

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. CB(1)1148/15-16  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/DEV

**Panel on Development**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Tuesday, 26 April 2016, at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS (Chairman)  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP (Deputy  
Chairman)  
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP  
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP  
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok  
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alvin YEUNG Ngok-kiu

**Members absent** : Dr Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP

**Public officers attending** : **Agenda item V**

Miss Cheryl CHOW Ho-kiu  
Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)1  
(Acting)

Mr WONG Wai-man  
Deputy Project Manager (New Territories East)1  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Stephen LI Tin-sang  
Chief Engineer/New Territories East 2  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Tom YIP Chi-kwai  
District Planning Officer (Kowloon)  
Planning Department

**Agenda item VI**

Miss Cheryl CHOW Ho-kiu  
Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)1  
(Acting)

Ms Alice PANG  
Deputy Project Manager (Kowloon)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Ringo MOK Wing-cheong  
Chief Engineer/Kowloon 5  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

**Agenda item VII**

Mr HON Chi-keung, JP  
Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)

Mr CHAN Chi-ming, JP  
Deputy Secretary (Works)<sup>2</sup>  
Development Bureau

Mr Daniel CHUNG Kum-wah, 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 Yi-mei  
Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial  
Planning Department

**Agenda item VIII**

Mr LAI Cheuk-ho  
Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)<sup>5</sup>  
Development Bureau

Mr Bosco CHAN Bun-pui  
Deputy Project Manager (Hong Kong Island &  
Islands)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr MAK Chi-biu  
Chief Engineer/Hong Kong<sup>(1)</sup>  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr SIU Kang-chuen  
Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East  
Transport Department

Mr POON Chi-man  
Principal Transport Officer/New Territories  
Transport Department

**Agenda item IX**

Mr Vincent MAK Shing-cheung  
Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)<sup>3</sup>  
Development Bureau

Mr LEUNG Wing-lim, JP  
Assistant Director/New Works  
Water Supplies Department

Mr CHAU Sai-wai  
Chief Engineer/Development (1)  
Water Supplies Department

Mr CHAN Tak-yeung  
Chief Engineer/Consultants Management (Acting)  
Water Supplies Department

**Clerk in attendance** : Ms Sharon CHUNG  
Chief Council Secretary (1)<sup>2</sup>

**Staff in attendance** : Mr Fred PANG  
Senior Council Secretary (1)<sup>2</sup>

Mr Raymond CHOW  
Senior Council Secretary (1)<sup>6</sup>

Ms Maggie LAU  
Council Secretary (1)<sup>2</sup>

Ms Christina SHIU  
Legislative Assistant (1)<sup>2</sup>

---

Action

- I Confirmation of minutes**  
(LC Paper No. CB(1)812/15-16 —Minutes of meeting on  
26 January 2016)

The minutes of the regular meeting on 26 January 2016 were confirmed.

## **II Information papers issued since the last meeting**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)707/15-16(01) —Administration's paper on action against illegal occupation of Government land and the latest plan for development of a public housing estate in Wang Chau, Yuen Long

LC Paper No. CB(1)725/15-16 (01) —Administration's response to the letter dated 9 March 2016 from Hon LEUNG Che-cheung on the Administration's actions against suspected illegal soil dumps (LC Paper No. CB(1)672/15-16(01))

LC Paper No. CB(1)742/15-16 (01) —Administration's response to the letter dated 3 March 2016 from Hon Alice MAK on the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (LC Paper No. CB(1)648/15-16(01))

LC Paper No. CB(1)769/15-16 (01) —Letter dated 30 March 2016 from six Members on holding a joint-Panel meeting to discuss the issues related to illegal dumping of soil in the New Territories

LC Paper No. CB(1)769/15-16 (02) —The Chairman's reply dated 7 April 2016 to the letter dated 30 March 2016 from six Members on holding a joint-Panel meeting to discuss the issues related to illegal dumping of soil in the New Territories (LC Paper No. CB(1)769/15-16(01))

LC Paper No. CB(1)775/15-16(01) —Administration's response to the letter dated 7 March 2016 from Hon Alan LEONG on the implementation approach for the waterfront promenade

fronting the hotel sites at the runway precinct of Kai Tak Development (LC Paper No. CB(1)663/15-16(01))

LC Paper No. CB(1)806/15-16(01) —Administration's paper on 53WS -- Upgrading of Chai Wan Salt Water Supply System

LC Paper No. CB(1)828/15-16(01) —Letter dated 11 April 2016 from Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT on review of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines)

2. Members noted that the above information papers had been issued since the last meeting.

3. The Chairman advised that Dr Helena WONG, Miss Alice MAK and Dr Elizabeth QUAT had suggested that the Panel should discuss the review of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines ("HKPSG") with the Administration. He sought members' views on the suggestion. He said that the standards and guidelines set out in HKPSG covered a wide and diverse range of land uses and facilities, and it might not be practicable for the Panel to discuss all of them. He enquired whether members would like to discuss any specific areas of concerns/interest regarding HKPSG with the Administration.

4. Dr Helena WONG said that the Panel on Development should discuss the overall review of HKPSG with the Administration. Regarding individual planning standards under the purview of specific bureaux/departments such as those related to parks, markets and day care centres, etc., members might consider whether they should be discussed at the meetings of the Panel on Development or other relevant panels. Dr Elizabeth QUAT said that shortfalls of car parking spaces, swimming pools and other recreational facilities in the districts were problems related to the planning standards set out in HKPSG. The Panel on Development should follow up with the Administration the review of these planning standards.

5. The Chairman noted the views of Dr WONG and Dr QUAT, and invited members to inform him in due course about the specific areas of their concerns/interest regarding HKPSG to facilitate his arrangement for a discussion on the subject at a future meeting.

### **III Items for discussion at the next meeting**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)811/15-16(01) —List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)811/15-16(02) —List of follow-up actions)

6. Members agreed that at the next regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, 24 May 2016, at 2:30 pm, the following items proposed by the Administration would be discussed:

- (a) PWP Item No. 3185GK — Re-provisioning of Transport Department's Vehicle Examination Centres at Tsing Yi; and
- (b) Implementation of the Validation Scheme for Unauthorized Signboards.

7. The Chairman advised that the Administration had earlier on submitted to the Panel an information paper on "PWP Item No. 53WS — Upgrading of Chai Wan salt water supply system" (LC Paper No. CB(1)806/15-16(01)). He suggested that, as some members had expressed the view that the proposal should be discussed at a meeting of the Panel before it was submitted to the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") for consideration, the proposal would be discussed at the meeting on 24 May 2016. Members agreed to the suggestion.

8. The Chairman suggested and members agreed that the meeting to be held on 24 May 2016 be extended to end at 5:00 pm.

*(Post-meeting note: The discussion on agenda item IX "PWP Item No. 196WC — Implementation of Water Intelligent Network" had not finished at the meeting due to time constraints. It was agreed that the Panel would continue the discussion on the proposal at the meeting on 24 May 2016, and the meeting would be extended to end at 5:40 pm. The notice of the meeting on 24 May and the agenda were issued to members on 29 April vide LC Paper No. CB(1)862/15-16.)*

**IV Matter arising from the meeting on 23 February 2016 — proposed visit to Dongjiang**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)798/15-16(01) —Administration's letter dated 12 April 2016 to the Chairman on the proposed visit)

9. The Chairman said that at the meeting on 23 February 2016, members had expressed their wishes that the Panel should conduct a duty visit to the Dongjiang River Basin within a few months. He had subsequently requested the Development Bureau ("DEVB") to line up a visit accordingly, and a copy of DEVB's reply (Chinese version only) had been circulated to members on 14 April 2016 (vide LC Paper No. CB(1)798/15-16(01)). In the reply, DEVB had advised that according to the Guangdong authorities, visits to the Dongjiang River Basin were generally arranged before or after the tide season, and suggested that the Panel might re-consider the timing for the visit. He sought members' views on the Administration's suggestion.

