

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1990/13-14
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/EA/1

Panel on Environmental Affairs

**Minutes of special meeting
held on Saturday, 22 March 2014, at 9:30 am
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

Members present : Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan (Chairman)
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming
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 Dennis KWOK
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP

Members attending : Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki

Members absent : Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Kenneth LEUNG
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen

Public Officers attending : **For item I**

Mr WONG Kam-sing, JP
Secretary for the Environment

Mr Howard CHAN, JP
Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2)
Environmental Protection Department

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

Mr Elvis AU, JP
Assistant Director
(Nature Conservation & Infrastructure Planning)
Environmental Protection Department

Attendance by invitation : **Session 1**

Community & Construction Professionals' Development Centre

Mr Spencer LI
Council Member

Tuen Mun Rural Committee

Mr HO Kwan-yiu
Chairman

Individual

Ms KWONG Wai-kuen

長洲回收再造社

陳治平先生
司庫

Individual

Dr Tom YAM

City and Environmental Planning Alliance for Hong Kong

Mr Raymond KO
Convenor

Hong Kong Project Management Exchange Centre Ltd

Ir FAN Ying-ming
Member

Civic Party

Mr Kenneth TONG
NTE District Developer

French Chamber of Commerce

Mr CHAN Kin-kan
President
Green Business Committee

Greeners Action

Mr Angus HO
Executive Director

Construction Industry Council

Mr Ivan KO
Manager – Council Services

Friends of the Earth (HK)

Ms YEUNG Hoi-shan
Assistant Environmental Affairs Manager

Range Educational Centre Environment Concern Group

Mr LO Tak-loi
Member

Cheung Chau Kai-Fong Society

Mr KWOK Cheuk-kin

Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design

Professor Bernard V LIM
President

Individual

Mr Robert BUNKER

Individual

Ms Louise PRESTON

The 30SGroup

Mr Alex WONG
Co-Convenor, Environment and Energy Working Group

Business Environment Council

Ms Sarah CHOI
Manager – Environmental Management

The Hong Kong Electronic Industries Association

Mr Basil WAI
CEO

Individual

Mr Craig COLBRAN

Individual

Mr John CHAN

Individual

Ms Eppie LI

Hong Kong Construction Association

Mr Ringo YU
Chairman of Environmental Committee

Hong Kong Environmental Industry Association

Mr Joe NG
Vice President

Environmental Contractors Management Association

Dr CHENG Wing-kin
Vice President

Individual

Mr Martin LERIGO

Individual

Mr Erik UEBEL

Session 2

Designing Hong Kong Ltd

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN
CEO

Hong Kong Professionals And Senior Executives
Association

Mr LAM Lik-shan
Executive Committee Member

Kaden Construction Ltd

Mr Simon LIU
Director

Leader Civil Engineering Corporation Ltd

Ms Decora LEE
Business Manager

Wai Kee (Zens) Construction and Transportation Co Ltd

Ms Ricci POON
Senior Environmental Engineer

Individual

Mr John SCHOFIELD

Hong Kong Green Strategy Alliance

Mr Jude CHOW
Vice Convenor of Waste Management Panel

Labour Party

Mr CHENG Sze-lut
Vice Chair

EagleOwl on Lantau

Mr Paul MELSOM
Eco-Educator

Individual

Ms Christine FONG

終極關閉將軍澳堆填區大聯盟

陳繼偉先生
主席

Professional Power

黃耀威先生

Individual

方裕政先生

Individual

陸秀貞女士

Individual

Ms Cynthia LAM

Individual

呂劍豪先生

Individual

盧文謙先生

Individual

曾先生

Individual

何太

Individual

英太

Individual

曹太

Clear the Air

Mr Christian MASSET

Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce

Mr Cary CHAN

Chairman

Environment & Sustainability Committee

The British Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong

Mr Tim PEIRSON-SMITH

Chairman of Business Policy Unit

The Chinese General Chamber of Commerce

Mr Philip FAN

Standing Committee Member

Youth Committee of Professional Power

張美雄先生

Session 3

Living Cheung Chau

Mr SIU Ka-man

Secretary

將軍澳中心 57 地段業委會

Mr AU YEUNG Ho-kwan

主席

Individual

李太

World Green Organisation

Mr Angus WONG
Policy Advocacy Manager

Individual

Mr Mark PARLETT

New People's Party

Mr KAM Man-fung
Member of Central Committee

離島長洲街坊事務委員會

Mr LEUNG Hon-wai
Chairman

Individual

Mr TSOI Yiu-cheong

Individual

Ms HO Hang-mui

Individual

Ms CHAN Shu-ying

Individual

Dr CHUNG Shan-shan
Assistant Professor
Department of Biology
Hong Kong Baptist University

Individual

Professor Irene LO
Professor
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

NT Concern Group

Mr TANG Yung-yiu
Chairman

新圍村關注組

Mr CHAU Chun-kun
Chairman

Individual

蕭志華先生

新墟村關注組

Mr HUI Cheuk-ho
Chairman

Individual

Mr TANG Tak-sum

Individual

Mr LUK Ping-choi

Hang Hau Resident's Right Association

Mr CHAN Chin-chun
Chairperson

Lohas Park Resident's Right Association

Mr CHEUNG Chi-tung
Chairperson

Alliance for Promoting Sustainable Waste Management for Hong Kong

Professor POON Chi-sun
Professor

Individual

Mr CHEUNG Pui-chuen

Session 4

Cheung Chau Development Association

Mr YEUNG Yung-hang
Secretary

Dutch Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong

Mr Daniël de Blocq van Scheltinga
Board member

Individual

Ms KWOK Man-yi

Swedish Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong

Mr Ulf OHRLING
Chairman

Hong Kong Climate Change Forum

Ir Dr Otto POON
Immediate Past Chairman

Individual

Mrs Jane HOUNG

Chun Wo Construction and Engineering Co Ltd

Mr NG Chi-man
General Manager (Compliance)

