

Panel on Development

List of follow-up actions (Position as at 6 October 2014)

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
1. PWP Item No. 347WF -- Reprovisioning of Harcourt Road fresh water pumping station (Development Bureau)	27 May 2014	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information:</p> <p><u>Justifications for reprovisioning the pumping station</u></p> <p>(a) An extract of the "Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront" ("UDS") report recommending that office development could be proposed for the site currently occupied by the Hong Kong Red Cross Headquarters and the Harcourt Road fresh water pumping station ("the Site") and the relevant justifications;</p> <p>(b) A chronology of events after the publication of the UDS report in 2011</p>	The Administration's response was issued to members on 22 July 2014 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1842/13-14(01).

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>leading to the proposal on the reprovisioning of the Harcourt Road fresh water pumping station at a site near the Central Fire Station on Cotton Tree Drive, including the major decisions made and the works/studies undertaken by the relevant departments;</p> <p>(c) the respective estimated land premiums of the Site at the 2014 price level under the following two circumstances: (i) relocating the Harcourt Road fresh water pumping station to another place; (ii) in-situ reprovisioning of the pumping station;</p> <p><u>Alternative sites</u></p> <p>(d) Alternative sites that had been considered by the Administration for the reprovisioning of the Harcourt Road fresh water pumping station and the pros and cons of each site;</p> <p>(e) Whether the Administration had considered reprovisioning the Harcourt</p>	

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>Road fresh water pumping station in-situ or at a site near the new Central harbourfront, such as the site for the Central Military Dock; if not, the reasons;</p> <p><u>Trees affected by the works</u></p> <p>(f) Of the trees transplanted under previous public works projects, (i) the number of these trees which had survived; (ii) the number of these trees which had died subsequently; and (iii) the successful rate of transplantation;</p> <p>(g) Criteria for considering whether trees affected by construction works should be felled or transplanted;</p> <p>(h) Breakdown of the 118 trees which had to be removed by age and size; and</p> <p><u>Public consultation</u></p> <p>(i) Written records or confirmation from the Central and Western District Council</p>	

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>indicating its support for the proposed works.</p>	
<p>2. PWP Item No. 769CL -- Pilot study on underground space development in selected strategic urban areas (Development Bureau)</p>	<p>27 May 2014</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information in the relevant paper(s) for the Public Works Subcommittee:</p> <p>(a) Respective scope of the territory-wide study commenced in December 2013 for completion in December 2015 on underground space development in the urban areas of Hong Kong and the Pilot Study under PWP Item No. 769CL; and the justifications for conducting two separate studies on underground space development concurrently; and</p> <p>(b) Reasons for selecting the four districts, namely, Tsim Sha Tsui West, Causeway Bay, Happy Valley and Admiralty/Wan Chai, on which there were concerns about the impact of underground space development on the traffic conditions and pedestrian flows, for the Pilot Study.</p>	<p>The requested supplementary information has been included as enclosure 3 to the paper submitted to the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC(2014-15)31).</p>

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
<p>3. Review of policy on the conservation of built heritage, progress report on heritage conservation initiatives and policy relating to preservation of historical remains discovered at works sites (Development Bureau)</p>	<p>24 June 2014</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information, with a breakdown by declared monuments, historic buildings under the "Revitalizing Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme" and other historic buildings under the management of the Antiquities and Monuments Office, for each of the past three years:</p> <p>(a) the expenditure incurred on the repair, maintenance and management of the concerned monuments/historic buildings; and</p> <p>(b) the number of visitors to these places.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued to members on 10 July 2014 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1782/13-14(01).</p>
<p>4. Revision of fees and charges under Mines (Safety) Regulations, Cap. 285B, Dangerous Goods (General) Regulations, Cap. 295B, and Dangerous Goods (Government Explosives Depots) Regulations, Cap.</p>	<p>7 July 2014</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information:</p> <p>(a) the criteria adopted by the Administration for deciding whether a service provided by the Government was "livelihood-related" or "non-livelihood related"; and</p> <p>(b) whether there were any services provided by the Government on which the fees</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued to members on 24 July 2014 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1870/13-14(01).</p>

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
<p>295D under the purview of the Civil Engineering and Development Department</p> <p>Revision of non-livelihood related fees and charges under the purview of the Water Supplies Department (Development Bureau)</p>		<p>charged were not based, or only partly based, on the "user pays" or full-cost recovery principle; if yes, the details, including the principle(s) for determining the charge(s) of such service(s).</p>	
<p>5. PWP Item No. 065TR – Detailed Feasibility Study for Environmentally Friendly Linkage System for Kowloon East (Development Bureau)</p>	<p>16 July 2014</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information:</p> <p>(a) details of the operation, including the annual financial performance for the past three years, of the monorail lines mentioned in the Administration's paper, namely, the Tokyo Monorail, the Osaka Monorail, the Okinawa Monorail and the monorail network in Chongqing; and</p>	<p>Administration's response awaited</p>

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		(b) financial resources to be allocated to the study on each of the potential transport modes, including the monorail, modern tramway, electric buses and travelators, under the proposed detailed feasibility study.	

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
6 October 2014