

新聞公報

行政長官於橫洲發展記者會的開場發言（只有中文）（附圖／短片）

行政長官梁振英聯同財政司司長曾俊華、運輸及房屋局局長張炳良教授、署理發展局局長馬紹祥、運輸及房屋局常任秘書長（房屋）應耀康和發展局副秘書長（規劃及地政）陳松青今日（九月二十一日）下午就橫洲發展舉行記者會。以下是梁振英的開場發言：

大家好。過去幾日，傳媒一直非常關注橫洲的房屋發展計劃。我們花了一些時間準備資料，今日我聯同財政司司長、運輸及房屋局和發展局的同事，向公眾說明橫洲公營房屋發展的相關問題，亦藉此機會，說明本屆政府解決房屋問題的決心，以及在過程中所遇到的困難。

增加土地和房屋供應一直是本屆政府施政的重中之重。二〇一三年，我們致力尋找土地興建公營房屋，當中元朗橫洲和北區皇后山是重點項目，因為這類面積大的土地不多，而且所有單位都是出租公屋或居屋，可以提供兩萬多個單位，大約等於全港一年的公營房屋總建屋量。這類大規模的發展項目通常涉及複雜的規劃、基建、交通、環保等多種問題，因此我決定親自主持工作小組，就橫洲和皇后山的發展作出一些高層次、方向性的決定，務求令項目可以盡快推展，解決基層市民的住屋問題。

這個工作小組於二〇一三年六月二十七日召開會議，與會者包括負責土地、房屋、規劃和環保等政策範疇的同事。工作小組議決的工作範圍包括盡快及盡量增加在橫洲和皇后山興建公營房屋，以及就有關發展面對的重大問題給予指導。

就橫洲的房屋發展而言，當日討論重點是提高地積比率，爭取建造更多單位，滿足市民對公營房屋的需求。會上亦討論當中涉及的法定程序、諮詢、棕地及環保等多個議題。這次會議決定將地積比率增至6.0。這個決定令我們可以在二〇二三／二四年興建第一期4,300個單位，第二、三期12,700個單位則於二〇二六／二七年落成，共提供17,000個單位。按照工作小組同意的安排，發展計劃的具體細節交由財政司司長領導的土地供應督導委員會跟進。我指出這個程序，是要說明橫洲發展，正如其他重大土地供應計劃一樣，要經過一個嚴謹、專業的決策過程。稍後我會請財政司司長向大家講解督導委員會的工作。

該次會議後，房屋署等部門的同事按一貫做法游說地區人士，並且聽取他們對橫洲發展的意見。就此，房屋署有紀錄顯示進行了四次游說工作，運輸及房屋局局長稍後會交代有關情況。

在游說當中，地區人士表達了各種意見，反對在橫洲興建17,000個單位，包括認為發展會對社區構成壓力，引致道路擠塞。由於橫洲發展會影響大批在棕地經營有社會功能的活動和受僱人士的生計，根據部門估計，必須要有新的政策去妥善處理。稍後署理發展局局長會交代處理棕地問題和所遇到的困難。

政府高層一直非常關心土地房屋發展，因此每星期我主持的三司會議上，都會討論規劃和土地房屋供應的工作進展。在二〇一四年一月二十七

日的會議上，運房局匯報地區人士在游說的時候強烈反對在橫洲興建17,000個單位。此外，部門亦認為需時妥善處理棕地問題，為免拖累整個建屋計劃，運房局建議先發展橫洲第一期，務求令4,000個單位早日落成，第二、三期則延後，但是興建17,000個單位的建屋目標維持不變。會議知悉這個建議及有關的考慮。我理解推動這個項目所面對的困難，支持部門朝這個方向開展工作。這個是我的決定。作為行政長官和特區的最高負責人，做決定是應有的擔當。

我用英文講講這句說話。This was my decision - the decision to carry out the development of the public housing programme in phases. Because as the CE, the Chief Executive of the Government, I have to take charge.

