

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1536/12-13
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/EA/1

Panel on Environmental Affairs

Minutes of meeting
held on Monday, 27 May 2013, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex

- Members present** : Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan (Chairman)
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun,
BBS, MH, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Claudia MO
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon Charles Peter MOK
Hon CHAN Han-pan
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen
- Members attending** : Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC

Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP

Members absent : Hon Steven HO Chun-yin
Hon Dennis KWOK
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP

Public Officers attending : **For item IV**

Mr WONG Kam-sing, JP
Secretary for the Environment

Mr TSE Chin-wan, JP
Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Environmental Protection Department

Ms Betty CHEUNG
Principal Environmental Protection Officer
(Community Relations)
Environmental Protection Department

For item V

Mr WONG Kam-sing, JP
Secretary for the Environment

Ms Christine LOH, JP
Under Secretary for the Environment

Ms Michelle AU
Political Assistant to Secretary for the Environment

Mr Albert LAM, JP
Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2)
Environmental Protection Department

Dr Ellen CHAN, JP
Assistant Director (Environmental Infrastructure)
Environmental Protection Department

Mr Lawrence LAU
Principal Environmental Protection Officer
(Waste Facilities)
Environmental Protection Department

Clerk in attendance : Ms Miranda HON
Chief Council Secretary (1)1

Staff in attendance : Mrs Mary TANG
Senior Council Secretary (1)1

Miss Mandy POON
Legislative Assistant (1)1

Action

I. Confirmation of minutes

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1066/12-13 — Minutes of the meeting held on
25 February 2013)

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 February 2013 were confirmed.

II. Information paper issued since last meeting

2. Members noted that the following paper had been issued since the last meeting -

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1076/12-13(01) — "Hong Kong Blueprint for
Sustainable Use of Resources
2013-2022" provided by the
Administration)

III. Items for discussion at the next meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1067/12-13(01) — List of follow-up actions

LC Paper No. CB(1)1067/12-13(02) — List of outstanding items for
discussion

Action

LC Paper No. CB(1)1103/12-13(01) — Letter dated 16 May 2013 from Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun to the Chairman (Chinese version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)1103/12-13(02) — Letter dated 21 May 2013 from Hon Claudia MO to the Chairman (Chinese version only))

3. Members noted Mr Christopher CHUNG's letter dated 16 May 2013 requesting discussion on the "Policy on the sustainability of recycling trades" and Ms Claudia MO's letter dated 21 May 2013 requesting discussion on the subject of "Monitoring the outsourcing of collection of recyclable materials". The Chairman said that there was also the item "Promoting the recycling of wood and other recycling trades" on the Panel's list of outstanding items for discussion. In view of the general concern about the promotion of the recycling trades, she said that arrangements would be made to include the various issues raised in the letters and the afore-mentioned item for discussion under the subject of the Government's policy to support the recycling trades.

4. Mr CHAN Hak-kan said that as the Administration had been seeking funding to replace polluting diesel commercial vehicles and to retrofit franchised buses with selective catalytic reduction devices, he suggested that discussion be held on "Green transport infrastructure", with emphasis on the use of environment friendly vehicles and the development of green transport infrastructure such as charging facilities for electric vehicles and facilities for producing motor vehicle biodiesel. The Chairman agreed to include the subject under the list of outstanding items for discussion.

5. Members agreed to discuss the following items proposed by the Administration at the next regular meeting scheduled for Monday, 24 June 2013, at 2:30 pm -

- (a) External lighting in Hong Kong;
- (b) Controlling the impact of dumping and dredging activities on the marine environment; and
- (c) Promoting recycling trades and monitoring the outsourcing of collection of recyclable materials.

Action

6. The Chairman said that as there were three agenda items for the regular meeting, she would decide whether to extend the meeting to end at 5:30 pm or to hold another special meeting. She said that she would let members know as soon as a decision had been reached.

(Post meeting note: At the request of the Administration and with the concurrence of the Chairman, a special meeting was scheduled for 14 June 2013, at 10:45 am to discuss the subject of "Retrofitting franchised buses with selective catalytic reduction devices", as well as the subject of "Controlling the impact of dumping and dredging activities on the marine environment" which was originally included in the agenda for the next regular meeting on 24 June 2013. As such, the latter item had been removed from the agenda of the next regular meeting.)