10. Dr Helena WONG said that Dongjiang was the major source of drinking water for Hong Kong and she was very concerned about the safety of Dongjiang water supplied to Hong Kong. She did not consider it a problem that the visit would be arranged during the tide season, and suggested that the Clerk might coordinate among members a date within the current session for the visit.

11. Mr CHAN Kam-lam and Mr IP Kwok-him opined that the proposed duty visit would enable members to have better understanding of the preventive and control measures that had been undertaken by the Guangdong authorities to safeguard the quality of Dongjiang water supplied to Hong Kong. Mr CHAN said that the Panel might propose the dates for the visit so that the Clerk would check with DEVB whether the Guangdong authorities could make arrangements accordingly. The visit should last for about two days.

12. The Chairman said that in considering the dates for conducting the visit, members should take into account the time required by the Panel to seek the House Committee's agreement to the proposed visit and make all logistical arrangements including transportation, accommodation, etc. He suggested and members agreed that the Clerk would consult members by a circular on their availability for possible dates for conducting the visit within the current session. In light of members' returns in response to the circular, the Clerk would work out proposed dates for the visit for the Administration to follow up.



(*Post-meeting* note: A circular setting out options of dates for conducting the visit was issued to members on 28 April 2016 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)859/15-16. Based on members' returns and on the advice of the Chairman, the Clerk has proposed two options, i.e. (a) 18 and 19 June, and (b) 12 and 13 June, to the Administration for arranging the visit. The letter from the Clerk to the Administration was circulated to members on 6 May 2016 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)882/15-16.)

13. Miss CHAN Yuen-han asked about the progress of the arrangement of the Water Supplies Department regarding a request made by members during the Panel's visit to Singapore in March 2016 for conducting a visit to the water treatment works, water quality monitoring facilities and laboratory of the Department. The Chairman advised that the Clerk would follow up the matter.

(*Post-meeting* note: The Water Supplies Department has arranged a visit to Sha Tin Water Treatment Works on 21 June 2016 for the Panel. Members were informed of the details of the visit on 19 May 2016 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)942/15-16.)

## V Matter arising from the meeting on 15 March 2016

### **PWP Item No. 765CL — Development of Anderson Road Quarry site**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)653/15-16(06) — Administration's paper on PWP Item No. 765CL — Development of Anderson Road Quarry site -- Site formation and associated infrastructure works

LC Paper No. CB(1)653/15-16(07) — Paper on the development of the Anderson Road Quarry site prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Updated background brief))

14. The Chairman said that at the meeting on 15 March 2016, the Panel had completed discussion on the item, and he had put to vote the question that the funding proposal under the item be submitted to PWSC for

consideration. In response to a member's request at the meeting, he had ordered a division, and due to time constraints, the meeting could not proceed to the division. He would like to consult members on whether they supported the submission of the funding proposal under the item to PWSC for consideration.

15. Miss CHAN Yuen-han and Mr WU Chi-wai indicated that they would like to further discuss the item with the Administration. The Chairman said that he would allow two minutes for each member to put questions to the Administration and receive replies. He reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council ("LegCo"), they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the subjects under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the subjects.

16. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that she supported the implementation of the proposed project, which was to carry out site formation and associated infrastructure works for the proposed development at the Anderson Road Quarry ("ARQ") site. She pointed out that the present traffic along Clear Water Bay Road Choi Hung bound was very congested. She was concerned about the effectiveness of the Administration's proposed measures to divert the anticipated traffic arising from the proposed development at the ARQ site to the roads near Tseung Kwan O ("TKO") Road and TKO Tunnel.

17. Deputy Project Manager (New Territories East)1, Civil Engineering and Development Department, replied that most of the traffic to be generated from the ARQ development would use the eastern road access connecting Po Lam Road, Sau Mau Ping Road and TKO Road. In light of the findings of the Traffic Impact Assessment of the ARQ site ("TIA"), it was envisaged that upon the commissioning of the Tseung Kwan O-Lam Tin Tunnel, the traffic using TKO Tunnel to Kowloon would be significantly reduced and the capacity of TKO Road could be spared for accommodating the traffic demand arising from the planned population intake of the ARQ site development. The Administration would carry out improvement works to increase the capacity of the junction of Sau Mau Ping Road, Lin Tak Road and TKO Road. To reduce the residents' demand for taking short-trip feeder transportation, four pedestrian connectivity routes comprising footbridges, lift towers and/or escalators would be provided to facilitate residents of the ARQ site development and the public housing estates along the routes to travel to/from the Kwun Tong MTR Station.

18. Miss CHAN Yuen-han opined that the Administration had yet to come up with an effective plan to address the concerns raised by Kwun Tong

District Council on the significant traffic impact generated by the ARQ site development. Mr WU Chi-wai shared the view of Miss CHAN that Kwun Tong District Council was very concerned about the proposed transport arrangements for the ARQ site. He requested the Administration to provide: (a) a copy/relevant extract of the TIA report for the proposed development; (b) details of the measures to mitigate the impact of the population intake of the proposed development on the traffic conditions and to address the increases in vehicular traffic and pedestrian flows; (c) the views/suggestions of the relevant District Councils on the measures; and (d) whether the Administration had addressed these views/suggestions.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)876/15-16(01) on 5 May 2016.)*

#### Submission of the funding proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee

19. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that the Panel supported the Administration's submission of the proposal to PWSC for consideration.

#### **VI PWP Item No. 7332CL (Part) — West Kowloon Reclamation — main works (remainder) — Footbridge at junction of Sham Mong Road and Tonkin Street West in Sham Shui Po**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)811/15-16(03) — Administration's paper on 7332CL (Part) — West Kowloon Reclamation — main works (remainder) — Footbridge at Junction of Sham Mong Road and Tonkin Street West in Sham Shui Po)

20. Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)1 (Acting) ("DS/DEV(P&L)1") briefed members on the Administration's proposal to upgrade part of 7332CL "West Kowloon Reclamation — main works (remainder)" to Category A at an estimated cost of about \$369 million for the construction of a footbridge system at the junction of Sham Mong Road and Tonkin Street West in Sham Shui Po. The details of the proposal were given in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)811/15-16(03)). With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Deputy Project Manager (Kowloon), Civil Engineering and Development Department ("DPM(K)/CEDD"), elaborated

on the scope and timetable of the proposed project, the cost breakdown, and the public consultation that had been conducted on the proposed works.

*(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)851/15-16(01) by email on 27 April 2016.)*

21. The Chairman reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of RoP of LegCo, they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the subjects under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the subjects.

#### Provision of lifts and escalators

22. Dr Helena WONG enquired about the geographical distribution of the six lifts to be provided under the proposed project. DPM(K)/CEDD replied that the Administration proposed to install two lifts at each of the locations near the future public housing development at the North West Kowloon Reclamation Area Site 6, Fu Cheong Estate, and Ying Wa College for connecting the proposed footbridge system and the street level. As regards the property developments above the existing West Rail Nam Cheong Station, the relevant land lease conditions had stipulated that the developer/owner concerned was required to provide lifts, escalators and staircases near the proposed footbridge system within the property developments.

23. Ms Cyd HO enquired about the justifications for providing escalators under the proposed works given that the facilities would consume a lot of energy and the footbridge would be retrofitted with lifts. She opined that if the anticipated pedestrian flow was high at the junction concerned, it might be more appropriate for the Administration to retain the existing at-grade pedestrian crossing facilities.