二〇一四年三月十一日，行政長官會同行政會議把屏山分區計劃大綱核准圖發還城規會作修訂，以反映最新土地用途建議，這個就是橫洲的第一期發展。

以上就是橫洲房屋發展的決策過程，是政府各部門經過專業的分析 and 評估得出的結論。我們採取先易後難的務實做法，是為了要盡快及盡量增加公營房屋供應，當中絕無任何所謂「官商鄉黑」。

雖然處理棕地問題需要時間，但政府有計劃就橫洲第二、三期房屋發展先作技術性研究，以縮短前期準備時間，當棕地問題找到解決方案後，我們便可盡快展開建屋工程。

以下我先請財政司司長向大家講解督導委員會的工作。

完

2016年9月21日（星期三）
香港時間16時18分

新聞公報

署理發展局局長於橫洲發展記者會的開場發言（只有中文）

行政長官梁振英聯同財政司司長曾俊華、運輸及房屋局局長張炳良教授、署理發展局局長馬紹祥、運輸及房屋局常任秘書長（房屋）應耀康和發展局副秘書長（規劃及地政）陳松青今日（九月二十一日）下午就橫洲發展舉行記者會。以下是馬紹祥的開場發言：

政府多管齊下的土地發展藍圖中，重整和釋放棕地作發展用途是我們一個主要的方向。

現屆政府在多年來的《施政報告》及《財政預算案》已一再表明處理有關棕地的議題。但正如清理寮屋，我們需要妥善處理好居民的補償安置問題，清理大規模的棕地亦需要審慎考慮對相關行業的影響。現時不少棕地作業，對物流、港口後勤、廢物回收、車輛維修、建築業等，都起着很重要的支援作用，亦提供不少就業機會，我們有必要小心考慮如何提供這些作業所需要的運作空間。

自棕地作業專責小組在二〇一四年成立後，我們做了大量工作，包括分別對洪水橋及元朗南的棕地作業分布及運作進行了調查。我們亦剛開展了顧問研究，希望以洪水橋新發展區作為試點，探討以多層工業大樓的模式，整合棕地作業的可行性，包括技術和財務方面的評估，以及探討經營和管理模式。我們預計研究會於二〇一八年中或以前完成。

向前看，我們正在檢討一套較為全面、適切可行的政策和措施去處理棕地。規劃署將於明年開展新界棕地使用及作業現況研究，就棕地的整體分布及用途展開全面的調查。調查結果將有助我們掌握棕地的資料，用以分析和制定棕地政策，針對不同地區的棕地，制訂適當的規劃和整合策略，達致善用土地、改善鄉郊的目標。

完

2016年9月21日（星期三）

香港時間16時45分

新聞公報

財政司司長於橫洲發展記者會的開場發言（只有中文）

行政長官梁振英聯同財政司司長曾俊華、運輸及房屋局局長張炳良教授、署理發展局局長馬紹祥、運輸及房屋局常任秘書長（房屋）應耀康和發展局副秘書長（規劃及地政）陳松青今日（九月二十一日）下午就橫洲發展舉行記者會。以下是曾俊華的開場發言：

大家好。剛才行政長官已經簡介了橫洲項目規劃的經過。

正如他所講，由他主持的專責小組在二〇一三年六月底開了一次會議，當時我正在外地訪問，所以未有出席。

大家都可能知道，我是「土地供應督導委員會」的主席。這個督導委員會的主要工作是統籌有關部門，協調不同用途土地供應的計劃，以及為本港未來發展預留足夠土地儲備。

由行政長官主持的專責小組在二〇一三年六月的會議上，要求「土地供應督導委員會」跟進橫洲發展項目，我們是全面積極地跟進，而且負責推展橫洲項目的相關部門，亦一直有向督導委員會報告工作進度，以及地區人士對橫洲發展計劃持有的意見。

至於日前有傳媒朋友問到，督導委員會有否決定將橫洲項目分期執行，我澄清督導委員會並沒有作出有關的決定，我相信大家現在都已經清楚。

作為督導委員會主席，我最重視的是我們可否有足夠的土地達至政府長遠興建房屋的目標。就着橫洲的項目，我關注它會否影響整體目標。因此我多次責成有關部門要盡最大努力，克服各種困難，提供足夠土地供應來配合政府長遠興建房屋的目標。

督導委員會亦留意到橫洲和不少新界發展項目都牽涉棕地這個問題，所以我亦在一四年六月成立「棕地作業專責小組」，由發展局牽頭，亦有相關部門參與工作，探討如何處理棕地作業相關的問題。署理發展局局長稍後會交代政府在這方面的工作進展。

多謝各位。

完

2016年9月21日（星期三）
香港時間16時25分

新聞公報

運輸及房屋局局長於橫洲發展記者會的開場發言（只有中文）

行政長官梁振英聯同財政司司長曾俊華、運輸及房屋局局長張炳良教授、署理發展局局長馬紹祥、運輸及房屋局常任秘書長（房屋）應耀康和發展局副秘書長（規劃及地政）陳松青今日（九月二十一日）下午就橫洲發展舉行記者會。以下是張炳良教授的開場發言：