IV. Proposed injection into the Environment and Conservation Fund

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1067/12-13(03) — Administration's paper on "Proposed injection into the Environment and Conservation Fund"

LC Paper No. CB(1)1067/12-13(04) — Updated background brief on "Environment and Conservation Fund" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

7. The Secretary for the Environment ("SEN") briefed members on the Administration's proposal to inject \$5,000 million into the Environment and Conservation Fund ("ECF") with a view to generating investment income for long-term and sustained support for community green actions.

Achievements and benefits of ECF

8. Noting that ECF had supported over 3 900 projects totalling \$1,668 million since 1994, Mr CHAN Hak-kan enquired if a review had been conducted on the effectiveness of the projects funded by ECF. He asked if the experience gained from implementing those projects could be applied on a wider scale in Hong Kong. For example, the trials on food waste recycling could be extended to all public rental housing estates.

Action

9. SEN responded that the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") had recently conducted a review on the operation and effectiveness of ECF as well as the achievements of ECF-funded projects. For instance, the Buildings Energy Efficiency Funding Schemes ("BEEFS") funded by ECF to subsidize owners of residential, commercial and industrial buildings to carry out energy-cum-carbon audits and energy efficiency projects had been well received and had helped to improve the energy efficiency of buildings. Cooperation would be sought from the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department in sharing the experience with building owners on a wider scale. The Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1) ("DDEP(1)") added that a gist of ECF's major achievements and benefits had been set out in Appendix 2 to the discussion paper. The experience gained from implementing ECF-funded projects would be shared with the community.

10. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired about the means to assess the effectiveness of ECF-funded projects and how ECF funding could support the implementation of the Blueprint for Sustainable Use of Resources. SEN said that ECF-funded projects had to meet funding requirements as well as their planned objectives. By way of illustration, there had been much improvement in the energy efficiency of the buildings which had undergone energy-cum-carbon audits and energy efficiency projects under BEEFS. Such improvements could be quantified by the reduction in electricity consumption. There were however difficulties in assessing the effectiveness of projects involving source separation of waste as they were meant to induce behavioural changes, but were instrumental in implementing the Blueprint for Sustainable Use of Resources.

11. The Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Community Relations) apprised members of the success of some of the ECF-funded projects. On waste reduction, ECF launched the "On-site Meal Portioning Funding Scheme" in December 2009 to provide subsidy for schools to adopt green lunch practice through meal portioning. At present, there were close to 100 schools which had been approved funding under the scheme. When all these schools started to implement on-site meal portioning, there would be a significant reduction in the number of disposable lunch boxes, as well as disposable chopsticks, forks and spoons generated daily. In addition, on-site meal portioning would facilitate students to adjust the meal portion as they needed and directly engage students to consciously make choices in reducing food wastage. At the household level, ECF had financed the provision of waste separation facilities in housing estates and enhanced the availability and visibility of such facilities with a view to imparting behavioural change. Together with various government measures, the recovery rate of domestic waste had increased significantly from 14% in 2004 to 38% in 2011. The waste reduction arising from on-site meal portioning and waste separation had significantly reduced the pressure on landfills.

Action

Allocation of funding

12. Dr Kenneth CHAN enquired about the measures to ensure that ECF funding would not be used by political parties to solicit support in election campaigns. DDEP(1) responded that as ECF was meant to provide funding support for educational, research and other projects and activities in relation to environmental and conservation matters, the political affiliation of project proponents would not be taken into account. Project proponents were advised that ECF funding could not be used for purposes of political publicity of any individuals or organizations. Investigation would be conducted upon receipt of complaints on the misuse of funds. Warning would be issued if the complaint was substantiated and such would adversely affect any future applications by the organization concerned. Dr CHAN considered that apart from warning, the organization concerned should be requested to return the funding to ECF.

13. Dr CHAN further enquired if co-financing could be considered for projects of a large scale incurring significant funding. DDEP(1) explained that the amount of funding to be granted by ECF would depend on the nature and scale of the project concerned, and in some cases, only partial funding support was sought from ECF.

14. Mr KWOK Wai-keung enquired whether those ECF projects such as waste recycling operations which were found to be commercially viable could be handed over to the private sector for continued operation. DDEP(1) responded that this could be considered if there was a market demand for the services. He recalled that a project proponent had applied for ECF funding for the trial of retrofit devices for providing air conditioning when the engine of a vehicle was switched off. After completion of the trial, the project proponent applied for a patent on the retrofit devices which would be promoted for use on a wider scale. SEN added that the experience gained through the implementation of BEEFS could be applied in the operation of viable business in the improvement of energy efficiency in buildings.