Hong Kong Waste Management Association

Mr Victor LI
Honorary Secretary

Environmental Association

Mr Alvin CHENG
Project Officer

LOHAS Cheung Chau Environmental Education Centre

Ms Grace CHENG
Centre Manager

Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of
Hong Kong

Mr TO Cho-ki
Young DAB

Individual

文貴旗先生

Individual

Mr MAN Kai-kwong

Individual

Mr MAN Chung-hing

The Conservancy Association

Mr WONG Tze-kang
Deputy Chief Executive

Individual

梁太

Neo Democrats

Mr Ventus LAU

Green.Recycling

Mr WONG Chor-ming
Chairman

Individual

Ms Leonie CHAN

Hong Kong Construction Association Young Members
Society

Mr LEUNG Kin-yeung
Student Representative

Individual

Ms SHUM Ka-yee

Individual

Mr FANG Hei-chun

Living Islands Movement

Mr Merrin PEARSE
Chairman

Integrated Waste Management Action Group

Mr Ian BROWNLEE
Consultant

The Hong Kong Association of Property Management
Companies

Mr Gary YEUNG
Chairman
Professional Practice Committee

Session 5

Individual

蘇女士

Individual

謝先生

Individual

謝太

Individual

Mr Christopher LAW

Cheung Chau Rural Committee

Mr YUNG Chi-ming
Chairman

Individual

Mr CHO Chau-ming

Individual

Mr NG Man-kit

Individual

Ms Amanda Whitmore SNOW

Hong Kong Outdoors

Dr Martin WILLIAMS
Director

The Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental
Management Hong Kong

Mr Alfred LEE
Committee Member

Individual

Ms LEE Kwai-chun

Individual

Mr Tom HOPE

Individual

趙媚珠女士

Range Study Centre

Mr Simon LAU
Member

Individual

單太

長洲大新街街坊會

Mr WONG Pak-ling
公關主任

香港漁民互助社(長洲辦事處)

彭華根先生

Cheung Chau Pak She Kai Fong Association

Mr HUI Fai-ching
Secretary

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

Staff in attendance : Miss Lilian MOK
Senior Council Secretary (1)1

Miss Mandy POON
Legislative Assistant (1)1

I. Meeting to receive views 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**
- (d) 5177DR: Integrated Waste Management Facilities Phase 1"**

Relevant papers

(LC Paper No. CB(1)931/13-14(01) — Administration's paper on "Environmental infrastructure projects"

LC Paper No. CB(1)951/13-14(03) — Updated background brief on "Extension of landfills" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat

IN06/13-14 — Information note on "Integrated waste management facilities in Hong Kong" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

The Chairman said that in view of the large number of deputations/individuals who wished to express their views on the four

Action

environmental infrastructure projects, the Panel would hold another meeting on 28 March 2014 at 10:00 am to receive public views on the projects.

2. At the Chairman's invitation, 119 deputations/individuals expressed their views on the four environmental infrastructure projects. A summary of the views of the deputations/individuals is in the **Appendix**.

3. Members also noted the following submissions from deputations/individuals not attending the meeting –

LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(29) — Submissions from three members of the public (English version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(30) — Submission from Mr Thomas HUI (English version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(31) — Submission from Dr T C BYOCE (English version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(32) — Submission from Mr Taher KSURI (English version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(33) — Submission from Ms Caroline CASSE (English version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(34) — Submission from Mr Martin WILLIAMS (English version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(35) — Submission from Mr Derek NG (English version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(36) — Submission from Professor Nora TAM Fung-yee, City University of Hong Kong (Chinese version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(37) — Submission from German Industry & Commerce Ltd (English version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(38) — Submission from The American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(39) — Submission from Professional Property Services Ltd (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(40) — Submission from European Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(41) — Submission from Ms Gwyneth MACCORMICK (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(42) — Submission from Ms CHOI Fong (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(43) — Submission from Ms LEUNG Siu-wah (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(44) — Submission from Hong Kong Association of Energy Engineers (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(45) — Submission from The Academic Research Centre (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(46) — Submission from Mr LEUNG (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(47) — Submission from Living Lamma (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(48) — Submission from Clean Air Network (Chinese version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(49) — Submission from Green Sense (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(50) — Submission from ECO-Environment Conservation & Education Association (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(51) — Submission from Federation of Hong Kong Industries (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/13-14(14) — Submission from Mr Steven QUILKEY (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1141/13-14(05) — Submission from Danish Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1141/13-14(06) — Submission from WWF Hong Kong (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1141/13-14(08) — Submissions from two members of the public (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1156/13-14(17) — Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)

Discussion

Session 1

4. In response to the views and concerns raised by deputations/individuals, the Secretary for the Environment ("SEN") said that Hong Kong was facing an imminent waste problem which required close collaboration between the Government and the public to reduce waste and maximize waste recycling. While the Administration was implementing different waste reduction measures, landfills and waste-to-energy facilities were still an indispensable part of the waste management chain in Hong Kong. Hong Kong should be heading in the same direction as many other overseas countries where effective waste

Action

reduction and recycling measures were implemented on the one hand and modern waste treatment technologies were adopted to handle unrecyclable waste on the other.

Session 2

5. After receiving deputations/individuals' views, SEN stressed that the Administration was committed to formulating a holistic policy on waste management for Hong Kong. The "Hong Kong Blueprint for Sustainable Use of Resources 2013-2022" ("the Action Blueprint") issued by the Environment Bureau ("ENB") had mapped out a waste management strategy with targets, policies and action plans for the coming years up to 2022. Given that Hong Kong had limited space for landfill disposal, municipal solid waste ("MSW") should best be recycled and converted into usable energy and resources. The Administration would conduct planning for Hong Kong's waste management beyond 2022. It would also put in place different measures to promote waste reduction and recycling in the community with a view to reducing the reliance on landfilling.

6. Mr Albert CHAN expressed concern as to whether the moving grate incineration technology selected by the Administration for the Integrated Waste Management Facilities ("IWMF") Phase 1 was outdated and new incineration technologies should be adopted. SEN responded that with reference to the Panel's overseas duty visit to the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden conducted in early March 2014 to study overseas experience in the development and operation of thermal waste treatment facilities, the moving grate incineration technology remained the mainstream MSW treatment technology and was safe and reliable. The Administration would ensure that the moving grate incineration technology of IWMF Phase 1 would fully meet the latest European Union ("EU") emission standards, which were the highest standards for modern incinerators in the world.

7. As regards Mr Albert CHAN's request that the Administration should legislate for source separation of waste in Hong Kong, SEN advised that with the implementation of MSW charging, which would be a forceful tool to encourage the public to reduce waste at source and separate recyclables from the waste stream, in 2016 and other effective waste management initiatives, the per capita waste disposal level of MSW in Hong Kong should be reduced.