房屋署在推行橫洲公共房屋發展計劃，跟推行其他房屋計劃一樣，都是按政府的既定程序去進行。

我們在二〇一二年七月開始為橫洲公共房屋發展及元朗工業邨擴展進行「規劃及工程研究」。從顧問研究的一些初步報告及草擬資料，二〇一三年中各部門已掌握一些數據和分析，研究如何推展橫洲的公營房屋發展。當時將房屋用地分為第一、二、三期，目標是希望一併發展三期，儘管落成日期會有先後。

後來，相關部門於二〇一三年年底商討後，認為第二、三期涉及各種問題，包括第二、三期有大面積棕地，必須先有妥善的棕地作業重置政策去配合。房屋署於二〇一四年一月向我匯報並建議先進行橫洲第一期公營房屋發展共四千個單位的建議，好處是可令我們提早興建四千個公屋單位，得以納入當時的十年公屋供應計劃內，及為免元朗區其他公營房屋發展計劃受到拖延，作為局長，我認同房屋署這個建議。

我們亦將這個建議上報由行政長官主持的「三司」會議。此後各部門按照既定的程序，將橫洲發展第一期計劃在二〇一四年六月正式諮詢元朗區議會，並且在二〇一五年六月，即一年後，完成改劃程序。

橫洲第二、三期的公營房屋發展，涉及共約一萬三千個單位，這一直在政府的長遠規劃內。但是有關發展需要妥善的交通和公共設施配套，以及環境影響緩解措施，更關鍵的是能否處理棕地作業的問題。這些考慮都是在規劃和發展大型項目時，我們經常要回應和處理的問題。如果我們將第一期和第二、三期一併發展，恐怕到今天我們仍然未能夠有條件去啟動在橫洲興建公營房屋的程序。

一如很多其他項目一樣，房屋署及相關政府部門的同事曾於二〇一三年七月至二〇一四年三月就橫洲公營房屋發展與一些地區代表進行非正式諮詢及游說。

正如我在上星期四表示，這些非正式諮詢不一定有會議紀錄。當時我是這樣說的：「我們不敢肯定在今次這個事情，究竟有沒有紀錄，或紀錄是怎樣，我都叫同事回去查一查」。現在房屋署同事在翻查資料後，確認沒有會議紀錄，但我們找到一些出席會議的同事的內部電郵，向上級匯報於非正式諮詢期間所搜集到的意見，和在工作文書中對這些會面的一些提述。

綜合這些資料，房屋署人員就橫洲項目曾作出四次的游說，簡要如下：

第一次在二〇一三年七月十六日，房屋署同事與元朗區議會主席梁志祥及當區區議員鄧慶業，和屏山鄉鄉事委員會主席曾樹和、副主席鄧達善及代表屏山鄉的鄉議局特別議員鄧志強會面。房屋署的資料沒有提及，但事後我們近期得到確認，元朗民政事務處（民政處）同事亦有出席。會上討論到政府打算在橫洲興建一萬七千個公共房屋單位的建議。該等地區代表提出各種關注，表示反對，房屋署同事當時表示不能接受減少規模。

第二次在二〇一三年九月五日，房屋署、民政處、創新科技署、香港科技園公司及「規劃及工程研究」顧問公司各代表和上述五位人士見面。會上介紹了橫洲打算建造一萬七千個公共房屋單位，以及元朗工業邨擴建。該等地區代表提出各種關注，反對兩項建議。他們認為政府只應發展第一期。

第三次（在）二〇一四年三月十二日，房屋署及民政處同事與上述五位人士見面，就在橫洲興建四千個公共房屋單位的建議（即第一期建議）會面。我們翻查資料中沒有找到關於該次會面的更多資料。

第四次是二〇一四年三月十七日，房屋署及民政處同事亦與另外兩位旁邊受到影響區域的區議員黃偉賢及鄭俊宇見面；他們支持橫洲興建約四千個公營房屋單位的建議，並且就保育樹木、增加單車泊位等事情提出意見。這是上述四次會面的一些情況。

各位，我必須強調，這些非正式諮詢及游說工作在一些影響地區的政府項目當中頗為普遍，但是這並不是、亦不會取代正式的諮詢程序。政府於二〇一四年四月開始諮詢鄉事委員會及元朗區議會，這是關於第一期的發展。還有其後的城規會程序，當中包括刊憲諮詢公眾，接受及處理陳述等。