24. DPM(K)/CEDD replied that retaining the existing at-grade pedestrian crossing facilities might defeat the main purpose of the proposal, which sought to provide a grade-separated walking environment to enhance road safety. Under the prevailing standards, the Administration would need to consider providing an escalator at a location if the estimated two-way pedestrian flow concerned would reach 3 000 persons per hour. To reduce energy consumption, the escalator would operate with sensors and automatically slow down when not in use. Moreover, during idling of the lifts, the ventilation system would be switched off automatically.

Provision of energy-saving items and green features

25. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok said that he supported the proposed project, taking into consideration that the footbridge system would facilitate residents and students to cross the junction concerned in a vehicular-free environment. He enquired about the greening works to be implemented under the proposal. DPM(K)/CEDD replied that space would be reserved for providing natural greenery along the bridge spans. The Administration would also plant trees at suitable locations in the vicinity of the proposed footbridge system.

26. Mr IP Kwok-him opined that it was appropriate for the Administration to provide the proposed footbridge in view of the busy traffic at the junction concerned. He enquired about the recurrent maintenance cost of the project, and whether the Administration had considered adopting renewable energy applications such as solar energy facilities for the project. In reply, DPM(K)/CEDD said it was estimated that the operation and maintenance costs for the proposed project, including electricity expenses, would be about \$3 million per annum. To reduce the maintenance cost, the Administration had adopted a modest design for the project. Durable materials would be used as far as practicable. The length of each span of the footbridge system ranged from about 46 to 67 metres. Provision of solar energy facilities would impose additional loads, thereby affecting the structural supporting capacity of the proposed footbridge system.

27. Ms Cyd HO opined that the Administration should decide at the design stage whether the proposed project should incorporate more facilities to maximize the use of renewable energy and promote energy efficiency, instead of adding the facilities during or after the construction works. She sought clarification on whether the design load was the factor limiting the provision of such facilities, and requested the Administration to provide in the discussion paper on the project to be submitted to PWSC ("the PWSC paper") information on the maximum design load of the proposed footbridge system; and whether and why it was not practicable to increase the proposed maximum design load to facilitate the provision of more energy-saving items.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was given in PWSC(2016-17)28, which was circulated to members on 25 May 2016.)*

Connection between the footbridge system and adjacent developments

28. Dr Kenneth CHAN enquired about where and how the footbridge system would interface with the pedestrian passage facilities in the adjacent public and private developments. He further enquired on the measures taken by the Administration to ensure round-the-clock barrier-free access for footbridge users for travelling to/from the pedestrian passage facilities in these developments and the public footpaths at-grade, and whether any works projects carried out in the developments would not adversely affect the use of the access by pedestrians. He was concerned whether the design/alignment of the barrier-free access and the aforesaid measures had taken into account the importance of providing footbridge users with the shortest possible routes to the pedestrian passage facilities and public footpaths in the vicinity.

29. Mr James TO opined that it was necessary for the Administration to ensure that the relevant lease conditions of the property developments above the West Rail Nam Cheong Station would require the developer/owner concerned to provide 24-hour access for users of the footbridge for travelling through the parts connecting the footbridge with the developments to/from the pedestrian passage facilities inside the developments.

30. DPM(K)/CEDD replied that the Administration had considered the pedestrian passage facilities to be provided within the adjoining public housing and private property developments. Regarding the property developments above the West Rail Nam Cheong Station, the land lease conditions had stipulated that the owner concerned had to provide round-the-clock access between the proposed footbridge system and the adjoining at-grade public footpaths via pedestrian passage facilities, including lifts, escalators and staircases near the proposed footbridge system. It was also specified in the lease conditions that the Administration had the right to carry out works in respect of the design, construction, management, repair and maintenance, etc., of the proposed footbridge system in the connection areas inside the developments. Dr CHAN requested the Administration to provide written information in the PWSC paper in light of his enquiries and concerns.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was given in PWSC(2016-17)28, which was circulated to members on 25 May 2016.)*

#### Cover to the footbridge

31. Dr Helena WONG, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok and Mr IP Kwok-him were concerned whether under the proposed works, the Administration would

provide a cover to the footbridge system that could effectively protect pedestrians from sun and rain, without compromising the need for allowing good air ventilation and light penetration. Dr WONG opined that the relevant design of the footbridge should allow natural sunlight to come in whilst screening off the strong sunlight during summer, thus reducing the effects of heat.

32. DPM(K)/CEDD replied that the design of the proposed footbridge system made use of natural lighting and ventilation and had taken into account the need to provide shelter from sunlight and rain. In this connection, the cover would be slightly extended over the edges of the bridge spans and provided with measures to reduce the effects of heat.

33. In response to Mr James TO's enquiry on whether the relevant part of the footbridge cover could form a rain shelter for the residents travelling to/from Fu Cheong Estate, DPM(K)/CEDD advised that the covers to the escalators and staircases of the proposed footbridge system near Fu Cheong Estate, together with the existing canopy in Fu Cheong Estate, would shelter the footbridge users travelling to/from the estate from rain.

#### Proposed removal of at-grade pedestrian crossing facilities

34. Noting that the Administration proposed to remove all the existing at-grade pedestrian crossing facilities at the road junction concerned, Mr CHAN Kam-lam was concerned that some residents might find it more convenient to continue using the at-grade pedestrian crossings instead of the proposed footbridge. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok said that the Administration should give consideration to Mr CHAN's concern.

35. DPM(K)/CEDD replied that with anticipated growth in the traffic flow at the junction of Sham Mong Road and Tonkin Street West, the concerned road junction would become heavily trafficked. One of the main purposes of constructing the proposed footbridge system was to provide a grade-separated walking environment so as to enhance safety of traffic and pedestrians, including local residents and students. The Administration had consulted the local communities on the proposal of removing the existing pedestrian crossings and had not received any objecting views. The proposed works included the provision of escalators which would enhance pedestrian accessibility to the proposed footbridge system.

36. Dr Helena WONG and Mr James TO held the view that the Administration should not remove the existing at-grade pedestrian crossing facilities. Mr TO said that pedestrians might need to use the at-grade

facilities in the event that the lifts or escalators were under repair or maintenance.

37. Ms Cyd HO requested the Administration to provide in the PWSC paper information on the time taken by a pedestrian to cross the roads at the junction concerned; and details about the duration of traffic signal phases for motorists using the junction/lanes concerned before and after the commissioning of the proposed footbridge system. Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that the Administration should also provide supplementary information on the existing capacity of the road junction for traffic flow; and how such capacity would increase after the proposed removal of the existing at-grade pedestrian crossing facilities.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was given in PWSC(2016-17)28, which was circulated to members on 25 May 2016.)*

#### Project cost and duration

38. Dr Helena WONG referred to the cost estimate of the proposed project, and questioned about the financial provisions allocated for commissioning consultants under the project and the justifications. DPM(K)/CEDD responded that the Administration would provide in the PWSC paper a breakdown of the project cost estimate, including the items "consultants' fees and remuneration of resident site staff", and "environmental mitigation measures", to address Dr WONG's question.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was given in PWSC(2016-17)28, which was circulated to members on 25 May 2016.)*

39. Mr YIU Si-wing said that the Administration had undertaken the works under 7332CL since 1989, and enquired whether all the projects under the item would be completed on schedule. DPM(K)/CEDD replied that works under 7332CL had been completed except for three proposed footbridge systems along Sham Mong Road. Various factors including the programme of the adjacent housing developments and traffic growth would be considered in determining the implementation programme of these footbridges. It was an appropriate time to implement the proposed works to cope with the developments adjacent to the project site. There was no delay in the implementation of the proposed works.