15. Mr Tony TSE enquired about the priority in the allocation of ECF funding. SEN said that the ECF Committee and its subcommittees would vet the funding applications, taking into account changing environmental challenges. As waste management was currently the focus of attention, more funding commitment would be given to food waste recycling and waste separation projects. He would welcome suggestions from members in this respect. In response to Mr TSE's question on the funding by ECF over the past years as set out in Appendix 1 to the discussion paper, DDEP(1) explained that the funding for each year referred to the amount of fund committed in the year but not the actual disbursement per year.

Action

16. Dr Helena WONG enquired about the role of the Government in the allocation of funds under ECF. She would like to know if the Government would play an active role in making sure that there would be projects funded under all the six major areas or whether it would simply await applications from project proponents. SEN responded that there had been a high subscription rate for ECF funding. The funding applied for had exceeded the actual funds available under ECF. The ECF Committee would assess the merits of funding applications and apportion the funding accordingly. DDEP(1) said that the six major areas which would remain relevant for ECF support included waste reduction, recovery and recycling; food waste reduction; energy efficiency and saving; environmental researches; air pollution and climate change; and nature conservation. The ECF Committee would make reference to the past funding records in the allocation of funding and conduct reviews on a regular basis. The proportion of funding to be allocated among the six areas was not fixed and could be adjusted flexibly.

Management and investment of ECF

17. Dr Kenneth CHAN enquired about the investment return expected from the injection of \$5,000 million into ECF. DDEP(1) said that discussion with the Hong Kong Monetary Authority ("HKMA") for assistance in earning investment returns for ECF was currently underway. On the basis of the current return rate of about 5% per annum, the expected investment return would be about \$200 million per annum. As ECF had an average funding payout of about \$154 million per annum, the investment return of \$200 million per annum should be sufficient for funding projects and operating expenses.

18. Mr Tony TSE was concerned if the investment return from the \$5,000 million injection would be sufficient as he noted that about \$200 million to \$300 million was incurred in the funding of projects by ECF annually. He also enquired whether agreement had already been reached with HKMA on the investment returns. SEN responded that the discussions with HKMA had been very positive and the injection would be made with the Legislative Council's support. The investment return of about \$200 million per annum should be sufficient to provide for the funding of projects which on average would be below \$200 million per annum. The investment returns from the injection of \$5,000 million into ECF would provide long-term and sustained support for community green actions.

19. Mr KWOK Wai-keung was concerned that with rising costs, the investment return of \$200 million per annum might not be sufficient to provide funding for projects. As such, he enquired if the capital of \$5,000 million could be flexibly used to fund the projects. DDEP(1) reiterated that the investment

Action

return of \$200 million per annum should be sufficient to provide funding for projects. Besides, with the revival in economy in the longer term, the investment return could be higher than 5%. The arrangement with HKMA would be reviewed in six years' time.

20. Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan sought elaboration on the financial arrangements made with HKMA on the investment of the \$5,000 million to be injected into ECF. He also enquired if service fees would be charged by HKMA on the investments. DDEP(1) said that with the approved injection of funds, the Administration would work out suitable and practical budgeting strategies in consultation with the ECF Committee. HKMA would not be charging the Government for the services provided.

21. The Chairman concluded that members did not object to the submission of the proposal to the Finance Committee.

V. Environmental infrastructure projects

- (a) 5163DR: Northeast New Territories landfill extension**
- (b) 5164DR: Southeast New Territories landfill extension**
- (c) 5165DR: West New Territories landfill extension**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1079/12-13(01) — Administration's paper on "Environmental infrastructure projects (a) 5163DR: Northeast New Territories landfill extension (b) 5164DR: Southeast New Territories landfill extension (c) 5165DR: West New Territories landfill extension"

LC Paper No. CB(1)1079/12-13(02) — Background brief on "Extension of landfills" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat

LC Paper No. CB(1)1079/12-13(03) — Submission from Alliance for Permanent Closure of Tseung Kwan O Landfill (Chinese version only)

Action

The Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2) ("DDEP(2)") briefed members on the Hong Kong Blueprint for Sustainable Use of Resources ("the Blueprint") and the three environmental infrastructure projects –

- (a) 5163DR: Northeast New Territories ("NENT") landfill extension;
- (b) 5164DR: Southeast New Territories ("SENT") landfill extension;
and
- (c) 5165DR: West New Territories ("WENT") landfill extension.

(Post-meeting note: A set of the power-point presentation materials was circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1140/12-13(01) on 27 May 2013.)