目前要推進橫洲第二、三期，我們仍然預計須要克服很多實際的困難，包括來自北面工業邨的污染、基建配套，以及如何處理棕地作業的問題。

為了壓縮規劃工序，政府現在決定在繼續研究解決棕地問題的同時，平行為第二、三期發展進行進一步技術研究，我們估計這需要約兩年時間。

最後我想強調橫洲第二、三期涉及一些大型工程基礎建設的配套問題，也涉及較突出的大量棕地及污染問題。二〇一四年初政府決定先推行橫洲第一期，令我們當時可以在相對較短時間內啟動各項正式諮詢程序，並在一年時間左右大致完成這些程序。如果當日堅持將橫洲第一、二、三期一併推出，恐怕到今天我們應該仍未可以啟動有關程序，亦不可能希望有四千個公營房屋單位在二〇二四／二五年度內完成。

多謝各位。

完

2016年9月21日（星期三）
香港時間17時45分

新聞公報

橫洲發展記者會答問全文

行政長官梁振英聯同財政司司長曾俊華、運輸及房屋局局長張炳良教授、署理發展局局長馬紹祥、運輸及房屋局常任秘書長（房屋）應耀康和發展局副秘書長（規劃及地政）陳松青今日（九月二十一日）下午就橫洲發展舉行記者會。以下是記者會的答問全文：

記者：想請教特首，剛才你講到你做決定的時候，其實想了解當時你有否考慮過，因為有報章引述政府內部一些文件，指不想與露天貨倉的一些持份者有直接衝突。是否有考慮過這個原因所以你才有一個這樣的決定，決定分階段發展？以及你之前說過不會有任何妥協，為何與報章引述的文件，剛才的說法有出入？另外亦想請教，在橫洲二、三期，各位局長及特首你都說，未來仍然會發展，但報章引述的文件都說，其實短至中期是難以發展。會如何克服這些困難？是否可以承諾公眾何時可以看到一萬七千個單位能齊齊整整見到？

行政長官：你最後的問題我稍後請張炳良局長回答你。你的問題其實在剛才張炳良局長的發言當中都可以找到答案，包括甚麼？張局長他聽了有關部門在二〇一三年底商討之後，認為第二、三期涉及各種問題，為免其他公營房屋發展計劃受到拖延，他本人都認同房屋署的建議。直至有關建議來到我主持的三司會，我聽取這些建議後，我認同、支持這些建議，我認同、支持這個方向，向這個方向推進。同時我亦重申，這個亦是房屋局同事他們堅持的，包括剛才局長說在二〇一三年九月五日我們的同事，應是一三年七月十六日房屋署同事當時向他們的游說對象表示不能夠接受減少規模，所以我們不會因為有地區人士反對我們就放棄一萬七千個建屋總目標。

運輸及房屋局局長：或者我補充幾句。其實不單只橫洲這個發展項目，在我們很多地區的房屋項目，無論是大規模，有時規模不太大，地區的聲音很多，一些有保留、有各種關注的聲音很多，有些時候，我們到區議會正式上會時，有時反對、保留的聲音繼續存在的。從政府而言，當然我們要向社區的民眾交代，所以亦需要很正視他們所提出來的種種疑問。但最終而言，我們解決現時社會上房屋這個問題，我們認為是我們施政上最重要的一個優先考慮，所以我們會盡量平衡地區上的關注，但最終如果我們認為是有條件去做的，我們會迎難而上。在橫洲第二、三期的問題，正如我剛才發言所講，除了社區上有種種聲音之外，我們面對一個很關鍵的挑戰，便是怎樣處理大面積棕地上的作業。剛才那位記者朋友說所謂露天儲物，即英文 ‘open storage’。‘open storage’ 是規劃裡面一個地帶的用途表述，不是我們一般口語上說「露天擺些貨」這麼簡單，是在那個地帶有很多作業，可能有修理汽車、可能有一些環保回收業、物流、其他的行業等等，這些行業有一些有它們的經濟價值、社會價值，最終來說並不是清（理）了它們，而是重新安置它們的問題。這麼大面積的作業，我們房屋署也好，或者其他相關的政府部門，經過商討之後，認為一定有一個比較全面妥善的政策去處理，這是其中一個我們面對的（問題）。第二個我們面對的（問題），因為鄰近工業邨，那些污染的問題，在環境的限制下，我們如何去解決呢？所以，當時部門之間在二〇一三年年底、十二月的時候，經過討論認為沒有條件這麼快解決到這些問題，更加遑論社區