40. In response to Mr YIU's enquiry on whether the cost estimate for the



proposed project had taken into account the trends of labour and construction material costs, and the risk of project delay, DS/DEV(P&L)1 advised that the Administration would provide in the PWSC paper the relevant information in light of Mr YIU's enquiry.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was given in PWSC(2016-17)28, which was circulated to members on 25 May 2016.)*

#### Submission of the funding proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee

41. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that the Panel supported the Administration's submission of the proposal to PWSC.

### **VII Establishment of the Lantau Development Office and the re-organization of existing Development Offices of Civil Engineering and Development Department**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)798/15-16(02) —Administration's paper on staffing proposal on the establishment of the Lantau Development Office and the re-organisation of existing Development Offices of Civil Engineering and Development Department

LC Paper No. CB(1)559/15-16(07) —Administration's paper on creation and redeployment of directorate posts in Civil Engineering and Development Department and Planning Department

LC Paper No. CB(1)801/15-16(01) —Extract of draft minutes of the Panel meeting on 23 February 2016 (discussion on Item VII)

42. The Chairman said that the details of the Administration's proposal on the establishment of the Lantau Development Office ("LDO") and the re-organization of existing Development Offices of Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CEDD") were given in Annex II to LC Paper No. CB(1)559/15-16(07), which had been discussed at the Panel's meeting

on 23 February 2016. Members did not support the Administration's submission of the proposal to the Establishment Subcommittee ("ESC"). Recently, the Administration had provided supplementary information in response to the members' concerns on the proposal, which had been circulated to members on 14 April 2016 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)798/15-16(02). The Chairman said that according to Rule 24(n) of the House Rules, the decisions of a committee should not be re-opened for discussion, unless with the permission of the committee. He asked whether members agreed that the discussion on the proposal should be re-opened. Members raised no objection.

43. Permanent Secretary for Development (Works) ("PS/DEV(W)") briefed members on LC paper No. CB(1)798/15-16(02), which set out the Administration's response to members' concerns expressed at the meeting on 23 February 2016 on the abovementioned staffing proposal. He also updated members on the latest situation of the ongoing public engagement exercise, which had commenced on 31 January 2016, for the development of Lantau. PS/DEV(W) sought members' support for the staffing proposal.

#### Justifications for the establishment of a Lantau Development Office

44. Dr Helena WONG said that, in LC Paper No. CB(1)798/15-16(02), the Administration had not made any amendment to the original staffing proposal. She queried how the Administration could convince members to support it. PS/DEV(W) replied that, while some Panel members supported the need of additional staff for carrying out the work related to development of Lantau, some members raised concerns on various issues, such as the public consultation process for the development proposals, conflicts of interest of some of the members of the Lantau Development Advisory Committee ("LanDAC") and adequacy of construction labour force for undertaking the proposed projects. To address members' concerns, the Administration had submitted a supplementary information paper to the Panel. In the past few months, the Administration had held three public forums and a number of consultative sessions to collect views and suggestions on the proposed development strategy for Lantau. The public views received so far indicated that there was major support for the broad direction of the proposed development strategy for Lantau, and there were views expressing the needs for studying the receiving capacity of Lantau, enhancement of the traffic and transport infrastructure, improvement works for the remote villages and local community, as well as detailed proposals on conservation in Lantau. The Administration considered that there was an urgent need to establish LDO to undertake the various tasks and studies to

address public aspiration and take forward those proposals that were supported by the public.

45. Dr Helena WONG stressed that it was not appropriate to establish LDO at this stage when there was no consensus among the public on the proposed development strategy for Lantau. She was worried that the establishment of LDO would mean all the development projects proposed by LanDAC, not yet with the support of the public, would go ahead. Mr Albert HO opined that the establishment of LDO at this stage would give the public an impression that the Administration had already drawn up a blueprint for developing Lantau. Dr WONG and Mr HO suggested that, instead of establishing LDO, the Administration should strengthen the manpower support for gauging and considering public views on the development of Lantau and then formulate development plans that were generally acceptable.

46. In response, PS/DEV(W) said that the Administration's proposal to establish LDO did not mean that development proposals would be implemented in Lantau immediately without public consultation. As regards the proposed development strategy for Lantau, he said that it generally followed the principles set out in the Revised Concept Plan for Lantau released in 2007. Under the proposed development strategy, a vast area of land in Lantau would be preserved, while north Lantau was proposed for economic and housing developments. Given that there was a very substantial workload associated with the tasks to be undertaken for the development of Lantau, it was essential to establish a dedicated multi-disciplinary office.

47. Mr WU Chi-wai said that, although the duration of the four proposed supernumerary directorate posts to be created to lead LDO would last only about 5 years, the proposed creation of 50 non-directorate posts in DEVB, CEDD and the Planning Department for the development of Lantau would make the establishment of LDO a permanent arrangement. He considered that the existing manpower in DEVB and the relevant departments could be strengthened to take up the planned development projects in North Lantau and the projects to improve the connectivity of Lantau. However, he objected to the Administration's plan to establish a dedicated office for developing Lantau in a massive scale. He opined that, given there was no public consensus on the new development projects to be carried out in Lantau, the establishment of LDO would certainly arouse controversies. He sought information about the roles and responsibilities of the proposed LDO.

48. PS/DEV(W) said that according to the recommendations of LanDAC, opportunities should be taken to capitalize on the benefits brought by the strategic positioning of Lantau to meet the long-term development needs of Hong Kong. Apart from the developments along the northern part of Lantau, there was potential to develop the East Lantau Metropolis ("ELM") as the third core business district in Hong Kong. Although developing ELM was a long-term planning beyond 2030 and its implementation had not yet been confirmed at the present stage, additional manpower was necessary for carrying out a thorough study on the feasibility of developing ELM. Therefore, there was a need to create the proposed supernumerary directorate posts and set up a dedicated multi-disciplinary office. The alternative of creating directorate posts in the Hong Kong Island and Islands Development Office for taking up Lantau-related tasks without establishing a dedicated development office would not be feasible.

49. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen opined that the proposed development strategy for Lantau had aroused great anxiety among the public about possible devastation of Lantau. He said the People Power was opposed to the aforesaid strategy recommended by LanDAC, which comprised members who were not familiar with the ecological and cultural features of Lantau. The proposed housing development in ELM was objectionable due to the impact of aircraft noise in the area.

50. PS/DEV(W) responded that the development of ELM was still at the conceptual stage. The proposed LDO would be responsible for taking forward preliminary work such as feasibility studies and assessment of the impact of aircraft noise in the area.

51. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that he objected to the proposed establishment of LDO because the proposed development strategy for Lantau was lacking in detailed proposals on conservation of the natural environment of Lantau. The majority of views received during the public engagement exercise were against the proposed development strategy. The Administration's proposal to develop more tourist attractions in Lantau aimed to promote commercial development but had not paid heed to conservation of the natural environment. The Administration was biased towards the interests of land owners and private developers in planning the development of Lantau. Dr CHEUNG opined that the requirements for LanDAC members to declare interests would not allay public concerns on the personal benefits these members would obtain from the development of Lantau.

52. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung expressed opposition to the proposal to establish LDO. He said that some of the medium- and long-term development proposals, such as the strategic studies for developing artificial islands in the central waters and the proposed ELM, were objectionable. He did not see the need to establish a new dedicated office for conducting studies on development plans which would only be implemented after 2030.

53. The Deputy Chairman held the view that, in developing Lantau, the Administration should aim to achieve a balance between development and conservation. He supported the proposal to establish a dedicated office as it would strengthen the manpower support to collect public views and conduct studies on the development of Lantau.