8. Mr James TO noted from the overseas duty visit to the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden conducted by the Panel in early March 2014 that there were significant improvements in different types of thermal waste treatment technologies. He however pointed out that while many overseas countries had been adopting advanced incineration technologies to address the problem of waste disposal, they had implemented mandatory waste

Action

separation at source to drive behavioural change in waste reduction. As such, the Administration should put in place a comprehensive waste management plan to show its commitment to step up waste recovery and recycling. Otherwise, the public would remain unconvinced that the Administration would proactively reduce waste and maximize waste recycling if the funding proposals for landfill extension and IWMF Phase 1 were approved.

9. In response, SEN reiterated that MSW charging anticipated to be implemented in 2016 would be a powerful tool to encourage the public to reduce waste at source and separate recyclables from the waste stream. The Council for Sustainable Development would collate the views received during the public engagement on MSW charging and put forward specific proposals for the Administration to devise a MSW charging mechanism suitable for Hong Kong.

Session 3

10. SEN provided a consolidated response to the views and concerns raised by deputations/individuals as follows –

- (a) Hong Kong was facing an imminent waste challenge as the three strategic landfills would reach their designed capacities one by one by 2019 if not extended. To handle the large quantity of waste generated every day, there was a need to extend the landfills and build a modern incineration facility. Otherwise, public hygiene in Hong Kong would be threatened;
- (b) the Administration was not only advocating the development of waste management facilities but had also stepped up its efforts to promote waste reduction at source in line with the Action Blueprint with the target of reducing the MSW disposal rate by 40% on a per capita basis by 2022;
- (c) a pilot scheme on MSW charging had been rolled out in some housing estates to accumulate experience for the future implementation of MSW charging;
- (d) the Administration had been progressively implementing different Producer Responsibility Schemes ("PRSs") to segregate recyclables from the waste stream for recycling and reuse after proper treatment. New PRSs on waste electrical and electronic equipment ("WEEE") and glass beverage bottles ("GBBs") would be introduced;

Action

- (e) the Administration had published "A Food Waste and Yard Waste Plan for Hong Kong 2014-2022" ("the Food Waste and Yard Waste Plan") to articulate specific strategies for tackling organic waste. The Organic Waste Treatment Facilities Phase 1 in Siu Ho Wan, North Lantau would be commissioned in 2016;
- (f) the Steering Committee to Promote the Sustainable Development of the Recycling Industry led by the Chief Secretary for Administration had been set up to examine the recycling operations of different types of recyclables with a view to formulating tailored support programmes and measures for individual recyclable types;
- (g) a host of publicity activities and educational programmes were being rolled out with an aim to change people's wasteful habits gradually; and
- (h) the Administration would carry out a strategic study on waste treatment technologies and siting for future waste management facilities to meet the longer term needs.

11. Noting that among the three landfills, the Southeast New Territories ("SENT") Landfill was the closest to major residential developments and its extension might cause environmental impacts on nearby residents, Dr Kenneth CHAN enquired whether the Administration would work for an early closure of the SENT Landfill and implement the extension of the landfill in phases subject to the effectiveness of different waste management measures. He further said that the Chief Executive ("CE") had indicated in his election manifesto that priority should be given to waste reduction and recycling without resorting to waste incineration and landfill extension.

12. SEN reiterated that the Action Blueprint, which covered action plans for waste reduction at source, food waste prevention, maximizing recycling, developing waste-to-energy infrastructure and landfilling, was a solution to the imminent waste management problem that Hong Kong was facing. The Administration had been taking measures to reduce waste and enhance recycling as outlined in CE's election manifesto. Overseas experience also showed that landfills were an essential part of the waste management chain. As Hong Kong was relying mainly on the three strategic landfills for waste disposal and these landfills would be saturated one by one by 2019, their timely extension was an integral part of the Action Blueprint. SEN also clarified that the proposed extension part of the SENT Landfill would be further away from residential areas.

Action

13. Mr Gary FAN urged the Administration to take into consideration the suggestions put forth by some local green groups to implement MSW charging, extend the coverage of PRSs to different products, review the Construction Waste Disposal Charging Scheme, promote the sustainable development of the recycling industry, prohibit the disposal of recyclable waste at landfills or waste-to-energy facilities and extend the existing landfills in phases. He also invited the deputations/individuals to give further views on whether members should consider the funding proposals for the landfill extension and IWMF Phase 1 as a package or assess each proposal separately on its own merits.

14. Mr AU YEUNG Ho-kwan, Chairman of 將軍澳中心57地段業委會, opined that the Administration should speed up the progress of different waste management measures before putting forward the funding proposals for landfill extension and IWMF Phase 1. Mr CHAN Chin-chun, Chairperson of Hang Hau Resident's Right Association, shared Mr AU YEUNG's views. Mr HUI Cheuk-ho, Chairman of 新墟村關注組, was of the view that the Administration should enhance its efforts in promoting source separation of waste instead of relying on landfills or other waste treatment facilities. However, Mr Angus WONG, Policy Advocacy Manager of World Green Organisation, urged members to vote in support of the funding proposals as there was a genuine need to extend the three landfills and develop a modern incinerator in a timely manner.

Session 4

15. SEN provided a consolidated response to the views and concerns raised by deputations/individuals as follows –

- (a) the Administration had adopted a multi-pronged approach to tackle the waste problem in Hong Kong with a view to reducing the quantities of waste going to landfills;
- (b) the design of IWMF Phase 1 would match in harmony with the surrounding environment. Some overseas waste-to-energy plants provided community facilities for the betterment of the nearby communities;
- (c) District Liaison Groups had been established in the affected districts to enhance communication with the local communities on the operation and management of the waste treatment facilities (including landfills) in the districts;
- (d) the Administration had been progressively implementing different PRSs to segregate recyclables from the waste stream for recycling and reuse after proper treatment. New PRSs on WEEE and GBBs

Action

would be introduced; and

- (e) the moving grate incineration technology to be adopted for IWWMF Phase 1 would fully meet the latest EU emission standards, which were the highest standards for modern incinerators in the world.

16. Dr Kenneth CHAN invited representatives of chambers of commerce to give their views on the adoption of the moving grate incineration technology meeting EU standards for IWWMF Phase 1. Mr Daniël de Blocq van Scheltinga, Board member of Dutch Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong, and Mr Ulf OHRLING, Chairman of Swedish Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong, shared the views that Hong Kong had the advantages of following the successful experience of EU countries in using advanced incineration technologies to turn waste into energy. Nevertheless, it took quite some time for EU countries to achieve the emission standards required by EU. Mr Ian BROWNLEE, Consultant of Integrated Waste Management Action Group, objected to landfill extension. He opined that priority should be given to reducing waste and maximizing recycling without resorting to large-scale landfill extension.

