contractor; if yes, the details, including the conclusions drawn from the assessment;</p> <p>(d) the number of registered lift/escalator contractors/subcontractors who had been EMSD staff members responsible for the work on lift and escalator safety; and</p> <p>(e) the number of registered lift/escalator contractors who received subcontracted</p>	

<b>Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		works from their previous employers who were also registered lift/escalator contractors.	

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
22 May 2013