54. Mr IP Kwok-him indicated support for the establishment of LDO. He opined that achieving a balance between land development and conservation of the environment was essential to the sustainable development of Lantau. There was a need to set up a dedicated office to conduct studies for the formulation of a development plan that could address both development and conservation needs of Lantau. Mr IP said that some members' criticism that the development of Lantau would be a way of collusion of benefits between the Government and private developers was groundless.

55. Mr CHAN Kin-por expressed support for the proposal to set up a dedicated office for undertaking studies for the development in Lantau. As regards some members' concern expressed at the meeting on 23 February 2016 on the shortage of labour to implement large-scale development projects, Mr CHAN said that the unemployment rate of the construction industry was still high and the major development projects would not be implemented in the short term. He believed there would be sufficient supply of construction workers to undertake the infrastructure projects related to the development of Lantau.

56. Mr CHAN Han-pan said that in 2013, LegCo Members debated a motion on "Developing a new North Lantau" at a Council meeting and showed support for enhancing the provision of infrastructure and community facilities in North Lantau, as well as improving North Lantau's internal and external economic development. So far, the Administration had conducted rounds of public consultation on the development of Lantau. There were many issues, raised by LegCo Members and the public, about the development of Lantau for the Administration to follow up. He believed that, with the establishment of LDO, more manpower resources would be made available for the Administration to work closely with stakeholders,

including green groups and local communities, to draw up detailed proposals for developing Lantau.

57. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok expressed support for the staffing proposal. He said that the establishment of LDO was necessary for planning a balanced development for Lantau. Ir Dr LO asked the Administration to elaborate why a multi-disciplinary office was needed to take forward the development initiatives for Lantau.

58. PS/DEV(W) replied that a dedicated multi-disciplinary LDO was required such that different professional staff, comprising engineers, town planners, architects and surveyors, would work together to take forward Lantau-related tasks in an integrated manner. Moreover, unlike other projects already in the implementation phase being undertaken by CEDD, the development proposals for Lantau were complex in nature and still in a preliminary stage requiring input from multi-disciplinary professional staff. Early establishment of LDO was essential for effecting better planning; resolving the interfacing issues; and undertaking good public engagement for the development of Lantau.

#### Transport infrastructure in Lantau

59. Expressing support for the establishment of LDO, Mr Michael TIEN relayed the concerns of residents in Tung Chung that the transport infrastructure facilities and train services in the area were inadequate. He proposed that, to meet the anticipated significant increase in the demand for transport services arising from the proposed developments in Lantau, a light rail system linking up the new railway station in Tung Chung East and the AsiaWorld-Expo station, with stops at the HKBCF island of HZMB and the North Commercial District of the Airport Island, etc., should be developed. The proposed light rail system would facilitate local employment and reduce external traffic. Mr TIEN opined that it was important for the proposed LDO to have a Chief Engineer who possessed knowledge and expertise in railway development. He further suggested that a new harbour-crossing railway connecting New Territories West and Hong Kong Island via North Lantau, and the proposed artificial islands in the central waters should be developed. Moreover, he suggested that LDO should consider developing the light rail system in Lantau by adopting the approach of the Energizing Kowloon East Office ("EKEO") for developing the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System in Kowloon East.

60. In response, PS/DEV(W) said that the proposed LDO would study thoroughly different transport options to improve the transport connectivity of Lantau in order to facilitate local employment. Experienced engineers at LDO would be engaged to study the feasibility of developing a light rail system, which would be one of the suggested transport options in Lantau. The approach adopted by EKEO would be made reference to as appropriate.

#### Nature conservation in Lantau

61. Dr Kenneth CHAN enquired whether the Administration had any plan to set up a Lantau Conservation Office. PS/DEV(W) said there was no such plan at the present stage. Dr CHAN pointed out that many green groups had expressed grave concern on the irreversible impact of the proposed developments on the ecology of Lantau. Under the consultation document for the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan prepared by the Environment Bureau in January 2016, one of the proposed action areas was to strengthen internal mainstreaming within the Administration and incorporate biodiversity considerations into the Administration's plans and projects according to the particular situation in Hong Kong. He urged the Administration to formulate concrete conservation measures for Lantau to address the concerns of the green groups. He said he would remain opposed to the establishment of LDO if no detailed proposal on nature conservation in Lantau was available. PS/DEV(W) replied that development and conservation were not mutually exclusive and staff of the proposed LDO would pay great attention to conservation issues.

62. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that there was public aspiration for preserving the natural resources of Lantau. There was no consensus among the public on some of the proposals to be taken forward by the proposed LDO, such as the development of ELM and the cable car system connecting Ngong Ping with Tai O, as these proposals would cause damage to the natural environment. Dr KWOK was dissatisfied that the Administration had included the studies for developing artificial islands in the central waters, which was not supported by PWSC, in the list of projects to be undertaken by LDO.

63. In response, PS/DEV(W) said that diversified views from the public were received. Some supported the development proposals for Lantau, while some raised concerns on environmental protection and requested detailed conservation proposals and assessment of the receiving capacity of Lantau. PS/DEV(W) also reiterated that conservation and development were not mutually exclusive and all the professional staff in the proposed LDO would properly consider the conservation needs in taking forward the

development proposals. The proposed construction of artificial islands in the central waters to develop ELM would bring benefits to the people of Hong Kong in the long term. The Administration would submit a proposal on conducting strategic studies for developing artificial islands in the central waters to LegCo for seeking funding approval.

64. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said he was not convinced that the proposed LDO would strive to conserve the natural environment in Lantau, given that LDO would mainly be staffed by engineers. He suggested that conservation experts from overseas and the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department should be engaged in formulating the conservation plans for Lantau. PS/DEV(W) reiterated that the proposed LDO would comprise professional staff of various disciplines. They would take into consideration the conservation needs in taking forward the development initiatives for Lantau.

65. Mr CHAN Kam-lam indicated support for the proposal to set up LDO. Mr CHAN opined that nature conservation in Lantau was important but the establishment of a conservation office might not be necessary. He said that nature conservation should not be regarded as an obstacle to land development, which was essential to the economic development and housing supply in Hong Kong. Mr IP Kwok-him enquired how the proposed LDO, which comprised a small number of staff, would be able to provide sound professional advice on the issues related to balancing development and conservation in Lantau.

66. PS/DEV(W) replied that a considerable amount of public views and suggestions on the conservation of Lantau, such as enhancement and preservation of marine parks and country parks, had been received in the public engagement exercise. He stressed again that all the staff in the proposed LDO including engineers, town planners, surveyors and architects would accord high priority to promoting conservation in Lantau in taking forward the development proposals.

#### Improvement of infrastructure in the villages in Lantau

67. Miss Alice MAK said that she did not agree to some of the development proposals put forward by LandAC. She considered that the establishment of LDO would be necessary for conducting more public engagement activities to gauge the views of the stakeholders, in particular the local villagers, on the overall development of Lantau. Miss MAK called on the Administration to improve the infrastructure facilities in the villages, such as sewerage systems, before planning the development of Lantau.



68. PS/DEV(W) replied that the tasks to be undertaken by the proposed LDO would include short-, medium- and long-term proposals. The implementation of the long-term proposals would be subject to further studies. For the short-term work, the Administration was aware of the local concerns on improvement of the road and sewerage systems in villages. More manpower resources would be required to investigate and pursue these works.

#### Roles and functions of the Lantau Development Office

69. Mr YIU Si-wing declared that he was a member of LanDAC. He indicated support for the proposal to set up LDO to take forward the development initiatives for Lantau. Mr YIU enquired whether the operation of the proposed LDO would be similar to that of EKEO and whether the Administration would draw on the successful experience of EKEO in taking forward development projects.