SENT Landfill Extension

23. Mr Ronny TONG said that Tseung Kwan O ("TKO") residents had been tolerating the odour nuisance from the SENT Landfill for many years. It would be unfair to them if the Government proposed to extend the SENT Landfill by 13 hectares into TKO Area 137. He opined that the 13-hectare extension of the SENT Landfill could easily be accommodated by the NENT and WENT Landfill extensions, although the municipal solid waste ("MSW") would have to be transported for longer distances to the latter landfills. As MSW could be transported by alternative modes, he urged the Administration to study the feasibility of alternative transport modes and withdraw the proposal of extending the SENT Landfill. SEN responded that the Administration would need to balance the community's needs for waste disposal outlets and the concerns of districts. The SENT, NENT and WENT Landfills would be exhausted by 2015, 2017 and 2019 respectively.

24. Mr Frederick FUNG recalled that the Chief Executive ("CE") had indicated in his election manifesto that the precious land resources should be used to develop housing and priority should be given to waste reduction without resorting to waste incineration and landfill extension. This had led to the shelving of the landfill extension and waste incineration projects by the then SEN. However, with the new term of Government, the incumbent SEN had re-submitted the same landfill extension projects. He questioned whether the incumbent SEN had not taken heed of CE's election manifesto or whether CE had changed his stance. Noting the Administration's target to reduce waste generation per capita from 1.27 kg in 2011 to 0.8 kg in 2022 (representing a 37% reduction), he questioned why the Administration proposed to take 11 years to reach its target when the city of Seoul was able to achieve 30% waste reduction soon after waste charging was implemented in 1995. He was

Action

also concerned that the Government had been advocating the development of waste infrastructure projects without taking measures to reduce waste and improve the recycling network. He criticized that while it had been the international trend to reduce and recycle waste, the Administration had been trying to extend landfills and incinerate waste. He would not support the proposed landfill extension projects.

25. Mr Albert CHAN commented that the landfill extension problem stemmed from the hegemony of property developers who had been promoting their properties in TKO and downplaying the environmental nuisances associated with the operation of landfills in the neighbourhood. The extension of landfills would further aggravate the already serious environmental problem. The situation had reflected erroneous urban planning, the consequences of which had to be borne by affected residents. He pointed out that Hong Kong had lagged behind other cities in waste management, most of which had opted for waste incineration. He considered it necessary that mandatory source separation of waste should be implemented before the development of a major Integrated Waste Management Facility ("IWMF") at the artificial island at Shek Kwu Chau. In the absence of a proper waste management strategy, he strongly objected to the three landfill extension projects.

26. Dr Elizabeth QUAT said that the odour nuisances arising from the SENT Landfill had been affecting TKO residents for a long time. The air pollution associated with the transfer of waste along Wan Po Road from dumper trucks and refuse collection vehicles ("RCVs") was another cause for concern. Members had been urging for the reception of construction waste only in an attempt to reduce the odour problem at the SENT Landfill. They had requested that consideration be given to restricting polluting vehicles from entering Wan Po Road. The management of the SENT Landfill should also be required to implement measures to reduce environmental nuisances. However, no such measures had been taken. She questioned whether and how the environmental and health impact associated with the SENT Landfill Extension project could be resolved. She considered that it would be irresponsible on the part of the Administration to extend the SENT Landfill without resolving the environmental problems associated with its operation. She would therefore urge the Administration to withdraw the proposal of extending the SENT Landfill. She also requested an undertaking that only construction waste would be received at the SENT Landfill in the very near future. SEN responded that the Administration would be implementing a package of measures to reduce the odour and other environmental nuisances associated with the operation of landfills.

27. Dr Helena WONG said that landfills operating in the neighbourhood of residential developments would certainly be a source of constant nuisance.

Action

Hong Kong's current landfilling rate of 52% was far from satisfactory. She questioned why the landfilling rate in 2022 would still be 22% when other places like Singapore, Taiwan and South Korea already had a much lower percentage of reliance on landfills. She opined that the way forward should be closure of landfills and increased waste recycling rather than landfill extensions. SEN said that Hong Kong would be heading in the same direction of South Korea which had a waste recycling rate of 61%, a waste incineration rate of 20% and a landfilling rate of 19%. It would take time to implement the waste management strategies as set out in the Blueprint, which included the introduction of waste charging and waste-to-energy facilities.