17. Mr Vincent FANG was of the view that more efforts should be made to enhance publicity and public education to promote waste reduction and recycling. The Administration should also expedite the subsidy scheme to assist the waste collection trade to retrofit their refuse collection vehicles ("RCVs") with metal tailgates and waste water sump tanks to reduce the environmental nuisances caused by RCVs travelling on roads. Noting that food waste made up 40% of the MSW disposed of at landfills and created odour nuisance, Mr FANG urged the Administration to recycle them to energy and other useful resources as far as possible. He also supported the adoption of advanced incineration technologies for IWWMF Phase 1 for mixed MSW treatment to reduce the bulk size of waste for disposal substantially.

18. SEN assured members that the Administration had spared no efforts in social campaigns to mobilize the community to take more environmentally-sustainable actions in their daily lives. For example, the Environmental Campaign Committee, the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") and the Education Bureau had launched the "Use Less, Waste Less in My Hands" Campaign to promote waste reduction at source and encourage "Use Less, Waste Less" green life style in schools. On food waste management, the Food Waste and Yard Waste Plan had set out specific strategies for tackling organic waste. SEN stressed that IWWMF Phase 1 would adopt well proven technology meeting EU standards so that it could operate reliably and would be able to handle a sizeable volume of MSW. The Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Infrastructure) ("ADEP(EI)") supplemented that the application period for the subsidy scheme for retrofitting RCVs would close on

Action

30 September 2014. It was expected that private RCVs would complete the retrofitting works within 2014-2015.

19. The Chairman remarked that Hong Kong lagged behind many other cities in waste management. Whilst a host of measures on waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery had been introduced, the general public remained unconvinced that the Administration would put substantial effort to reduce MSW if the funding proposals for landfill extension and IWMF Phase 1 were approved. She opined that the District Liaison Groups established in the affected districts should comprise representatives of local residents and steer the operation and management of the waste treatment facilities (including landfills) in the districts.

Session 5

20. In response to the views and concerns raised by deputations/individuals, SEN stressed that the Administration was committed to taking different actions to address the problem of waste management in Hong Kong. The discussion of landfill extension and construction of waste-to-energy facilities had been going on for many years. Most people agreed that there was a need to extend the three landfills and the application of modern waste treatment technologies should be considered. ADEP(EI) supplemented that the Administration noted the concerns of the Sai Kung District Council ("SKDC") and local residents about the problems of odour, air pollution, environmental hygiene, dust and transport alleged to be caused by the operation of the SENT Landfill. The details of the progress of the different mitigation measures implemented by the Administration to alleviate the environmental nuisances caused by the SENT Landfill had been submitted to SKDC for information. ENB and EPD would continue to work closely with other relevant policy bureaux and government departments to enhance the operation and management of the SENT Landfill.

21. On the development of IWMF Phase 1, the Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Nature Conservation & Infrastructure Planning) ("ADEP(NC&IP)") explained that a comprehensive site selection exercise to identify potential sites for the first phase of IWMF had been conducted in 2007. The site search exercise identified that the sites near Shek Kwu Chau and at Tsang Tsui Ash Lagoons could be further considered as potential sites for developing IWMF Phase 1. Detailed environmental impact assessment ("EIA") studies on the two sites had been carried out to ascertain their environmental acceptability. Taking into account the EIA results, the spatial distribution of our waste management facilities and transport efficiency (e.g. the artificial island near Shek Kwu Chau was closer to the refuse transfer stations on Hong Kong Island and Kowloon), the Administration concluded that the artificial island near Shek Kwu Chau was the preferred site for developing IWMF Phase 1. As regards the thermal treatment technology to be adopted for IWMF Phase 1,

Action

ADEP(NC&IP) advised that the moving grate incineration technology was currently the mainstream advanced technology adopted worldwide for large scale MSW treatment. It was reliable and robust and could fully meet the latest EU emission standards. An advanced air pollution control system would also be installed in IWMF Phase 1 and in particular, flue gas would be treated by selective catalytic reduction for more effective nitrogen oxides removal so as to achieve a level more stringent than the EU emission standard.

22. Dr Kenneth CHAN noted that the proposals for landfill extension and IWMF Phase 1 development were clearly not favoured in the districts where the facilities were located. To gain public support for the proposals, he enquired whether the Administration would consider providing betterment measures, such as reduction in waste charges, as compensation for residents living in the vicinity of waste treatment and disposal infrastructures. SEN responded that it was not the prevalent practice of overseas countries to provide financial subsidies to residents. Instead, many waste treatment facilities in overseas countries had incorporated social, recreational and educational facilities for public enjoyment. The Administration would engage local residents in the design of IWMF Phase 1 to make it a welcome facility to the public and step up publicity to promote the safety operation of the facility. On MSW charging, SEN advised that the Council for Sustainable Development was analyzing the views received from the public engagement exercise conducted in 2013 and would make recommendations on the charging mechanism to the Administration.

II. Any other business

23. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:28 pm.

Panel on Environmental Affairs

Special meeting on Saturday, 22 March 2014, at 9:30 am

Meeting to receive views 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

(d) 5177DR: Integrated Waste Management Facilities Phase 1"

Summary of views and concerns expressed by deputations/individuals

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
Session 1		
1.	Community & Construction Professionals' Development Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the proposals for landfill extension and the development of the Integrated Waste Management Facilities ("IWMF") Phase 1 in Shek Kwu Chau; • the Administration should work out a comprehensive waste management strategy and explain to the public the pros and cons of different thermal waste treatment technologies to allay their concerns about the IWMF project; • the Administration should consider enhancing tripartite collaboration among the community, the business sector, and the Government in taking forward different environmental projects and report the progress of the projects regularly; and • the Administration should explore and promote the wider use of green materials in public works
2.	Tuen Mun Rural Committee	presentation of views as set out in submissions (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1109/13-14(01) and CB(1)1187/13-14(03))
3.	Ms KWONG Wai-kuen	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1156/13-14(01))
4.	長洲回收再造社	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • objected to the development of IWMF Phase 1; • expressed concern about the environmental impacts that might arise from IWMF Phase 1; and • doubted whether advanced incineration technologies meeting the standards of the European Union ("EU") would be adopted for IWMF Phase 1
5.	Dr Tom YAM	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(02))