70. PS/DEV(W) said that the Kai Tak Office ("KTO") under the Kowloon Development Office of CEDD and EKEO under DEVB had been established for the development of Kowloon East, which included Kai Tak. The work of EKEO focused on the revitalization of former industrial areas in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay, while KTO was responsible for the implementation of infrastructural projects in the Kai Tak Development. In view of the scale of development in Lantau, the roles and functions of LDO would be comparable to those of a combined office of EKEO and KTO.

71. Mr YIU Si-wing opined that, although the tasks to be undertaken in transforming Kowloon East were complicated, the implementation of the various projects under the purview of EKEO showed good results. The work of EKEO in conducting public engagement activities would be a useful reference for the development of Lantau. PS/DEV(W) said that the successful experience of EKEO in the revitalization of Kowloon East would be carefully considered when the Administration took forward the development initiatives for Lantau.

#### Re-organization of the Development Offices

72. Mr CHAN Kam-lam remarked that the titles of the four new Development Offices to be set up under the proposed re-organization (i.e. the North Development Office, the East Development Office, the South Development Office and the West Development Office) could not reflect the

district boundary of each Development Office. The Deputy Chairman expressed a similar view.

73. Director of Civil Engineering and Development replied that, in making a proposal to set up LDO to take up development projects in Lantau and other outlying islands, the Administration had taken the opportunity to review the work allocation and geographical boundaries among the existing four Development Offices. Given that the workload of the development and infrastructure projects being undertaken by the existing New Territories East Development Office had exceeded the capacity of a development office, the Administration proposed re-distribution of duties and responsibilities and revision to the geographical boundaries among the four Development Offices. The re-titling of the re-organized Development Offices was proposed after careful consideration. The responsibilities and geographical boundary of the New Territories West Development Office would remain unchanged but it would be re-titled as the West Development Office. The development and infrastructure projects in the North, Tai Po and Sha Tin Districts would be overseen by the North Development Office. The South Development Office would be responsible for projects in Hong Kong Island, and the Sham Shui Po and Yau Tsim Mong Districts, while the East Development Office would be responsible for projects in the Sai Kung, Wong Tai Sin, Kwun Tong and Kowloon City Districts.

74. PS/DEV(W) added that changes to the geographical boundaries of the four new Development Offices were drawn up with reference to the boundaries of the District Council constituency areas. He said the Administration would be happy to brief members on this issue in detail.

#### Submission of the proposal to the Establishment Subcommittee

75. The Chairman enquired whether members supported that the proposal be submitted to ESC for consideration. He said that he would exercise his original vote on the proposal. At members' request, the Chairman ordered a division. The division bell was rung for five minutes. Thirteen members voted for and 10 members voted against the question. The votes of individual members were as follows:

*For:*

Mr CHAN Kam-lam  
Mr CHAN Kin-por  
Mr Michael TIEN  
Mr CHAN Han-pan

Mr CHAN Hak-kan  
Mr IP Kwok-him  
Mr YIU Si-wing  
Miss CHAN Yuen-han

Mr LEUNG Che-cheung  
Dr Elizabeth QUAT  
Mr Tony TSE (the Chairman)  
(13 members)

Miss Alice MAK  
Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok

*Against:*

Mr James TO  
Ms Cyd HO  
Mr WU Chi-wai  
Dr Kenneth CHAN  
Dr Fernando CHEUNG  
(10 members)

Mr Frederick FUNG  
Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen  
Dr KWOK Ka-ki  
Dr Helena WONG

*Abstain:*

(0 member)

76. The Chairman concluded that the Panel supported the submission of the proposal to ESC for consideration.

**VIII PWP Item No. 417RO — Improvement works at Tai O, phase 2, stage 1**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)811/15-16(04) —Administration's paper on 417RO — Improvement works at Tai O)

Other relevant papers

(LC Paper No. CB(1)832/15-16(01) —Joint submission from deputations (大澳文化工作室、大澳居民權益關注組及大澳永續發展教育工作室) dated 22 April 2016

LC Paper No. CB(1)840/15-16(01) —Submission from a member of the public dated 22 April 2016

LC Paper No. CB(1)840/15-16(02) —Six submissions of the same content from six members of the public dated 22, 23 and 24 April 2016

LC Paper No. CB(1)840/15-16(03) —Two submissions from Maggie FUNG dated 24 April 2016

LC Paper No. CB(1)850/15-16(01) —Submission from a member of the public dated 25 April 2016

LC Paper No. CB(1)850/15-16(02) —Submission from KC dated 25

April 2016

LC Paper No. CB(1)850/15-16(03) —Submission from a member of the public dated 25 April 2016)

77. Members noted the above submissions from concerned organizations.

78. At the invitation of the Chairman, Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)5, Development Bureau ("PAS/DEV(W)5"), briefed members on the proposal to upgrade part of 417RO, entitled "Improvement Works at Tai O, Phase 2 Stage 1", to Category A, for the construction of an entrance plaza, a public transport terminus, a public car park, a loading and unloading area and a cycle parking area, provision of on-street parking spaces and associated roadworks, landscaping and ancillary works at Tai O, at an estimated cost of \$124.0 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Chief Engineer/Hong Kong(1), Civil Engineering and Development Department, elaborated on the design, scope and benefits of the proposed project. He added that the name "entrance plaza" seemed to have given a misunderstanding to some of the public that it was a large area with landmark features. It was indeed a public open space providing an adequate area for people to wait and queue for tour coaches/buses without any landmark structures. The details of the proposal were set out in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)811/15-16(04)).

*(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)851/15-16(02) by email on 27 April 2016.)*

79. The Chairman reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of RoP of LegCo, they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the subjects under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the subjects.

#### Design of the proposed entrance plaza

80. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that development and conservation of the environment should not be mutually exclusive. She said she was aware of the overcrowding problem in the area near the entrance to the Tai O town centre and improvement works were needed. However, she considered that the design of the proposed entrance plaza, which was lacking in greening features, would be at odds with the environment of Tai O. She suggested that the Administration should improve the public areas and preserve the natural

attributes of Tai O by providing more greenery instead of concrete facilities. Miss Alice MAK said that the villagers in Tai O had expressed concern on whether the design of the facilities to be provided under the project would preserve the ambience of Tai O as a fishing village.

81. The Deputy Chairman said that there were strong aspirations from the Tai O Rural Committee and the local community for the early implementation of the proposed improvement works to enhance road safety in the area near the entrance to the Tai O town centre. He noted Miss CHAN Yuen-han's concern about the design of the proposed entrance plaza. He suggested that the Administration should consider using more natural materials, instead of cement, in the construction of the entrance plaza.

82. Mr WU Chi-wai suggested that the Administration should plant more trees at the proposed entrance plaza so as to provide the seating areas with shade and to blend in with the surrounding environment.

83. Mr IP Kwok-him shared members' views that the design of the facilities to be provided under the proposed project should be compatible with the natural environment of Tai O. He suggested that, when submitting the funding proposal to PWSC, the Administration should provide more information about how to make use of greenery and natural materials under the proposed project.

84. Deputy Project Manager (Hong Kong Island & Islands), Civil Engineering and Development Department ("DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD"), advised that the Administration would consider members' suggestions of providing more greening works under the proposed project. For example, the Administration would consider using tiles made of natural materials to pave the ground surface of the entrance plaza.

