

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. ESC137/15-16

(These minutes have been  
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/3/2

**Establishment Subcommittee of the Finance Committee**

**Minutes of the 18<sup>th</sup> meeting**  
**held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**  
**on Tuesday, 14 June 2016, at 2:30 pm**

**Members present:**

Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS (Deputy Chairman)

Hon James TO Kun-sun

Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP

Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung

Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP

Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP

Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH

Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP

Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP

Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP

Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP

Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC

Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung

Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip

Hon NG Leung-sing, SBS, JP

Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS

Hon WU Chi-wai, MH

Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS

Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP

Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP

Hon CHAN Chi-chuen

Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP

Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok

Hon Kenneth LEUNG

Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP

Hon KWOK Wai-keung

Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon IP Kin-yuen  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP  
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP  
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH  
Hon TANG Ka-piu, JP  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan  
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alvin YEUNG Ngok-kiu

**Member attending:**

Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP

**Members absent:**

Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP

**Public Officers attending:**

Ms Esther LEUNG, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)1
Mr Eddie MAK Tak-wai, JP	Deputy Secretary for the Civil Service (1)
Mr HON Chi-keung, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Mr CHAN Chi-ming, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Works)2
Mr Daniel CHUNG, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP	Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms Amy CHEUNG	Assistant Director of Planning (Territorial)

**Clerk in attendance:**

Ms Connie SZETO

Chief Council Secretary (1)4

**Staff in attendance:**

Mr Jason KONG

Council Secretary (1)4

Ms Alice CHEUNG

Senior Legislative Assistant (1)1

Ms Haley CHEUNG

Legislative Assistant (1)9

Miss Yannes HO

Legislative Assistant (1)6

---

Action

The Deputy Chairman drew members' attention to the information paper ECI(2016-17)5, which set out the latest changes in the directorate establishment approved since 2002 and the changes to the directorate establishment in relation to the eight items on the agenda. He then reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP"), they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interest relating to the funding proposals under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the items. He also drew members' attention to RoP 84 on voting in case of direct pecuniary interest.

**EC(2016-17)11      Proposed creation of four supernumerary posts of one Principal Government Engineer (D3), one Government Town Planner (D2) and two Chief Engineers (D1) in the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) to lead a new Lantau Development Office (LDO) up to 31 March 2021; and redeployment of three D3, five D2 and 13 D1 directorate posts within CEDD arising from the establishment of LDO and re-organisation of the existing Development Offices in CEDD with immediate effect upon approval by the Finance Committee**

2.      The Deputy Chairman advised that the Administration's proposal was to create four supernumerary directorate posts in the Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CEDD") to lead the Lantau Development Office ("LDO"), and redeploy 21 directorate posts within CEDD arising from the establishment of LDO and reorganization of the existing Development Offices. He pointed out that discussion of the item was carried over from the

meeting on 8 June 2016.

### Declaration of interests

3. Mr Albert CHAN declared that he was a resident of Lantau. Mr SIN Chung-kai declared that he owned land in Lantau.

### Justifications for setting up the Lantau Development Office and reorganizing Development Offices

4. Mr WU Chi-wai questioned the necessity to set up LDO for implementing the Lantau development initiatives and reorganize the existing Development Offices. He enquired about the functions of LDO and the division of work between the Office and other bureaux and departments, including whether the proposed Office would be responsible for all development projects and transport planning of Lantau. He found it an unreasonable arrangement for LDO to take up policy research and inter-bureau/department coordination. He suggested strengthening the manpower of the Hong Kong Island and Islands Development Office to take forward the Lantau development projects.

5. Permanent Secretary for Development (Works) ("PS(W)") explained that Lantau development was a large-scale programme covering development projects currently under study and taken forward by the Development Bureau ("DEVB") and other departments. To better coordinate Lantau development, the Government considered it necessary to set up a dedicated and multidisciplinary LDO under CEDD so that professionals from the engineering, planning, architecture, surveying and other disciplines could work more closely together and take forward the development projects more effectively. The arrangement of setting up the proposed LDO was similar to the past practice of setting up dedicated regional Development Offices for the development of new towns. He clarified that LDO would not replace the functions of other bureaux and departments. For instance, DEVB would continue to take the lead in policy study and coordination of Lantau development, whereas LDO would be responsible for planning, studying, designing and taking forward various development projects. Moreover, LDO would conduct studies on the overall traffic and transport for various developments in Lantau, but the detailed planning and management for the traffic in individual areas would remain to be the responsibility of the Transport and Housing Bureau and the Transport Department. Given the heavy workload associated with the implementation of the Lantau development initiatives, the Government considered it impracticable to take forward Lantau development only by strengthening the manpower of the Hong Kong Island and Islands Development Office.

6. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired whether entrusting LDO with all development projects in Lantau and other outlying islands would significantly reduce the workload of the Hong Kong Island and Islands Development Office and lead to uneven distribution of workload. He asked the Administration to elaborate on this proposed arrangement.

7. Director of Civil Engineering and Development ("DCED") explained that several Development Offices were under heavy pressure due to substantial increase in workload arising from the commencement of various major projects in different districts in recent years. The proposed LDO would be responsible for the development projects and related administrative work in Lantau and other outlying islands. CEDD also took the opportunity to review the workload and the geographical boundaries of various Development Offices to achieve better distribution of work. The Government proposed to re-demarcate the geographical boundaries and redistribute the duties and responsibilities of the New Territories West, New Territories East, Kowloon, and Hong Kong Island and Islands Development Offices, and to rename the four Development Offices as North, East, South and West Development Offices. The reorganization would achieve a more even and reasonable distribution of workload among Development Offices.

8. Mr Albert CHAN pointed out that when the New Airport Projects Co-ordination Office was established in the past to implement the Hong Kong Airport Core Programme, thorough studies had already been conducted on relevant projects. In contrast, Lantau development was still an initial idea, he hence considered it unreasonable to set up LDO at the present stage. In response, PS(W) remarked that the New Airport Projects Co-ordination Office and LDO functioned differently and were incomparable.

9. Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong ("DAB") supported the establishment proposal. He agreed that the Administration should set up a dedicated office to study the future development of Lantau in an integrated manner and to better address the current planning problems. He appealed to members to support the Administration's proposal.

10. Miss CHAN Yuen-han and Miss Alice MAK expressed support for the Administration's proposal. Miss CHAN opined that a dedicated LDO would facilitate more efficient coordination among various bureaux and departments. Miss MAK enquired whether the setting up of LDO would expedite the resolution of the current planning problems of Lantau in meeting residents' needs.

11. Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands), Civil Engineering and Development Department ("PM(HKI&I)") responded that the Government

noted that the transport facilities and infrastructural development of some remote areas in Lantau were lagging behind. Upon the establishment of LDO, there would be a dedicated team to examine the needs of residents living in the rural areas of Lantau and take forward relevant projects (such as sewerage works) to improve their living conditions.

#### Scale of Lantau development and environmental implications

12. Mr Albert CHAN was gravely concerned that the large-scale development of Lantau would cause severe damage to the environment (including country parks and Coastal Protection Areas). He referred to the case of dumping of construction waste in Pui O and criticized the Administration for ineffective monitoring. He said that the Administration had failed in convincing the public that it could properly protect the natural environment in Lantau in taking forward Lantau development.

13. PS(W) said that equal emphasis would be placed on development and conservation in Lantau development. The work report of the Lantau Development Advisory Committee ("LanDAC") had clearly indicated that the most part of Lantau would be used for conservation, leisure, and cultural and green tourism. The Government had noted the situation of soil fill in the habitat of water buffaloes in Pui O, and would look into the matter and take follow-up actions proactively.

14. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr TANG Ka-piu pointed out that in the early 1990s, the Government had planned to develop North Lantau New Town ("NLNT") into a community that would accommodate a population of over 300 000. However, the Government later substantially reduced the planned population of that new town, which brought about a halt in its development. At present, the population of Tung Chung was only about 80 000, and Tung Chung faced problems such as inconvenient transport, inadequate community facilities and high unemployment rates. As the Administration now proposed developing Lantau into an area that would accommodate a population of one million, Mr LEUNG and Mr CHAN considered the plan over ambitious. They were concerned that the Administration would repeat the same mistake of NLNT and create planning problems. They suggested that instead of implementing a large-scale development programme, the Administration should expeditiously resolve the current problems of Lantau in response to the aspirations of the community. Moreover, Mr CHAN expressed dissatisfaction that the Administration had all along neither released the data of the Noise Exposure Forecast 25 contour collected over the years, nor given an account to the public that the development of NLNT had come to a halt due to higher-than-expected aircraft noise. Mr TANG opined that the Tung Chung New Town Extension ("TCNTE") for increasing the population of Tung Chung and strengthening

community services was long overdue.