上的一些關注。

如果我們心中無底，未能夠很掌握到如何去處理這些問題的時候，我們去到正式諮詢程序的時候，去到區議會，其實都是解決不到的。所以我們認為應該要先易後難，先處理第一期，第一期的棕地面積是比較小的，用數字上來說是低過百分之二是棕地面積，所以相對是比較容易去處理。當然我們明白，任何的土地發展有時可能要收回土地，有時要處理在一些地方上的一些寮屋、其他各方面的問題，這些在過去都有這樣的項目的事例。但房屋署同事作過分析之後，覺得如果我們盡快希望有一些數字出來，我們知道社會上很焦急，如果能夠先做第一期，先有四千個單位，這對於我們面對未來十年的建屋計劃是有幫助的。所以我作為局長，我接受這樣的一個取捨。

行政長官：我在這裏補充一句，剛才張炳良局長講「棕土」，我們剛才發言的時候有時候用「棕地」。社會上「棕土」、「棕地」都有人用，英文是brownfield site，是一個概念來的，不是兩種東西來的，是同一個東西。

記者：想問問，其實特首堅持沒有向鄉紳妥協，但其實文件都顯示其實是因為他們反對，甚至你今日都承認了是因為運房局的匯報，是因為他們的反對而縮減規模，而餘下的一萬三千個單位其實現在都沒有期，其實是否變相餘下的單位是名存實亡，即是之前的說法是否「講大話」？另外想問問，其實特首要做一個公營房屋規劃的一個小組主席，為甚麼？這件事是否比較罕有？以往有沒有做過？為甚麼特別皇后山和橫洲這個計劃要出動特首去做這個工作小組？其實是否如報道所說是涉及一些鄉紳的利益，甚至是附近一些私人發展商，例如新世界他們在附近亦申請興建單位，是否因為有關係所以要出動你去做這個工作小組主席？多謝。

行政長官：完全不是。房屋問題是困擾香港社會多年的問題，房屋短缺是因為土地短缺。而本屆特區政府四個施政重點——房屋、扶貧、安老、環境，第一個就是房屋問題。而社會大眾大多數人多年以來，在我上任前就非常關注香港樓價高、租金高，而且上升勢頭不斷的問題。所以我在過去四年經常向大家說，我很感謝我們各個部門的同事迎難而上，他們真的做到前仆後繼去爭取改劃土地，因此，甚至在社會上有些人批評我們說我們「盲搶地」。我們爭取更多的建屋土地興建公營房屋，興建私人房屋，問題是甚麼呢？為了解決大家住屋的難題。

如果我們要去迴避某些人士或某些界別利益的話，今日大家看不到，當亞太地區主要房地產市場樓價升了百分之五的同時，香港下跌了百分之八。我們增加土地供應，令到樓價下跌、租金下跌，會否有人不喜歡我本人呢？大家心中有數。所以我們迎難而上，我們為全社會做事，我們不會因為某些界別的利益，對我們增加土地供應、增加樓房供應有意見，我們就不去做。所以我們確實是本着一個很堅強的意志去為社會做事。

香港很多問題，無論是現在舖租貴、寫字樓租金高、大家住的情況不好、醫院很擠迫，說到底都是土地短缺問題，所以我十分重視香港的土地供應。而這兩個項目，皇后山在北區，橫洲在元朗，這兩個項目全部都是用來建公營房屋，包括出租公屋、包括居屋，就是為了解決基層上樓、中產置業的問題。

如果說橫洲這個問題，我因為一些鄉事的利益或一些周邊土地的地產

商利益，過去四年大家不會看到我們在土地問題上做了那麼多工作。而皇后山是在同一個工作小組裏的一個項目，皇后山是甚麼呢？過去是一個軍營，完全沒有一個鄉事問題在內，亦沒有旁邊甚麼地產商的利益在內。我把皇后山和橫洲放在一起，在一個工作小組裏和大家同事一起努力解決問題做事，為甚麼？

剛才發言時其實也說過，兩萬多個單位！這類土地，這麼大面積，我們可以解決到規劃問題。一塊地可以有萬多個單位來幫助萬多個家庭，我認為我應該有這樣的擔當去做。我們如果可以解決到這兩塊地的發展問題，我認為我們始終會解決。香港住屋短缺問題會有紓緩；解決不到，香港的住屋問題會繼續惡化。這個就是我們的初衷。