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
6.	City and Environmental Planning Alliance for Hong Kong	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/13-14(01))
7.	Hong Kong Project Management Exchange Centre Ltd	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/13-14(16))
8.	Civic Party	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(03))
9.	French Chamber of Commerce	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/13-14(15))
10.	Greeners Action	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1156/13-14(02))
11.	Construction Industry Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the proposal to further extend the Southeast New Territories ("SENT") Landfill; • the Administration should ensure that the construction waste generated from landfill extension would be disposed of properly at designated dump sites; and • the Administration should better manage the disposal of construction and demolition waste at the three strategic landfills in order to recycle the waste for reuse in public works projects
12.	Friends of the Earth (HK)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Administration had failed to make concrete achievements in waste management; • waste reduction at source should be further promoted; • the community was concerned that the Administration might not proactively reduce waste and maximize waste recycling if the funding proposals for landfill extension and IWMP Phase 1 were approved; and • the Administration should show its commitment to step up waste recovery and recycling
13.	Range Educational Centre Environment Concern Group	presentation of views as set out in submissions (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)957/13-14(02) and CB(1)1156/13-14(03))
14.	Cheung Chau Kai-Fong Society	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(04))
15.	Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the development of IWMP Phase 1;

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • having regard that many overseas waste treatment facilities incorporated social, recreational and educational facilities that were well received by the public, the Administration should explore how the design of IWMF Phase 1 could match in harmony with the surrounding green and natural environment of Shek Kwu Chau and blend with other local community amenities; • the Administration should co-ordinate relevant policy bureaux/government departments and engage stakeholders in the development and operation of IWMF Phase 1; and • the Administration should enhance the transparency of the tendering of the Design-Build-and-Operate contract of IWMF Phase 1
16.	Mr Robert BUNKER	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(05))
17.	Ms Louise PRESTON	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/13-14(02))
18.	The 30SGroup	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(06))
19.	Business Environment Council	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/13-14(03))
20.	The Hong Kong Electronic Industries Association	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1141/13-14(07))
21.	Mr Craig COLBRAN	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(07))
22.	Mr John CHAN	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1156/13-14(04))
23.	Ms Eppie LI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Administration had failed to make concrete achievements in waste reduction and recycling; • the Administration should explore alternative ways to tackle the imminent problem of waste instead of pursuing landfill extension; • the SENT Landfill was located close to major urban areas and Tseung Kwan O ("TKO") residents had been affected by the environmental problems caused by the operation of the SENT Landfill for many years; and

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> criticized the Administration for its ineffective enforcement actions against refuse collection vehicles ("RCVs") dripping leachate or dropping waste during their trips to landfills
24.	Hong Kong Construction Association	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/13-14(04))
25.	Hong Kong Environmental Industry Association	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/13-14(05))
26.	Environmental Contractors Management Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> supported the proposals for landfill extension and the development of IWMF Phase 1 to handle unrecyclable waste; supported waste reduction at source and the implementation of municipal solid waste ("MSW") charging and different Producer Responsibility Schemes ("PRSs"); more efforts should be made to support the development of the recycling industry and enhance publicity and public education to promote waste reduction and recycling; the Administration should proactively address the concerns of the residents living in the vicinity of waste management facilities; the Administration should take forward the waste management strategies in the "Hong Kong Blueprint for Sustainable Use of Resources 2013-2022" ("the Action Blueprint"); and each district in the territory should fairly share out the waste management responsibilities
27.	Mr Martin LERIGO	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1141/13-14(01))
28.	Mr Erik UEBEL	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(08))
Session 2		
29.	Designing Hong Kong Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> landfill extension and the development of waste-to-energy facilities should be considered as the last resort of waste management as compared to other waste management measures, such as waste reduction, recycling and recovery; the Administration should highlight the value of resources that could be recovered from waste to encourage recycling and enhance publicity and public education to promote source separation of waste;

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Administration's plan to develop different treatment facilities for different types of waste was faulty. Instead, integrated waste facilities should be built in the existing landfills to handle the different types of waste collected in their catchment areas; and • the Administration should set up a waste authority to work with the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") and other relevant government departments to implement different waste management measures
30.	Hong Kong Professionals And Senior Executives Association	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(09))
31.	Kaden Construction Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the proposals for landfill extension and the development of IWMF Phase 1; • since IWMF Phase 1 would adopt advanced incineration technologies, it should not have significant impacts on the environment and nearby residents; and • waste-to-energy facilities were indispensable in the waste management system of Hong Kong for treating unavoidable waste
32.	Leader Civil Engineering Corporation Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the proposals for landfill extension and the development of IWMF Phase 1; • while the Administration should continue to implement waste reduction measures, there was an urgent need to extend landfills and develop waste-to-energy facilities to deal with the enormous quantities of waste generated every day; • many overseas countries were adopting modern incineration technologies to handle unrecyclable waste; and • as Hong Kong had limited space for landfills, IWMF Phase 1 was considered a more cost-effective means to substantially reduce the volume of waste and turn waste into energy for local use
33.	Wai Kee (Zens) Construction and Transportation Co Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hong Kong needed to take immediate actions to resolve the waste problem as exemplified by the imminent exhaustion of the three existing landfills; • supported the proposals for landfill extension and the development of IWMF Phase 1; • since IWMF Phase 1 would adopt advanced incineration technologies, it should not have significant impacts on the

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<p>environment and nearby residents; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Administration should closely monitor the operation of the three landfills and address nearby residents' environmental concerns
34.	Mr John SCHOFIELD	presentation of views as set out in submissions (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1132/13-14(06) and CB(1)1179/13-14(01))
35.	Hong Kong Green Strategy Alliance	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1156/13-14(05))
36.	Labour Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • given the imminent waste problem and the slow progress in strengthening environmental education, there was no other choice but to extend the existing landfills and develop IWMF Phase 1; • the Administration should introduce a landfill ban on recyclable waste to extend the service lives of the three strategic landfills and conserve landfill space; • apart from landfill extension and development of IWMF Phase 1, the Administration should implement other waste management measures (e.g. PRSs) to prevent and reduce MSW across the board; and • the Administration should set aside a recurrent expenditure of \$2 billion per year to promote reduction, separation and recycling of waste with a view to reducing reliance on landfill
37.	EagleOwl on Lantau	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1156/13-14(06))
38.	Ms Christine FONG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support the development of thermal waste treatment facilities and MWS charging with a corresponding reduction in government rates; • TKO residents were seriously affected by the nuisances associated with the operation of the SENT Landfill and were gravely concerned whether the SENT Landfill had to be extended year by year and would continue to operate indefinitely; • urged for the permanent closure of the SENT Landfill; and • landfill sites should be located on outlying islands far away from Hong Kong to minimize their environmental nuisances to the local communities