15. PS(W) responded that the Government had proposed a phased development of NLNT (including Tung Chung and Tai Ho area) when the North Lantau Development Study was conducted in 1990. Subsequently, the Government had reviewed the overall planning of Lantau in 2004 and 2007 and released a Concept Plan for Lantau and a Revised Concept Plan for Lantau respectively, under which the sustainable development of NLNT was incorporated. Therefore, the planning and development of the new town concerned had not come to a halt. At present, the Tung Chung New Town ("TCNT") had a population of about 80 000 and its existing infrastructural facilities, which were able to support a population of about 120 000, were sufficient to cope with the short-term population growth. There was no shortage of employment opportunities in TCNT. The Government would introduce initiatives to encourage Tung Chung residents to work in their living districts in order to reduce the burden on the public transport systems arising from cross-district commute. Recently, the Finance Committee ("FC") had approved funding for the Government to undertake detailed design and site investigation works for TCNTE. Upon completion of the proposed extension programme, the population capacity of TCNT would be increased to about 270 000. PS(W) explained that developing Lantau into a district capable of accommodating a population of one million was a long-term development concept and was just an initial idea at the current stage. The relevant population figure was only an estimated maximum capacity based on the assumption that all proposed development projects (including the East Lantau Metropolis) would be taken forward.

16. Dr Fernando CHEUNG pointed out that, as he understood from the Hong Kong Population Projections 2015-2064 published by the Census and Statistics Department, the projected population growth in Hong Kong from 2015 to 2064 would be under 600 000. The ambitious plan of developing Lantau into a district capable of accommodating a population of one million was apparently at variance with the projection of territory-wide population growth. He enquired about the criteria of population projection with regard to the planning for Lantau.

17. Miss CHAN Yuen-han expressed reservation about the proposal of constructing and developing artificial islands in the central waters and developing them into a new metropolis capable of accommodating a population of several hundred thousand.

18. In reply, PS(W) said that the average number of members per household in Hong Kong had registered a continuous decrease, and the number of households was projected to increase by about 500 000 by 2044. As such, Hong Kong required a large quantity of residential sites to meet the

housing needs and address the current problem of small living space per capita. The proposal of constructing artificial islands in the central waters was one of the options to resolve the problem of insufficient land supply. Even if the project was proven feasible by detailed studies on various fronts, it was estimated that the project would not be taken forward until after 2030. In implementing the project, the Government would closely monitor impact of the project on the ecosystem, shipping routes, etc., with a view to addressing public concern.

#### Transport and community facilities in Lantau

19. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Mr Albert CHAN pointed out that there had been a sizeable growth in the number of visitors to Lantau in recent years, and several ongoing works projects had also brought forth many construction workers. However, bus services in Lantau were grossly inadequate, seriously affecting the daily commuting of residents. They were dissatisfied that the Administration had ignored the aspiration of residents and failed to implement appropriate remedial measures promptly to improve bus frequencies. They were concerned that a large-scale development of Lantau would further aggravate the traffic problem in the area. Mr LEUNG enquired about the details of "improvement works at Mui Wo, Tai O and Ma Wan Chung" mentioned in paragraph 10(g) of the paper. Ms Emily LAU asked whether the Administration was well-versed with the traffic problems of Lantau and what solutions were in place.

20. Mr CHAN Han-pan expressed support for setting up the proposed LDO. He asked whether the Administration would consider building a light rail system to enhance the connectivity between Tung Chung and the Airport Island with a view to promoting same-district employment of Tung Chung residents. He also enquired how the Administration would improve transport facilities in the remote areas of Lantau. Mr TANG Ka-piu asked whether consideration would be given to constructing a "north-south access" in Lantau to improve traffic conditions.