#### The need for the provision of an entrance plaza

85. The Panel noted from the Administration's paper that the Administration had received a total of 1 499 objections to the proposed project and the objectors' major concerns included whether there was a need to provide the proposed entrance plaza. Dr Helena WONG said that many objectors were opposed to the construction of an iconic structure at the proposed entrance plaza. They were also worried that the proposed works would give rise to an influx of additional visitors exceeding the tourist reception capacity of Tai O. Dr WONG asked whether the Administration had explained to the local community the purpose of the proposed project and to address their concerns.

86. DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD replied that the proposed project scope was determined mainly based on the Revised Concept Plan for Lantau promulgated in 2007. The improvement works were proposed after the Administration had conducted extensive consultation with the local residents and the Tai O Rural Committee. Two briefings had been made for local residents to gauge their views on the proposed works. He advised that the proposed works mainly involved the reprovisioning of the bus terminus and the public car park. Upon the completion of the proposed works, public access to and enjoyment of the waterfront at Tai O would not be affected. He assured members that the Administration had no plan to construct any iconic structure at the proposed entrance plaza.

87. Dr Kenneth CHAN remarked that, when working out the design of the proposed improvement works, it was important for the Administration to address the concern of the local community. Given the large number of objections to the proposed project, he suggested that the Administration should carefully consider the counter-proposal made by local community groups. Dr CHAN said that, to gain public support for the proposed project, the Administration should make a pledge that no iconic structure would be provided at the entrance plaza in an attempt to make the place a landmark of Tai O. Mr WU Chi-wai expressed a similar view.

88. In response, DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD said that seven objection resolution meetings with objectors had been held to discuss their concerns. The major concern of the objectors was related to the proposed entrance plaza. The Administration had explained to the objectors that the proposed entrance plaza aimed to provide a public open space for visitors or residents to gather before taking a bus/coach. The Administration had no plan to provide any iconic structure at the entrance plaza.

89. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that the local community groups and green groups considered the provision of an entrance plaza at Tai O unnecessary, as visitors would prefer to stay at the promenade or the town centre when they arrived at Tai O. He remarked that the suggestion of developing the entrance plaza into a landmark raised by a member of the Islands District Council had aroused great controversy. Dr CHEUNG held the view that the Administration should adopt the counter-proposal made by community groups and withdraw the proposal to construct an entrance plaza, so as to address objectors' concern and reduce the project cost.

90. DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD said that the description of the proposed public open space next to public transport terminus as an "entrance plaza" might

have caused confusion. He said that the counter-proposal made by some community groups did not differ significantly from the Administration's plan, and the only major difference was that the former proposed to reduce the size of the public open space. The proposed entrance plaza, which would serve as a public open space and a buffer zone with the public transport terminus and the loading and unloading area, would address the congestion problem outside the entrance to the town centre.

91. Mr IP Kwok-him suggested that the Administration should avoid describing the public open space as an "entrance plaza", which did not reflect the function of the space. In the funding proposal for the proposed project to be submitted to PWSC, the Administration should clearly state that there was no plan to provide an iconic structure at the said public open space. DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD said that the Administration would consider Mr IP's suggestion.

92. Mr YIU Si-wing enquired whether the Administration had discussed the proposed works and the design of the entrance plaza with the Tai O Rural Committee and the Islands District Council. DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD said that the Administration had been in close communication with these two organizations on the proposed project. The two organizations urged for the early implementation of the project and the provision of an entrance plaza next to the public transport terminus. They agreed that the entrance plaza would serve as a buffer zone and was important for addressing the traffic problems near the entrance to the Tai O town centre. Mr YIU called on the Administration to pay heed to the views of the local residents when working out the detailed design of the entrance plaza.

#### Proposed increase in the number of public parking spaces for private cars

93. While expressing support for the proposed works, Miss Alice MAK stressed that she did not agree to opening up the closed roads in Lantau. She hoped that the improvement of car parking facilities under the proposed project was not to pave way for allowing more cars to go to Lantau.

94. Dr Helena WONG questioned whether increasing the number of parking spaces for private cars from 49 to 100 was to attract more visitors to drive to Tai O. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung enquired how the Administration had come up with the number of the additional parking spaces to be provided in Tai O.

95. DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD replied that the proposed project did not aim to attract more visitors to Tai O. It was not related to the relaxation of traffic

restrictions on closed roads and increasing the quota of closed road permits. The provision of 100 parking spaces for private cars under the proposed project sought to address the problem of illegal parking in the area. The number of private cars allowed to access Tai O would continue to be controlled under the Lantau Closed Road Permit System. The number of parking spaces for coaches remained unchanged before and after the completion of the proposed works.

96. Mr Frederick FUNG was not convinced by the Administration's explanation. He believed that the Administration had taken into account the anticipated increase in the number of vehicles and visitors at Tai O in working out the number of additional bus bays and parking spaces. He queried whether the Administration had assessed the tourist reception capacity of Tai O, and expressed concern that the proposed project might bring in a large number of visitors in future, causing nuisances to the daily life of the local residents.

97. DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD explained that, at present, it was unsatisfactory to have only two pick-up/drop-off bays to accommodate three bus routes at the existing bus terminus. The provision of two more bus bays under the proposed project would better serve the passengers. While there were currently no designated public parking spaces for bicycles at Tai O, the proposed cycle parking area would provide convenience to many local residents who used the bicycles as a means for daily commuting.

98. Mr YIU Si-wing enquired whether the parking spaces for coaches and goods vehicles to be provided upon the completion of project would be adequate to cope with the demand. DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD replied that the total number of parking spaces for coaches remained the same before and after the completion of the project. Under the proposed project, to enhance the safety of road users, the coach parking spaces at the existing public car park at Tai O Road would be re-provided at Lung Shing Street where the coaches would park or wait after unloading of passengers at the town centre entrance.

#### Illegal parking of private cars at Tai O

99. Dr Kenneth CHAN enquired whether the Administration had taken enforcement actions against illegal parking at Tai O. Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East, Transport Department, replied that although there were vacant car parking spaces in other parts of Tai O, many Tai O residents, perhaps for convenience, preferred to park their private cars, even illegally, near the existing bus terminus. The Transport Department ("TD")



would continue to liaise with the Hong Kong Police Force on the issue of illegal parking at Tai O.

100. Dr Kenneth CHAN queried whether the provision of additional parking spaces would be effective in alleviating the illegal parking problem. He requested the Administration to provide information on the current situation and the cause of illegal parking of private cars at Tai O, and how the proposed construction of a public car park would solve the problem of illegal parking.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)982/15-16(01) on 30 May 2016.)*

#### Number of coaches to be allowed to access Tai O

101. Mr YIU Si-wing further enquired how the Administration would control the number of coaches going to Tai O to ensure that the number of coach parking spaces was adequate. DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD replied that according to TD, the provision of coach parking spaces at Tai O was considered adequate.

102. Mr YIU Si-wing asked whether the Administration would increase the quota of the permits for tour coaches to access South Lantau when the proposed project was completed in 2019. DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD replied that issues related to the Lantau Closed Road Permit was under the purview of TD. TD would review the quota for tour coaches at the appropriate time.

103. In response to Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung's enquiry, PAS/DEV(W)5 advised that at present a maximum of 40 tour coaches per day were allowed to access South Lantau. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung was concerned how the 21 coach parking spaces to be provided at Tai O would meet the parking demand of 40 coaches. DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD replied that the actual number of coaches that were granted Lantau Closed Road Permits to access South Lantau was usually less than 40 per day. With the permits, the coaches could travel to areas other than Tai O, such as Ngong Ping and Cheung Sha. Hence, the provision of coach parking spaces at Tai O was considered adequate.

#### Provision of ancillary facilities

104. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired whether the Administration would provide more public toilets at the project site to facilitate the visitors. DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD said that, subject to the views of the local community,

the Administration would consider providing additional public toilets in the next phase of the improvement project.

