

**Clerk to the Panel on Development
Legislative Council Secretariat
2/F Legislative Council Complex
1 Legislative Council Road
Central, Hong Kong** **By E-mail: panel_dev@legco.gov.hk**

**Comments to Penal on Development
Special meeting on Saturday, 1 June 2013, at 9:00 am
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
Enhancing land supply strategy: reclamation outside Victoria
Harbour and
rock cavern development -- Stage 2 public engagement**

Dear Sirs,

I am a resident in Peng Chau and would like to comment on the above proposal for reclamation with particular emphasis on the 6th option of building "Artificial Islands in Central Waters" ("AIs Option") as follows:

Information insufficient and sometimes confusing

1. Many people like me have no or very little idea what the Government has on its mind in regard to the AIs Option. Basic information such as the number and the locations of such islands, the intended users and planning, how they will be built and developed, etc., are never made clear.
2. Sometimes, the information released/reported sounds confusing. In one instance, it is said that artificial islands will house offensive trades, but in another, they will be developed as new urban districts or extensions of existing urban districts. These are very different plans that may be mutually conflicting unless I imagine offensive trades and urban development are regarded as one development. Or are we going to have one island for offensive trades or similar activities, one for a new district, one for luxury premises and one for housing ordinary people, one for the extension of an existing urban district, one for industrial use and one for non-industrial use, etc.? How many do we need? What is the AIs Option about, after all?

3. I have written to the CEDD trying to clarify whether Peng Chau may be affected. Copies of my email and their reply are attached. At this moment, my position is like a blind man trying to tell what another man sees but does not even know whether that other man is as blind as myself.

This is desperately required: A clear public announcement whether or not the purpose of reclamation is to solve our housing problem

4. The Government must decide whether the purpose of the proposed reclamation is to solve the housing problem, i.e., to help ordinary people to have better, cheaper or affordable housing. With rocketing property prices and sky-high residential and commercial rentals, many people are facing difficulties in residing here and doing business here. It has nothing to do with insufficient land, I believe. The Government must announce, in clear and unambiguous words, whether that is the purpose and end one of the long outstanding debates about reclamation.
5. When we have a clear answer, members of the public may plan their future and think about other ways to deal with the problem. Let everyone face and accept the reality: our housing problem lies at the root of the structure of our system.
6. My initial view is that the reclamation cannot help, nor is it designed for helping, ordinary people. History has proved that; otherwise we would have a very different world today. I hope I am wrong, and I am sure many share my hope.

Population Cap and Consultation

7. We must agree on a cap on the increase in our population before turning to reclamation. For example, if the existing land in Hong Kong is sufficient to accommodate an increase of one million people without reclamation, we must consider whether our total population should be capped within such limit. The subject must go before any definite decision about reclamation. We must have public consultation about population cap and policy now.

Are there any other options?

8. If I remember correctly, one Legco member suggested leasing land from Shenzhen at a meeting last year. That is one option absolutely worth exploring! We have leasehold estate from the Government and why shouldn't our Government acquire land from our neighbour for the development of Hong Kong?
9. Another option has already been raised, namely, restoring those legal protections for tenants under the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance that were abolished in 2003/04. After that, rentals have increased by multiple times causing increase in property prices, speculations, cage-like cubicles, social unrest, etc.
10. I propose we must have a public forum to study, think about and conduct consultation about such options and any other possible options. Let's be open-minded, creative and innovative in solving problems.

Peng Chau must not be affected by reclamation

11. I am a nature lover and strongly hope that Peng Chau may be preserved unaffected by the proposal. The noise, air, water, and light pollutions, the harms to our physical and mental health and other living things such as trees, birds, corals, fishes, the social and economic impact on the local community, the ecological and environmental damages, etc., that may be caused are my main concerns and I am not the only one with such concerns. The Government must first of all conduct an impartial and independent study on all these effects and consult all parties concerned before making any decision.
12. Peng Chau is a very small island with an area of 99 hectares only. It is so meagre that it may simply be discarded under the AIs Option of reclaiming 2,400 hectares or more. The OZP plan for Peng Chau is designed for low-density and low-rise developments as well as preserving its rural character and natural environment. While developments in transport, healthcare and other public services, and tourism are welcome, reclamation will inevitably take away everything here. Since the release of the previous 25 reclamation sites in 2012, the property prices here have been driven up

more or less 7-10 times! This is what reclamation has already done to us!

13. I will learn more about the subject matter and submit further comments before the deadline for the 2nd stage consultation, 20 June 2013. In the meantime, I hope the Government may give us more information about the AIs Option. Thank you very much for your attention.

Yours faithfully,

Kenneth Lo

17th May 2013

Copies of my email to CEDD and their reply

landsupply@cedd.gov.hk

9 May 2013

to me

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