21. PS(W) said that the Government was aware of the traffic problems in Lantau, including inadequacies of the existing bus services and connectivity to north Lantau, which caused inconvenience to residents and visitors and hindered Lantau residents from seeking employment on the Airport Island. The Government would implement various short, medium and long-term initiatives to improve transport in Lantau. On short-term initiatives, the Transport Department had already rationalized some public bus routes in Lantau to shorten travelling time. On long-term initiatives, the North Commercial District on the Airport Island and the Topside Commercial Development on the Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities ("HKBCF") Island of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge under planning would create

ample employment opportunities. The Administration would study transport facilities connecting Tung Chung, the Airport Island and the HKBCF Island to facilitate employment. The Government was also studying the feasibility of building a light rail system on the HKBCF Island. The proposed LDO would undertake an overall traffic and transport study for the developments in Lantau. Paragraph 10(j) of the Government's paper had set out this duty. He emphasized that it was necessary for the Government to have a dedicated office to conduct a comprehensive review on the transport planning of Lantau, collect relevant data, and analyze the merits and demerits of various development proposals.

22. PS(W), Deputy Secretary for Development (Works)2 ("DS(W)2") and PM(HKI&I) added that the Government had undertaken pre-construction preparatory work for a number of district works projects (including improvement works at Mui Wo, Tai O and Ma Wan Chung). The existing Tai O bus terminus and public car park were co-located in a small area crowded with public buses, coaches and other vehicles. With a very narrow entrance to this small area, the place was often overcrowded during weekends and public holidays. To address the problem, the Government was implementing "Improvement works at Tai O, Phase 2 Stage 1", which included construction of a public transport terminus and provision of additional parking spaces. The project had been submitted to the Public Works Subcommittee for consideration. The improvement works would be conducive to improving bus frequencies. The Government would also discuss with bus operators ways to enhance services.

23. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung asked about the timeframe for completing the overall traffic and transport study for the developments in Lantau. He was concerned whether the setting up of LDO would result in delay in implementing other transport improvement measures in the pipeline. In response, PS(W) said that a detailed timetable for the aforesaid study was not yet available. The Government expected that the blueprint for the overall development of Lantau could be introduced by the end of 2016, which would include the implementation timetable for transport planning of Lantau. Meanwhile, the Government would also implement various transport improvement measures in a timely manner.

24. Mr TANG Ka-Piu and Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed concern about the inadequate community and welfare facilities in TCNT. Dr CHEUNG was worried that preference would be given to commercial and tourism infrastructures in Lantau Development, thus aggravating the problem of inadequate community facilities. He enquired whether amendments would be introduced to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines with a view to improving the planning of public services. Mr TANG asked whether the Administration would undertake to build new railway stations and public

markets in Tung Chung when developing Lantau.

25. Assistant Director of Planning (Territorial) ("ADP(T)") responded that planning for community facilities was in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines having regard to population growth and density in individual areas. PS(W) pointed out that the Government would review the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines from time to time to ensure that the Planning Standards kept up with the times. DS(W)2 said that LanDAC had conducted in-depth studies into the situation of social development in Lantau and had come up with the following findings and recommendations: (a) unemployment rate of Islands District was 3.1% in 2013, which was lower than Hong Kong's overall unemployment rate (3.4%); (b) community services and facilities in all major areas of Lantau were generally in good condition; for instance, after the North Lantau Hospital had commenced operation, there had been a noticeable improvement in the supply of healthcare services in the district; (c) provision of more diversified education services was recommended to attract families with children to live in Lantau; (d) provision of professional training and educational facilities was recommended to tie in with the economic development of Lantau; and (e) the development strategy for Lantau should cater for the needs of rural and remote areas in Lantau. The Government would study the above recommendations in detail.

26. DCED added that the funding proposal for the TCNTE project had been submitted to FC earlier on. The Recommended Outline Development Plan enclosed in the proposal had already included the construction of the Tung Chung East Railway Station and the Tung Chung West Railway Station. CEDD was discussing with other relevant departments the arrangements for finalizing the two railway stations. Moreover, at the FC meeting where the said funding proposal was discussed, the Government had explained to Members that new public and private markets would be provided in the extension area of Tung Chung.

### Public engagement

27. Dr Fernando CHEUNG pointed out that the Administration had displayed a model to the Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress and briefed him on the preliminary major proposals of Lantau development. He enquired about the details of displaying the model to the public, including how the public could view the actual model on-site, and, with regard to online display, the relevant website and the format of the display (whether it would be displayed in a two-dimensional or three-dimensional format). He urged the Administration to increase the transparency of the Lantau development programme. Mr Albert CHAN also requested the Administration to display the model to the public as soon as

possible.

28. PS(W) said that the aforesaid model contained the same information as that of the public engagement digest of Lantau development released by the Government earlier on. Photos of the model had been uploaded to the website of "Lantau Space for All" for public viewing. The model was now kept by CEDD. Members of the public and Legislative Council Members could make appointment with CEDD to view the model.