28. Mr Vincent FANG stated that members of the Liberal Party did not support landfill extensions. He considered that more needed to be done in waste recycling as the progress of recycling at the EcoPark was far from satisfactory. Although Hong Kong's present recycling rate was 48%, this had factored in the export of recyclable wastes which might not be sustainable in the long run if the receiving parties refused to accept such wastes. For TKO residents, the only improvement that had been pledged was the designation of the SENT Landfill Extension for the reception of only construction waste with no odour concern. However, it would take about two years before such designation would materialize. He would support that measures be taken to recycle food waste and separate waste at source in the meantime. SEN responded that it was worthy to note that South Korea had been exporting some of the recyclable wastes to other countries as well. The EcoPark had been progressing well with the recycling of different kinds of waste, including food waste and waste wood.

29. Mr KWOK Wai-keung shared the concern about the poor urban planning of TKO which allowed residential developments to be located in the vicinity of the SENT Landfill. He opined that there should not be further extension of the SENT Landfill which would aggravate the odour nuisances and dust problem caused by the landfill operation and pose health risk to the residents of TKO. SEN reiterated that the Administration would need to balance the municipal needs of the community and the concerns of local residents. There was a need for more landfill capacity and more would be done to mitigate the environmental nuisances associated with the operation of landfills.

30. Mr Gary FAN declared interest as a TKO resident and a member of the Sai Kung District Council. He said that he had been monitoring the environmental problems caused by the operation of the SENT Landfill for more than 10 years. Due to poor urban planning, the LOHAS Park with its many 50-storeyed buildings was located close to the SENT Landfill. He further said that he and members of the Neo Democrats had urged for the permanent closure of the SENT Landfill after it had completed its historical mission in 2015. He considered it unfair to require TKO residents to continue to bear the

Action

consequences of the unsatisfactory progress in the implementation of the waste management strategy as set out in the Policy Framework for the Management of Municipal Solid Waste (2005-2014). With the expansion of the TKO population from 100 000 to 400 000 over the last 25 years, there was a need to close the SENT Landfill which occupied one-tenth of the land in TKO and accepted the disposal of a third of the MSW generated in Hong Kong. Given the 13-hectare extension of the SENT Landfill was much smaller in scale than that of the NENT and WENT Landfills which covered 70 and 200 hectares respectively, there might not be a need to extend all three landfills. He would object to the proposed SENT Landfill Extension.

31. Mr WU Chi-wai said that despite the significant investment in the extension of landfills, it was doubtful whether the extensions would be able to resolve the waste problem. More needed to be done to promote waste recycling and the commitment of the entire Government was necessary. Therefore, members of the Democratic Party would not support the landfill extension projects. SEN responded that the Administration would make arrangements to recover waste glass materials under the Producer Responsibility Scheme on glass beverage bottles for processing into eco-pavers for use in public works projects. Continued efforts would be made to reduce and recycle waste.

32. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok noted from the Blueprint that it was the Government's target to reduce Hong Kong's per-capita MSW disposal rate from 1.27 kg in 2011 to 0.8 kg in 2022, with 23% of waste being incinerated. He said that he had visited the waste-to-energy facilities in Japan and understood that these facilities were present in every district. He pointed out that even if the targeted per-capita MSW disposal rate of 0.8 kg was achieved in 2022, there would still be a need to dispose waste at landfills and to provide for an IMWF. He enquired if the Administration had any plan to further reduce the reliance on landfill disposal of waste beyond 2022 by increasing the use of incineration. The Under Secretary for the Environment ("USEN") said that the Administration would proactively consider the need to develop more waste treatment facilities, taking into account the progress of waste reduction.

33. Mr Tony TSE enquired if the scale of landfill extension could be reduced following the implementation of the Blueprint and the adoption of waste incineration. He also enquired if consideration could be given to compensating residents living in the vicinity of landfills through betterment measures, such as reductions in electricity tariff and waste charges as in Seoul. USEN responded that based on overseas experience, significant waste reduction could be achieved through waste charging. The Blueprint had set out the way forward for waste management. Public consultation would shortly be held on waste charging. Reference would be made to the latest waste-to-energy technology in the development of IWTF.

Action

34. Mr CHAN Kin-por said that there was much difficulty in taking forward the landfill extension projects on account of local objection. He noted that in view of the strong objection raised by TKO residents, the Administration had agreed to designate the proposed SENT Landfill Extension for the reception of only construction waste in an attempt to reduce the odour nuisance as well as the traffic and environmental impact associated with the transport of waste. He said that it was understandable that District Council members would strive to protect the interest of the districts by objecting to the extension of landfills. However, as a Legislative Council member, he would have to take account of the need for landfill extensions and the long-term and short-term impact on the community. Based on the experience of South Korea, there would be a need for waste disposal at landfills. Given the present progress of the waste management strategy, landfills would still be needed in Hong Kong in the near future. He was of the view that if the landfill extension projects were withdrawn, Hong Kong would run into a waste catastrophe. He would therefore support the extension of landfills. The Administration should try to liaise with the districts concerned on the landfill extensions with a view to mitigating the nuisances and providing suitable compensatory measures for the betterment of the districts and affected residents.