105. Mr WU Chi-wai requested the Administration to provide information about the scope of each phase of the entire project on "Improvement Works at Tai O".

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)982/15-16(01) on 30 May 2016.)*

106. Mr Michael TIEN held the view that the proposed improvement works should be implemented as soon as possible to solve the traffic congestion problem and enhance road safety at the Tai O town centre. Taking in view that many visitors to Tai O were families, including the elderly, he suggested that shelters should be provided at the queuing area of the proposed public transport terminus and along the pedestrian walkways connecting the terminus with the entrance plaza. DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD advised that the Administration would consider Mr TIEN's suggestion.

*[At 6:11 pm, the Chairman ordered that the meeting be extended for 15 minutes to 6:45 pm to allow sufficient time for members' deliberation on the item and the next.]*

#### Other concerns

107. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired whether any greening zones, fish ponds or wetlands were located within the site boundary of the proposed works. DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD replied in the negative. He advised that the majority of the original ground surface of the project site was paved with concrete. He assured members that the proposed works would not affect the characteristics of Tai O as a fishing village.

108. Mr Frederick FUNG asked whether the Administration had formulated a strategy to support the sustainable development of Tai O as a traditional fishing village. In response, DPM(HKI&I)/CEDD said the greatest value of Tai O was the cultural heritage, such as the dragon boat water parade. The residents in Tai O had all along been engaged in preserving the tradition of Tai O. The Administration considered that the provision of and improvement to the community amenities would be the appropriate measures to facilitate the sustainable development of the Tai O fishing village.

Submission of the funding proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee

109. The Chairman enquired whether members supported that the funding proposal be submitted to PWSC for consideration. At members' request, the Chairman ordered a division. The division bell was rung for five minutes. Ten members voted for, 6 members voted against the proposal, and 1 member abstained. The votes of individual members were as follows:

*For:*

Mr CHAN Kam-lam  
Mr CHAN Kin-por  
Mrs Regina IP  
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung  
Dr Elizabeth QUAT  
(10 members)

Mr CHAN Hak-kan  
Mr IP Kwok-him  
Mr YIU Si-wing  
Miss Alice MAK  
Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok

*Against:*

Mr Frederick FUNG  
Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Dr Fernando CHEUNG  
(6 members)

Ms Cyd HO  
Dr Kenneth CHAN  
Dr Helena WONG

*Abstain:*

Miss CHAN Yuen-han  
(1 member)

110. The Chairman concluded that the Panel supported the submission of the funding proposal to PWSC for consideration.

**IX PWP Item No. 196WC — Implementation of Water Intelligent Network**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)660/15-16(01) — Administration's paper on 196WC — Implementation of Water Intelligent Network)

111. Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)3, Development Bureau ("PAS(W)3/DEVB"), said that the proposal was to upgrade part of PWP Item No. 196WC to Category A for the implementation of the first stage of the Water Intelligent Network ("WIN") at an estimated cost of \$239.7 million in MOD prices.

112. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Chief Engineer/Consultants Management (Acting), Water Supplies Department, elaborated on the scope, features and benefits of the proposed project. He explained that, with WIN, the Administration would be able to analyze the condition of the water distribution network and determine the most cost-effective means to maintain the healthiness of the network. Under WIN, the water distribution network would be divided into discrete District Metering Areas ("DMAs") and Pressure Management Areas ("PMAs") of manageable size. High-technology monitoring and sensing equipment would be installed in each DMA and PMA network. Tremendous amount of time-series flow and pressure data as well as other associated network data would be collected from the monitoring and sensing equipment. With WIN, an intelligent network management computer system would be established for analyzing the data collected for continuous monitoring of the condition of the water distribution network so as to assess the level of leakage and unauthorized consumption, and to enable timely determination of the priorities and the most effective network management measures for DMAs and PMAs.

*(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)851/15-16(03) by email on 27 April 2016.)*

113. The Chairman reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of RoP of LegCo, they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the subjects under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the subjects.

#### Replacement of aged water mains

114. Noting that, according to the Administration's paper, the leakage rate of water mains in Hong Kong had been reduced from exceeding 25% in 2000 to 15% in 2015, Dr Helena WONG considered that the present leakage rate was still high and urged the Administration to undertake measures to further reduce water mains leakage. Referring to the fact that the total length of water mains in Hong Kong was about 8 000 kilometres ("km") and about 3 000 km of aged water mains had been replaced and rehabilitated, Dr WONG asked whether the Administration had studied the conditions of the remaining 5 000 km of the water mains and had any plan to replace the deteriorated parts under the proposed WIN project; if so, of the details (including the locations of the deteriorated water mains and the replacement timetable).

115. PAS(W)3/DEVB advised that given the poor conditions of the water distribution network about a decade or so ago, the programme of Replacement and Rehabilitation of water mains ("R&R Programme") had been launched for a wholesale replacement and rehabilitation of around 3 000 km of the aged water mains. Following the substantial completion of the R&R Programme, the conditions of the water distribution network had been largely improved. With the proposed WIN, the Administration would be able to take a different network management approach by analyzing the conditions of the water distribution network and reprovisioning water mains that were identified as having a high risk of failure. As regards the location(s) of those water mains that had to be reprovisioned, PAS(W)3/DEVB said that while the proposed WIN had yet to be set up, the Administration had some information about where the water mains with a high risk of failure were located, and the proposed project had included the reprovisioning of some high-risk water mains.

#### Impact of water main bursts

116. Dr Kenneth CHAN said that water main bursts not only resulted in a waste of water resources, but also caused disturbance to road traffic and the residents nearby. Referring to the scope of the proposed project, which covered the establishment of about 85 DMAs and PMAs in Kwun Tong, Sha Tin and Tai Po districts only, Dr CHAN sought information from the Administration on the action that it would take to alleviate the problem of frequent occurrences of water main bursts and leakage in Hong Kong Island. Dr Helena WONG shared Dr CHAN's concern about the impact of water main bursts, and pointed out that such incidents occurred frequently in districts like Kowloon City and To Kwa Wan.

117. PAS(W)3/DEVB explained that eventually about 2 000 DMAs and PMAs would be established throughout the territory. Among these DMAs and PMAs, 600 would be established under the proposed project, whereas the other 1 400 were either established or being established as Category D public works projects. While these 1 400 DMAs and PMAs were originally developed on a distinct and individualistic basis, with the advancement of telecommunications equipment and analytical technology, the Administration would link up these DMAs and PMAs to the proposed intelligent network management system to be set up under the proposed project. By incorporating all the DMAs and PMAs into the proposed intelligent network management system, WIN would eventually be established and would enable efficient network management to cover the entire water distribution network in the territory. PAS(W)3/DEVB

undertook to provide the information requested by Dr CHAN after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)911/15-16(01) on 12 May 2016.)*

118. Dr Kenneth CHAN further asked if the Administration had analyzed the relevant data collected from the established DMAs and PMAs to improve the monitoring of the conditions of water mains. PAS(W)3/DEVB advised that although a number of DMAs and PMAs had been established, the intelligent network management computer system had yet to be procured under the proposed project to enable efficient analysis of the data collected.

*[At 6:30 pm, the Chairman sought members' view on whether they agreed to a further extension of the meeting beyond 6:45 pm to complete the deliberation of the item. Dr Fernando CHEUNG raised objection. The discussion ended at 6:42 pm.]*

119. The Chairman said that the discussion on the item would continue at the next meeting to be held on 24 May 2016. The meeting on 24 May would therefore be extended for 40 minutes to end at 5:40 pm.

## **X Any other business**

120. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:43 pm.