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
39.	終極關閉將軍澳堆填區大聯盟	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • objected to the extension of the SENT Landfill as TKO residents had been seriously affected by the nuisances arising from the operation of the SENT Landfill for many years; • the mitigation measures undertaken by the Administration to address the environmental nuisances of the SENT Landfill were not effective; and • the Administration was oblivious to the complaints lodged by TKO residents against the environmental nuisances of the SENT Landfill
40.	Professional Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the large number of RCVs and dump trucks delivering waste to the SENT Landfill had given rise to traffic congestion as well as noise and odour nuisances; • RCVs dripping leachate or dropping waste during their travel to and from the SENT Landfill might pose danger to other road users and undermine road safety; • being a TKO resident, he considered that the Administration was oblivious to the complaints lodged by TKO residents against the environmental nuisances of the SENT Landfill; • the Administration should closely monitor the level of PM2.5 in the vicinity of the SENT Landfill; and • urged for the permanent closure of the SENT Landfill
41.	方裕政先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the air pollution, traffic congestion, as well as the noise and odour nuisances associated with the operation of the SENT Landfill had been disturbing nearby residents for years; and • being a TKO resident, he urged for the permanent closure of the SENT Landfill
42.	陸秀貞女士	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • due to the frequent cleansing of Wan Po Road, considerable quantities of dust and grit were blown from Wan Po Road to the nearby footpath, affecting environmental hygiene and the health of TKO residents; and • TKO residents were concerned that the closure of the SENT Landfill had been extended time and again and they urged for the permanent closure of the SENT Landfill
43.	Ms Cynthia LAM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TKO residents had been misled by the Administration to believe that the SENT Landfill would be closed soon; • the air pollution and odour nuisances associated with the operation of the SENT Landfill had been disturbing nearby

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<p>residents for years; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TKO residents were concerned that the closure of the SENT Landfill had been extended time and again and they urged for the permanent closure of the SENT Landfill
44.	呂劍豪先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • being a TKO resident, he objected to the extension of the SENT Landfill; • the air pollution, traffic congestion, as well as the noise and odour nuisances associated with the operation of the SENT Landfill had been disturbing nearby residents for years; and • while the Administration should expeditiously take forward the development of IWFM Phase 1, the development of waste-to-energy facilities should be considered as the last resort of waste management as compared to other waste management measures, such as waste reduction, recycling and recovery
45.	盧文謙先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Administration had been threatening the public over the years by claiming that the three strategic landfills would be exhausted one by one shortly; and • since the treatment cost per tonne of waste was high, IWFM Phase 1 might not be a cost-effective means to handle MSW
46.	曾先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • being a TKO resident, he objected to the extension of the SENT Landfill; • the large number of RCVs and dump trucks delivering waste to the SENT Landfill had given rise to traffic congestion as well as noise and odour nuisances; and • RCVs dripping leachate or dropping waste during their travel to and from the SENT Landfill might pose danger to other road users and undermine road safety
47.	何太	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the air pollution, traffic congestion, as well as the noise and odour nuisances associated with the operation of the SENT Landfill had been disturbing nearby residents for years; and • being a TKO resident, she and other TKO residents were concerned that the closure of the SENT Landfill had been extended time and again and they urged for the permanent closure of the SENT Landfill
48.	英太	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • being a TKO resident, she urged for the permanent closure of the SENT Landfill; • due to poor urban planning, residential developments in TKO

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<p>were very close to the SENT Landfill and local residents had been affected by the environmental problems caused by landfill operation over the years; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • landfill sites should be located on outer islands to minimize their environmental nuisances to the local communities
49.	曹太	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • being a TKO resident, she criticized the Administration for submitting the funding proposals for landfill extension and IWMF Phase 1 to the Panel as a package as each proposal should be considered separately on its own merits; • the large number of RCVs and dump trucks dripping leachate or dropping waste during their travel to and from the SENT Landfill had given rise to traffic congestion as well as noise and odour nuisances; • despite the fact that EPD had arranged frequent cleansing of Wan Po Road, there were considerable quantities of dust and grit blown from Wan Po Road to the nearby footpath, affecting environmental hygiene and the health of TKO residents; • the Administration should strengthen its enforcement actions against RCVs dripping leachate or dropping waste on the way to and from landfills; and • was concerned about the reception of only construction waste upon the extension of the SENT Landfill since such waste might contain toxic materials and particulates which would affect public health
50.	Clear the Air	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(10))
51.	Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(11))
52.	The British Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported the adoption of a multi-pronged approach to tackle the waste problem of Hong Kong; • supported using the moving grate incineration technology for large-scale treatment of MSW and energy recovery; • the Administration should promote waste reduction at source, maximize waste recycling and invest in waste-to-energy facilities while landfill extension should be the last resort in waste management; and • doubted the Administration's explanation on the urgent need for developing IWMF Phase 1

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
53.	The Chinese General Chamber of Commerce	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/13-14(07))
54.	Youth Committee of Professional Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • criticized the Administration for submitting the funding proposals for landfill extension and IWFM Phase 1 to the Panel as a package as each proposal should be considered separately on its own merits; • due to poor urban planning, residential developments in TKO were very close to the SENT Landfill. Local residents had been affected by the environmental problems caused by landfill operation over the years; and • TKO residents had already had their fair share in accommodating the SENT Landfill in the past years and hence, consideration should not be given to its further extension
Session 3		
55.	Living Cheung Chau	presentation of views as set out in submissions (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1109/13-14(12), CB(1)1132/13-14(08)) and CB(1)1187/13-14(03))
56.	將軍澳中心 57 地段業委會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more efforts should be made to promote waste separation and recycling, in particular food waste, to reduce reliance on landfill; and • the Administration should closely communicate with the local communities to help the general public to participate in waste separation
57.	李太	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • being a TKO resident, she and other TKO residents had been affected by the environmental problems caused by the operation of the SENT Landfill over the years; and • given the scarce land resources in Hong Kong, landfill was not a cost-effective solution to address the problem of waste disposal
58.	World Green Organisation	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(13))
59.	Mr Mark PARLETT	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1156/13-14(07))
60.	New People's Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • while the Administration should implement mandatory waste separation at source, landfills and waste-to-energy facilities were indispensable in handling unrecyclable waste; • supported in principle the proposal for landfill extension; • the Administration should provide betterment measures to