35. DDEP(2) responded that the Administration had implemented a package of measures to mitigate the environmental nuisances caused by the operation of landfills. To address community concerns on the odour problem, the proposed SENT Landfill Extension would be designated for the reception of only construction waste with no odour concern and the remaining waste, including MSW and special waste, would be diverted to other waste disposal facilities. With the proposed designation, the number of RCVs entering the landfills would be significantly reduced.

36. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that she appreciated the difficulties faced by the current term of Government in resolving the objection to the extension of the SENT Landfill, given that the faulty planning that allowed the development of the LOHAS Park near the landfill was made years ago. She did not agree to the extension of the SENT Landfill and considered that the Administration should communicate with the affected residents to achieve a practicable solution to address the nuisance problem instead of seeking to extend the landfill. SEN said that efforts would be made to resolve the odour problem arising from the operation of landfills.

37. Ms Emily LAU considered it necessary that the Administration should hold a summit meeting with political parties, environmental groups, and stakeholders to discuss the landfill extension projects as the projects had not been met with approval from the community. Further discussions were

Action

necessary in an attempt to reach consensus on the way forward. SEN explained that the waste problem was a long standing one which had to be resolved. The Administration had formulated the Blueprint which set out the way forward for waste management. He agreed on the need to meet with relevant parties to further discuss landfill extensions.

NENT and WENT Landfill Extensions

38. Mr CHAN Hak-kan noted the objections of TKO residents to the proposed extension of the SENT Landfill. He pointed out that while measures were implemented to reduce the environmental nuisances at the SENT Landfill, no such measures were taken at the NENT and WENT Landfills for the benefit of residents of Ta Kwu Ling and Tuen Mun, where the scale of landfill extension was much larger than that of the SENT Landfill. Moreover, the Administration had given an undertaking to Tuen Mun residents that no additional obnoxious facility would be built in Tuen Mun after the construction of the sludge treatment facility. Residents of Ta Kwu Ling were also concerned that all odorous food waste would be disposed of at the WENT and NENT Landfills if the SENT Landfill no longer received MSW, including food waste. The nuisance associated with transport of waste was another cause of concern on account of the long distance in the delivery of waste to the two landfills.

39. SEN said that the Administration would try to balance the interest and needs of different districts in the implementation of the Blueprint. The odorous smell of MSW would be significantly reduced with the removal of food waste from the waste loads. Furthermore, with the use of marine transport in the delivery of waste to Tuen Mun, the nuisances associated with land transport would not arise.

40. Mr Paul TSE said that as the proposed 13-hectare extension of the SENT Landfill was much smaller in scale than the NENT and WENT Landfill Extensions which covered 70 and 200 hectares of land respectively, it might not be worthwhile to extend the SENT Landfill, particularly in view of the strong objection from TKO residents. Besides, as the WENT and NENT Landfills were situated in rural areas with more vacant land, their extensions would be easier to accommodate. He also supported making reference to the experience on waste management of Singapore where waste incineration had been implemented years ago. More resources should be invested in expediting the implementation of waste management facilities for the benefit of the community. USEN explained that as landfill capacity was scarce in Hong Kong, and given the severity of the waste problem, the Administration had to make use of the available landfills, including the relatively smaller SENT Landfill.

Action

Motions

41. The Chairman referred members to the following two motions -

(a) *Motion moved by Mr Gary FAN -*

本委員會反對新界東南堆填區擴建計劃。

(Translation)

That this Panel objects to the Southeast New Territories landfill extension project.

(b) *Motion moved by Mr WU Chi-wai*

本委員會反對現階段所有堆填區擴建計劃。

(Translation)

That this Panel objects to all landfill extension projects proposed at this stage.

42. The Chairman suggested and members agreed that the motions could be moved and voted on separately.

43. The Chairman put the motions to vote. On the motion moved by Mr Gary FAN, nine members voted for the motion, four members voted against it and no one abstained. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

44. On the motion moved by Mr WU Chi-wai, four members voted for the motion, four members voted against it and four members abstained. The Chairman declared that the motion was negatived.

VI. Any other business

45. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:30 pm.