29. The Deputy Chairman requested the Administration to provide supplementary information to elaborate the arrangements for public display of the model.

*[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information submitted by the Administration was circulated to members on 20 June 2016, vide LC Paper No. ESC123/15-16(01).]*

30. Mr Alvin YEUNG said that the Civic Party did not object to developing Lantau, but was concerned whether there was thorough public engagement before implementation of the project. He urged the Administration to consider carefully the views of stakeholders (particularly opposing views), and asked about the principles and vision on which the preliminary major proposals of Lantau development were based, and whether relevant environmental impact assessments had been undertaken before the Administration introduced the proposals.

31. In response, PS(W) pointed out that the work report of LanDAC had already set out the vision, strategic positioning and planning principles of Lantau development. The proposals in the report were preliminary in nature. The Government did not have any predetermined views with regard to the future planning direction of Lantau. The Government had conducted a three-month public consultation from January to April 2016, during which three public forums and 30 consultation sessions were organized to extensively collect the views of the public and stakeholders from various sectors (including the Legislative Council, District Councils, Town Planning Board, Heung Yee Kuk and Rural Committees, industries, professional bodies, green groups, fisheries organizations, community organizations, etc.) on the proposed development strategy. A 95-day roving exhibition was organized covering 16 places. The Government also received over 20 000 written submissions, the majority of which agreed with the overall direction of Lantau development. Some respondents also expressed views on conservation. The Government would consider the views of all parties carefully.

32. Mr Albert CHAN queried the credibility of the public consultation sessions. He noticed that most of the attendees were representatives of the

engineering sector and business sector, while residents and representatives of green groups who were opposed to the development programme were denied participation. PS(W) clarified that all consultation sessions were open to the public without screening. Given that the consultation exercise had been well-received, the Government had scheduled an additional consultation session so that the views of different stakeholders would be taken into account as far as possible.

*(At 4:30 pm, the Deputy Chairman ordered that the meeting be suspended for a break. The meeting was resumed at 4:40 pm.)*

33. At 4:40 pm, the Deputy Chairman remarked that discussion on the item had lasted for more than two hours, and many members had repeated their questions. He instructed that each member could ask questions for the last round. Dr Kenneth CHAN and Dr Fernando CHEUNG objected to this arrangement. They said that as a number of committees were holding meetings concurrently in the afternoon, members were unable to attend all those meetings. Therefore, some members had yet to raise their questions. They opined that those members should be allowed sufficient time to ask questions.

#### Balance between development and conservation

34. Dr Kenneth CHAN disagreed with the rationale behind Lantau development. He was gravely concerned that the Administration would tilt towards economic development at the expense of conservation, and might even develop the country parks in Lantau. He requested the Administration to give an undertaking that in developing Lantau, no changes would be made on the land use of country parks. He also proposed setting up a separate office dedicated to the conservation of Lantau as a check-and-balance measure, with a view to preventing excessive damage to the environment caused by Lantau development.

35. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen also pointed out that the public in general were concerned that a large-scale development of Lantau would accelerate damage to the ecosystem. He opined that the Administration should implement the Lantau development projects one by one to facilitate more thorough public discussions on individual projects.

36. PS(W) reiterated that the work report of LanDAC had stated clearly that equal emphasis would be placed on development and conservation in the planning of Lantau development. The work report had come up with many recommendations relating to conservation, such as the focus on eco-conservation in respect of the planning concept for south Lantau. He remarked that sound legislation was in place to protect the existing country

parks. No developments could be taken forward in country parks unless approval had been given through a stringent mechanism, and the community had yet to reach a consensus in the development of country parks. He found it inappropriate to establish a separate office outside LDO dedicated to conservation work, as that would result in a cumbersome organizational structure and overlap of duties.

37. Mr TAM Yiu-chung expressed support for the setting up of LDO to undertake studies and planning of various development projects. He pointed out that the development of TCNT was slower than expected. Many residents aspired to expeditious expansion of Tung Chung which could promote the economic development of the area and provide more employment opportunities there. According to his observation, there was still much room for improvement in the current planning for Tung Chung, such as the provision of transport facilities. He urged the Administration to review the planning problems of TCNT, and maintain a balance between development and conservation in implementing the Lantau development projects.