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<p>residents living in the vicinity of waste management facilities; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • since the whole territory of Hong Kong should fairly share out waste management responsibilities, the funding proposals for extending the three strategic landfills should be considered as a package
61.	離島長洲街坊事務委員會	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/13-14(09))
62.	Mr TSOI Yiu-cheong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Administration had failed to make concrete achievements in waste management and show its commitment to step up waste recovery and recycling; and • the Administration should proactively address affected residents' concerns about the environmental nuisances caused by the waste management facilities in their vicinities
63.	Ms HO Hang-mui	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Administration should implement mandatory waste separation at source; • the Administration should provide assistance to the recycling industry in the collection and recycling of recyclable materials which were of lower market values; • only non-recyclable waste should be landfilled or incinerated; and • the three strategic landfills should fairly share out the burden of waste disposal
64.	Ms CHAN Shu-ying	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/13-14(10))
65.	Dr CHUNG Shan-shan Assistant Professor Department of Biology Hong Kong Baptist University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • landfill was an ultimate part of the waste management chain. Despite strenuous efforts to reduce waste, there would still be non-recyclable waste which had to be disposed of at landfills; • the Administration should take effective measures to minimize the potential environmental impacts of landfill operation on nearby residents; and • supported the funding proposal for IWMF Phase 1
66.	Professor Irene LO Professor Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the moving grate incineration technology as proposed by the Administration for IWMF Phase 1 remained to be the mainstream MSW treatment technology which was safe and reliable. The plasma gasification technology and the gasification and pyrolysis technologies were not yet mature and not suitable

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
	The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	<p>for use in large-scale treatment of MSW;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • landfill should be considered as the last resort of waste management and only for the disposal of non-recyclable waste. There was a need to extend landfills to provide adequate disposal outlets before the commissioning of IWMF Phase 1 in 2021-2022; • the Administration should review from time to time the remaining landfill capacity and scale down landfill extension when different waste reduction measures were carried out effectively; • the Administration should expedite the development of recreational facilities at restored landfills and the implementation of MSW charging and different PRSs; and • the Administration would work out the operation of the Recycling Fund to support the recycling industry
67.	NT Concern Group	presentation of views as set out in submissions (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1109/13-14(16) and CB(1)1187/13-14(03))
68.	新圍村關注組	presentation of views as set out in joint submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1187/13-14(03))
69.	蕭志華先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the odour nuisances associated with the operation of the West New Territories ("WENT") Landfill had been affecting Tuen Mun residents; and • being a Tuen Mun resident, he urged for the permanent closure of the WENT Landfill
70.	新墟村關注組	presentation of views as set out in joint submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1187/13-14(03))
71.	Mr TANG Tak-sum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not only had the Government reneged on its promise of closing landfills, but it had now sought to further extend landfills; • urged for the permanent closure of the WENT Landfill; • the way forward for waste management should be increasing waste recycling and recovery instead of landfill extensions and development of waste infrastructures; and • the Administration should from time to time review different incineration technologies given the rapid advancement of technology

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
72.	Mr LUK Ping-choi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • objected to the extension of the SENT Landfill as TKO residents had been seriously affected by the environmental nuisances arising from the operation of the SENT Landfill for many years; • the large number of RCVs and dump trucks delivering waste to the SENT Landfill had given rise to traffic congestion as well as noise and odour nuisances; and • urged for the permanent closure of the SENT Landfill
73.	Hang Hau Resident's Right Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • being a TKO resident, he objected to the extension of the SENT Landfill; • while the Administration sought to extend landfills and develop waste-to-energy facilities, it should put in place a holistic waste management plan and implement effective nuisance abatement measures to address affected residents' environmental concerns; • the Administration should provide adequate assistance to the recycling industry in the collection and recycling of recyclable materials; and • the Administration should promote waste separation at source and expedite the implementation of different PRSs to enhance waste recycling
74.	Lohas Park Resident's Right Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SENT Landfill was close to residential buildings and TKO residents had been affected by the environmental problems caused by landfill operation over the years; • expressed concern about the problems of odour, air pollution, environmental hygiene, dust and transport caused by the operation of the landfills; and • criticized the Administration for neglecting the views and concerns of TKO residents
75.	Alliance for Promoting Sustainable Waste Management for Hong Kong	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(17))
76.	Mr CHEUNG Pui-chuen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Administration had failed to make concrete achievements in waste management; • the Administration should expedite the implementation of MSW charging and different PRSs to enhance waste recycling; • Hong Kong lagged behind many other cities in waste management and the over-reliance on landfill for waste disposal

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<p>was undesirable; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more efforts should be made to promote waste separation and recycling
Session 4		
77.	Cheung Chau Development Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • considered it not practicable to follow overseas experience to incorporate social, recreational and educational facilities (e.g. heated dipping pool) in IWMF Phase 1 as the latter was situated far away from residential areas. Rather, the Administration should provide such community amenities in Cheung Chau for public enjoyment; • transportation between Cheung Chau and Hong Kong Island should be improved; and • the Administration should provide betterment measures (e.g. transportation subsidies) to Cheung Chau residents when IWMF Phase 1 commissioned
78.	Dutch Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(18))
79.	Ms KWOK Man-yi	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1156/13-14(08))
80.	Swedish Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(19))
81.	Hong Kong Climate Change Forum	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(20))
82.	Mrs Jane HOUNG	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1156/13-14(09))
83.	Chun Wo Construction and Engineering Co Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as it took time to drive behavioural change in waste reduction, there was a pressing need to extend the three existing landfills and develop a modern waste-to-energy facility to treat MSW; and • urged for the early implementation of the landfill extension projects and development of IWMF Phase 1
84.	Hong Kong Waste Management Association	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1156/13-14(10))

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
85.	Environmental Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • given the waste problem in Hong Kong, there would be no other alternative but to extend the landfills; and • the Administration should show its commitment to step up waste recovery and recycling, thereby reducing the reliance on landfill for waste disposal
86.	LOHAS Cheung Chau Environmental Education Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Administration should promote the development of the recycling industry; and • Shek Kwu Chau was not a suitable location for the development of IWMF Phase 1 as it was located in close proximity to Cheung Chau
87.	Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the waste problem in Hong Kong was imminent and the city would be surrounded by waste if the proposals for landfill extension and the development of IWMF Phase 1 were not approved; • waste management facilities (including landfills and incinerators) were indispensable in treating unavoidable waste; and • the Administration should implement mitigation measures to address the environmental nuisances arising from the operation of the three strategic landfills and provide betterment measures to residents affected by the operation of waste management facilities
88.	文貴旗先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • objected to landfill extension; • the three existing landfills had been extended time and again, and the natural environment of the New Territories was affected as a result; and • the incident of leachate leakage from the North East New Territories ("NENT") Landfill in July 2013 had undermined people's confidence in the safety operation of landfills
89.	Mr MAN Kai-kwong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fly-tipping of waste along the side streets to the NENT Landfill had given rise to odour which had been affecting residents in the neighbourhood; • the Administration had formulated waste management strategies over the past decades but in vain; and • there were many recyclables such as glass bottles being disposed of at landfills

