

Panel on Development

List of follow-up actions
(Position as at 7 October 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) & (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 |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| 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 |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <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> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|---|------------------------|--|---|
| | | <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> | |
| <p>3. 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>The Administration's response was issued to members on 17 July 2013 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1556/12-13(01).</p> |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>(b) with respect to the Administration's advice that the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("EMSD") had 23 staff 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</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>work on lift and escalator safety; and</p> <p>(e) the number of registered lift/escalator contractors who received subcontracted works from their previous employers who were also registered lift/escalator contractors.</p> | |
| <p>4. Meeting to receive views on "Enhancing land supply strategy: reclamation outside Victoria Harbour and rock cavern development -- Stage 2 public engagement" (Development Bureau)</p> | <p>1 June 2013</p> | <p>Given that the Administration has listed out on the website of the Development Bureau that the amount of unleased or unallocated residential government land after deducting land which are considered not suitable for development, not yet available for development, or with low development potential is only 391.5 hectares (as at June 2012), members noted that there were views on other possible sources of land supply as follows:</p> <p>(1) 561 hectares of road/passageways, man-made slopes, simplified temporary land allocation and sites smaller than 0.05 hectares;</p> <p>(2) 1 200 hectares of land zoned Village Type Development;</p> | <p>The Chinese version of the Administration's response was issued to members on 5 July 2013 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1458/12-13(01). The English version was issued on 17 July 2013 vide LC Paper CB(1)1555/12-13.</p> |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>(3) a total of around 1 840 hectares of land zoned Commercial, Industrial, Government, Institution or Community, and Open Space;</p> <p>(4) 160 hectares of land zoned Other Specified Use ("Undetermined"), Comprehensive Development Area or designated for property development above railway stations;</p> <p>(5) 2 291 hectares of land area let under short term tenancy and allocated for temporary use;</p> <p>(6) a total of 2 750 hectares of land covering 14 military sites which had been handed over to the Hong Kong Garrison exclusively for defence purposes from 1 July 1997;</p> <p>(7) around 800 hectares of brownfield sites; and</p> <p>(8) an estimated 1 010 hectares of farm land and residential land reserve held by five major property developers.</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|---|---------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>The Administration was requested to provide a written response to confirm the amount of land as listed above and whether it would first consider developing the above land to meet the pressing housing needs before resorting to reclamation as a long-term land supply measure.</p> | |
| <p>5. Work of the Urban Renewal Authority (Development Bureau)</p> | <p>25 June 2013</p> | <p>Given that the Urban Renewal Authority has invited applications for two rounds of projects under the pilot demand-led redevelopment scheme and a total of seven projects have been selected from the applications, the Administration is requested to provide the numbers of applications accepted and rejected in each round, and general information about each application, including the reason(s) for acceptance or refusal.</p> | <p>The Administration's response was issued to members on 26 July 2013 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1621/12-13(01).</p> |
| <p>6. Regulation of use of public open space in private developments (Development Bureau)</p> | <p>25 June 2013</p> | <p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information --</p> <p>(a) whether enforcement actions had been taken by the Administration (including but not limited to the issue of warnings/reminders)</p> | <p>Administration's response awaited</p> |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>with respect to non-compliances by owners/management companies of public open space in private developments ("POSPD") with their responsibilities of managing/maintaining the relevant POSPD as well as permitting the public to access and enjoy the facilities; if yes, (i) the types and number of the enforcement actions taken; and (ii) the particulars of the POSPD (such as their locations/addresses, names of owners/management companies etc.) where such non-compliances were found and enforcement actions were taken; and</p> <p>(b) with respect to the Administration's advice that relevant Government departments such as the Lands Department were aware of the complaint related to the placing of large movable planters by the owner/management company of Cheung Kong Centre within the public open space around the building, (i) the follow-up/enforcement actions, if any, that had been/would be taken by the Administration on the case; and (ii) the time required to complete the handling of the</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|---|---------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>case;</p> <p>and to respond to the concerns raised by Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki in his letter to the Panel Chairman dated 4 July 2013 (CB(1)1459/12-13(01)) on the subject.</p> | |
| <p>7. North East New Territories New Development Areas Planning and Engineering Study (Development Bureau)</p> | <p>15 July 2013</p> | <p>There were discussions on resuming the land lot in Kwu Tung granted to the Hong Kong Golf Club under a private recreational lease and currently used as the Fanling Golf Course for housing development. The Administration was requested to provide the names of senior Government officials who were members of the Hong Kong Golf Club.</p> | <p>Administration's response awaited</p> |
| <p>8. Proposed enhancements to the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for development clearance exercises (Development Bureau)</p> | <p>22 July 2013</p> | <p>To facilitate members' understanding of the proposed enhancements to the general ex-gratia compensation for development clearance exercises, the Administration was requested to provide a table comparing the current and proposed ex-gratia compensation arrangements, with illustrative cases showing the amount of compensation received/to be received by the relevant clearers.</p> | <p>Administration's response awaited</p> |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|-----------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 9. North East New Territories New Development Areas and Engineering Study (Development Bureau) | 22 July 2013 | <p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information --</p> <p><i>The revised development proposals</i></p> <p>(a) Projection of the population structure in the proposed North East New Territories New Development Areas ("NENT NDAs") and the preliminary plans, if any, for provision of community facilities in the NDAs to cater for the needs of future residents of various demographic features;</p> <p>(b) The detailed plan, other than the general information given in the discussion paper and the Information Digest, for introducing economic activities in the proposed NDAs so as to ensure that the target of offering 37 700 job opportunities in 2031 for local residents could be achieved;</p> <p>(c) Whether it would consider the requests, if any, of owners of agricultural land within the areas of the proposed NDAs for selling</p> | Administration's response awaited |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>the land to the Government to facilitate agricultural resite/rehabilitation; and whether the acquisition prices, if offered by the Government, would be comparable with the compensation packages for agricultural land owners affected by the NDAs project;</p> <p>(d) Whether the Administration would consider renting private agricultural land and leasing it to the public for eco-farming or to farmers for agricultural rehabilitation.</p> <p><i>The interest of the family of the Secretary of Development in an agricultural plot in Kwu Tung North</i></p> <p>(e) A detailed account of whether the Secretary's disclosure of interest in respect of the formulation of the NENT NDAs proposals meets the declaration of interest requirements for Principal Officials, including why the Secretary did not disclose his wife's interest in an agricultural plot in Kwu Tung North upon his assumption of office but he later reported the interest to the</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | Chief Executive in September 2012; and (f) With reference to the last paragraph of the speaking note of the Secretary provided at the meeting, whether the Secretary meant that he would declare his family's interest, if any, in an agricultural plot in Kwu Tung North when the Committee on Planning and Land Development discussed land resumption compensation in future. | |