Motion on adjournment of discussion on item EC(2016-17)11

38. At 5:03 pm, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung moved a question under paragraph 32 of the Establishment Subcommittee ("ESC") Procedure that discussion on item EC(2016-17)11 be now adjourned. The Deputy Chairman thereupon proposed the question that discussion on the item EC(2016-17)11 be now adjourned. He directed that members could speak once for not more than three minutes on the motion.

39. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung introduced his motion. He opined that the Administration should examine whether there were any mistakes in the early planning of TCNT, and resolve the current problems (such as inadequate community facilities) of Lantau as soon as possible in order to address members' concerns. Moreover, he considered that Tung Chung should be made the core of the future development of Lantau. Under this premise, it was not necessary to set up LDO at the present stage.

40. Dr Kenneth CHAN, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Alan LEONG, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Mr Albert CHAN spoke in support of the motion. Mr WU said that the Democratic Party supported the motion. The views and suggestions of the above members were as follows: (a) the Administration had failed to convince the public that it was able to balance development and conservation in implementing the Lantau development programme and monitor construction projects effectively to ensure that the environment would not be severely damaged by those projects; (b) given the lack of a consensus on the Lantau development programme in the community, the Administration should refrain

from setting up LDO at the present stage; (c) as there were fewer public controversies surrounding the developments in the northern part of Lantau, focus should be given on the implementation of those projects; (d) the Administration should take forward the recommendations of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Hong Kong as soon as possible; and (e) the Subcommittee should accord priority to dealing with establishment proposals that were less controversial and more pressing.

41. Mr CHAN Kam-lam and Mr YIU Si-wing spoke against the motion. Mr YIU held that the Administration had endeavoured to listen to the views of stakeholders. He pointed out that as Tung Chung was under-populated, there were a large number of job vacancies on the Airport Island. There was an urgent need for the Government to develop Lantau in order to promote economic growth and improve the living conditions in Lantau.

42. At the invitation of the Deputy Chairman, PS(W) responded to the motion moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung. He reiterated that equal emphasis would be placed on development and conservation in the Lantau development plan. The work report of LanDAC had clearly indicated that strengthening conservation was an important element in Lantau development, and most areas of Lantau would be used for conservation, leisure, and cultural and green tourism. He believed that good planning could help minimize the impacts of development on the environment. Currently, the work relating to Lantau development was being handled by DEVB and several departments without dedicated leadership at the directorate level, and the workload was continuously increasing. The existing manpower was not sufficient. It was necessary for the Government to set up LDO and create the proposed directorate posts to take forward the development programme in Lantau in a more effective manner. LDO would conduct a study on the appropriate conservation measures for Lantau development, with a view to coming up with specific proposals in the new blueprint for developing Lantau. He also pointed out that the Government had recently completed the public consultation on the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan for Hong Kong. DEVB and the relevant bureaux/departments would continue to examine how to implement the Action Plan.

43. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung spoke in reply on his motion. The Deputy Chairman then put the motion to vote. At the request of Mr Albert CHAN, the Deputy Chairman ordered a division and the division bell rang for five minutes. 13 members voted for, and 19 voted against the motion. The Deputy Chairman declared that the motion was negatived. The votes of individual members were as follows:

Action

*For:*

Mr James TO  
Ms Emily LAU  
Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Mr WU Chi-wai  
Dr Kenneth CHAN  
Mr SIN Chung-kai  
Mr Alvin YEUNG  
(13 members)

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Mr Alan LEONG  
Mr Albert CHAN  
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen  
Dr Fernando CHEUNG  
Dr Helena WONG

*Against:*

Mr CHAN Kam-lam  
Mr WONG Kwok-hing  
Ms Starry LEE  
Mr IP Kwok-him  
Mr YIU Si-wing  
Miss Alice MAK  
Mr Martin LIAO  
Mr TANG Ka-piu  
Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok  
Mr Christopher CHUNG  
(19 members)

Mr TAM Yiu-chung  
Mr WONG Ting-kwong  
Mr CHAN Hak-kan  
Mr NG Leung-sing  
Mr MA Fung-kwok  
Mr Christopher CHEUNG  
Mr POON Siu-ping  
Dr CHIANG Lai-wan  
Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan

*(The Subcommittee continued discussion on EC(2016-17)11.)*

Scale of Lantau development and environmental implications

44. Dr Fernando CHEUNG asked about the total population capacity of all new developing areas under planning across the territory. He once again asked about the criteria of population projection with regard to planning for Lantau. ADP(T) remarked that the population of Hong Kong was projected to increase in the next few decades, and the average number of members per household was declining. The rate of increase was expected to be higher in number of household compared with population growth. Besides, there was public aspiration for larger per capita living space. Hong Kong required a large quantity of land to meet the housing needs. Furthermore, new community facilities and infrastructure as well as economic development would generate huge demand for land. Various new development areas and other development proposals currently under planning mainly served to address the demand for land up to 2030. Therefore, it was necessary for the Government to conduct longer-term planning and study on ways to create more land. The strategic study of developing artificial islands in the central waters was one of the options to meet the long-term development needs.

Action

45. Mr James TO opined that directorate posts in the profession of environmental protection should be created in LDO. The four proposed directorate posts were all in the engineering and planning grades. Holders of those posts might not be knowledgeable in conservation, or they might only focus on mitigation measures for the works projects and overlook the need for proactive and comprehensive conservation strategies.

46. PS(W) responded that, apart from the four proposed directorate posts, a number of non-directorate posts would be created in LDO to support the Lantau development programme. Those newly created posts were mainly professional grade posts, including engineers, architects, quantity surveyors and town planners. Professional grade officers possessed relevant experience and were capable of taking forward conservation initiatives. As the strategy of Lantau development was to place equal emphasis on development and conservation, conservation would not be confined to mitigation measures of individual projects. The aforesaid professional officers would consider the overall conservation strategy carefully in taking forward the Lantau development programme.

47. Mr WU Chi-wai reiterated that the Administration should set up a "North Lantau Development Office" to confine the Lantau development projects to the northern part of Lantau, with a view to addressing public concerns regarding the large-scale development of the southern part of Lantau. In response, PS(W) pointed out that given the need for the Government to adopt a holistic approach for the planning for Lantau, the said suggestion was not appropriate.

Motion on adjournment of further proceedings of the Subcommittee

48. At 5:56 pm, Mr Albert CHAN moved a motion under paragraph 32 of the ESC Procedure that further proceedings of the Subcommittee should then be adjourned. The Deputy Chairman thereupon proposed the question that the meeting be now adjourned. He directed that members could speak once for not more than three minutes on the motion.

49. Mr Albert CHAN introduced his motion. He considered that the Government had not consulted the public thoroughly before putting forward the plan to develop Lantau into an area with a population capacity of one million. Such a practice was not in compliant with general planning procedure, might mislead the public, and was tantamount to transferring interests to the business sector.

50. Mr James TO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Kenneth CHAN, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Mr LEUNG

Action

Kwok-hung spoke in support of the motion. Their views and suggestions were as follows: (a) the establishment of LDO implied that a large-scale development in Lantau would be inevitable, posing great risks to the natural environment of Lantau; (b) it was inappropriate to set up LDO at the present stage, because the new Lantau development concepts had not been thoroughly discussed, and the duties of the proposed LDO were unspecific; (c) with the slowdown in the economic growth of South China, the plan to develop Lantau into a core business district was untimely; and (d) focus should be given on the development of the northern part of Lantau based on the outline of the Revised Concept Plan for Lantau released in 2007, and other areas of Lantau should be left for nature conservation.

51. Mr CHAN Kam-lam and Mr IP Kwok-him spoke against the motion. Mr IP remarked that DAB opposed to the motion. They opined that development invariably would have effects on the environment, but there was an urgent need for new supply of land in Hong Kong to cope with the population growth. Curtailing all developments in the name of conversation was unreasonable. As the majority of the projects under the Lantau development programme were preliminary proposals; in implementing any of the projects in the future, the Administration would certainly consult the public and the relevant committees of the Legislative Council. There would be ample opportunities for members to express their views on the development of Lantau.

52. The Deputy Chairman said that as the meeting of the Subcommittee would soon end as originally scheduled, it was not necessary to put to vote Mr Albert CHAN's motion on adjournment of further proceedings. The Deputy Chairman then informed members that Mr Albert CHAN and Dr Fernando CHEUNG had respectively submitted three and one proposed motions pursuant to paragraph 31A of the ESC Procedure to express views on EC(2016-17)11. The Deputy Chairman said that the Subcommittee would continue to discuss this item at the meeting on 21 June 2016.

53. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:30 pm.