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
90.	Mr MAN Chung-hing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • objected to landfill extension and the development of IWMF Phase 1 • given that waste separation at source was not widely practised in Hong Kong, adopting incineration for waste treatment might not be as cost-effective as European countries as the latter had comprehensive systems to facilitate source separation of waste and broaden the types of recyclables to be recovered; and • the Administration should consider adopting the plasma gasification technology for IWMF Phase 1
91.	The Conservancy Association	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(21))
92.	梁太	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the large number of RCVs and dump trucks travelling to and from the SENT Landfill had given rise to odour nuisances which had been affecting nearby residents for years; and • being a TKO resident, she urged for the early closure of the SENT Landfill
93.	Neo Democrats	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(22))
94.	Green.Recycling	presentation of views as set out in submissions (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1109/13-14(23), CB(1)1141/13-14(03) and CB(1)1156/13-14(11))
95.	Ms Leonie CHAN	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1156/13-14(12))
96.	Hong Kong Construction Association Young Members Society	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1156/13-14(13))
97.	Ms SHUM Ka-yee	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1156/13-14(14))
98.	Mr FANG Hei-chun	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1141/13-14(04))
99.	Living Islands Movement	presentation of views as set out in submissions (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)974/13-14(01) and CB(1)1132/13-14(11))
100.	Integrated Waste Management Action Group	presentation of views as set out in submissions (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1109/13-14(24), CB(1)1156/13-14(18) and CB(1)1179/13-14(02))

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
101.	The Hong Kong Association of Property Management Companies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported in principle the proposals for landfill extension and the development of IWMF Phase 1 in Shek Kwu Chau; • the Administration should oversee the operation of IWMF Phase 1 and adopt advanced incineration technologies to alleviate the grave concerns of nearby residents over the possible adverse impacts of the facility; • the Administration should closely monitor the effectiveness of the mitigation measures implemented to address the environmental nuisances of the SENT Landfill; and • the Administration should step up waste recovery and enhance public education to promote waste reduction at source, and expedite the subsidy scheme to assist the waste collection trade to retrofit their RCVs with metallic tailgates and waste water sump tanks to enhance their environmental performance. It should also draw up traffic diversion plan to reduce the traffic nuisance caused by RCVs travelling on roads
Session 5		
102.	蘇女士	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • objected to the extension of the SENT Landfill; • due to poor urban planning, residential developments in TKO were very close to the SENT Landfill; and • the air pollution and odour nuisances associated with the operation of the SENT Landfill had been disturbing TKO residents for years
103.	謝先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • objected to the extension of the SENT Landfill; • the control measures implemented by the Administration to mitigate the environmental problems of the SENT Landfill were ineffective; • TKO residents had been affected by the odour nuisances of the SENT Landfill; and • the large number of RCVs and dump trucks delivering waste to the SENT Landfill had given rise to air pollution
104.	謝太	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • objected to the extension of the SENT Landfill; • more effort should be made to reduce waste at source and support the recycling industry; • the air pollution, traffic congestion, as well as the noise and odour nuisances associated with the operation of the SENT Landfill had been disturbing nearby residents for years; and

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> urged for the permanent closure of the SENT Landfill
105.	Mr Christopher LAW	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(25))
106.	Cheung Chau Rural Committee	presentation of views as set out in submissions (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1156/13-14(15) and CB(1)1187/13-14(03))
107.	Mr CHO Chau-ming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> objected to the development of IWMF Phase 1 which might have negative impacts on marine ecology and emit toxic pollutants affecting public health; Shek Kwu Chau was not a desirable location for IWMF Phase 1 as it was located very close to Cheung Chau; more effort should be made to separate waste at source; and incinerators should be built in the existing landfills to handle the waste collected in their catchment areas
108.	Mr NG Man-kit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> objected to the development of IWMF Phase 1 which might have negative impacts on marine ecology and emit toxic pollutants affecting public health; and Shek Kwu Chau was not a desirable location for IWMF Phase 1 as it was located very close to Cheung Chau
109.	Ms Amanda Whitmore SNOW	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(26))
110.	Hong Kong Outdoors	presentation of views as set out in submissions (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1132/13-14(12) and CB(1)1187/13-14(03))
111.	The Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management Hong Kong	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1109/13-14(27))
112.	Ms LEE Kwai-chun	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> objected to the development of IWMF Phase 1 which might emit toxic pollutants affecting public health; more scientific and medical proof should be provided to allay public worries about the safety of IWMF Phase 1; and more effort should be made to separate waste at source
113.	Mr Tom HOPE	presentation of views as set out in submissions (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1109/13-14(28) and CB(1)1156/13-14(16))

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
114.	趙微珠女士	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • expressed concern that IWMF Phase 1 might emit toxic pollutants affecting public health; • objected the extension of the WENT Landfill; and • the Administration should consider adopting the plasma gasification technology for IWMF Phase 1
115.	Range Study Centre	presentation of views as set out in joint submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1187/13-14(03))
116.	單太	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • objected to the extension of the SENT Landfill; • due to poor urban planning, residential developments in TKO were very close to the SENT Landfill; • the air pollution, traffic congestion, as well as the noise and odour nuisances associated with the operation of the SENT Landfill had been disturbing nearby residents for years; and • urged for the permanent closure of the SENT Landfill
117.	長洲大新街街坊會	presentation of views as set out in joint submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1187/13-14(03))
118.	香港漁民互助社(長洲辦事處)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • objected to the development of IWMF Phase 1 as it might have negative impacts on fisheries resources and the fisheries industry; • the waters in the vicinity of IWMF Phase 1 were a fishing ground for Cheung Chau fishermen; and • the Administration had all along failed to provide sufficient support to fishermen over the years, rendering it difficult for them to survive and sustain the development of the fisheries industry
119.	Cheung Chau Pak She Kai Fong Association	presentation of views as set out in submissions (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1132/13-14(13) and CB(1)1187/13-14(03))