大家看橫洲、看皇后山。大家可以看在過去四年，特區政府在土地房屋問題上所作的努力這個大背景，大家就會得到一個清晰的、正確的信息。

署理發展局局長：或者我解釋一下關於土地規劃方面的工作。就橫洲的規劃，當我們檢討土地用途的時候，會考慮不同的規劃因素。現時橫洲主要是一些荒廢農地，有一部分是常耕農地，有部分是有植被的土地，但亦有很大部分是寮屋和臨時構築物。露天倉庫則沿朗屏路及福喜路一帶，現時有不同的作業，包括停車場、修車場、物流運作和環保回收的工業。

在規劃橫洲用地範圍的時候，我們考慮到這個地段臨近元朗新市鎮，主要是棕地作業、寮屋和臨時構築物，地勢亦相對平坦，所以適合作為大型公營房屋的規劃。當然，在規劃的過程中，我們要避免有生態價值的土地，同時亦要撇除三條村，即是永寧村、鳳池村和水田村的村界，這就是我們如何在規劃的角度去定橫洲公營房屋發展的範圍。

剛才你提到在橫洲公營房屋用地的旁邊有一個規劃申請，將「綠化地帶」改劃為「住宅地帶」，所處的地方位於村界範圍內，所以之前規劃署物色的橫洲用地並沒有包括該些土地。這些地段主要在村界範圍裏，一般不會包括在發展用地內。

記者：想問司長，剛才特首和局長都有提到，為何四次摸底或游說工作都只是見了建制派和一些鄉事便決定將計劃縮水，這不是妥協或屈服又是甚麼？另外就是，日前市民都很關心為何曾司長會發一個聲明去反對特首的一些說法。外界關注你們兩位是否各自打算競選特首而內訌或不妥。曾司長你剛才說你永遠都是agree with你的老闆，但為何你又要發聲明當晚澄清或反對他的說法呢？可否解釋一下？

財政司司長：我想第一部分問題應該是Anthony（運輸及房屋局局長張炳良教授）答，或許我答你第二部分問題。我答的問題是沒有反對特首的聲明。我是(被)問及兩個很簡單的問題。第一，我是否專責小組的成員？我說「我是專責小組成員，但我沒有去那個會，因為我不在香港」。第二個問題就是，是否這個督導委員會作出決定？我就是答，「不是督導委員會作出的決定」。你覺得這個是和特首的聲明是有反調嗎？我覺得這個想法有少少奇怪。

運輸及房屋局局長：關於那四次與一些地區的代表(的游說)，不是四次與同一批人的，有三次是，但是我們要明白，我們的定位不是與鄉事。我們通常政府部門做一些地區上非正式的諮詢、游說工作，因為這差不多在地

區上，很多區議會期望我們上會前先作些接觸，這是很多影響到地區的項目，都會有這個情況。那麼怎樣去定見甚麼人呢？通常是區議會主席，有些區議會可能是屬下的一些委員會，譬如交通，有交通及運輸委員會，那可能也會見T&T Committee的主席。在鄉郊地方，是當區的鄉事委員會的主席。所以你要看剛才我所說，遲些有正式文本出來時大家知道，每一位都有一個身份，不是隨便去揀選的。第四次及第三次(游說)就是我們上會前，即上區議會前，說第一期發展是說四千個單位，第三次都是說四千個單位。第四次（游說），我們的同事亦有與在那個發展的地區鄰近的區議會區域的兩位區議員，黃偉賢議員和鄭俊宇區議員（見面），兩位都是民主派的議員。

記者：有幾個問題想繼續追問。第一，其實第一期的發展，同樣我們現在見到有些村民反對，但是其實政府好像在整個過程中完全沒有問過他們的意見，就立刻同意了四千個。為何第二、三期有人反對便立刻延遲？而第一期有人反對，你們是不知道所以硬着「去馬」，還是甚麼原因？第二個問題是，區議會其實我們現在所知道，是沒有收到一個資訊指第二、三期是會發展，我們譬如從梁志祥議員那邊聽到他們是不知道，即是政府沒有向他們說有第二、第三期。其實是不是「呃住先」，等他們同意了第一期便「上馬」先？第二、三期你們不打算向他們說，之後就不知怎樣再做？第三，想問特首，因為我們根據資料知道，新世界其實那幅地，即是準備向城規會申請轉用途那幅地，其實在九十年代已買下，最近才申請轉用途，不知與橫洲事件是否有關。其實你自己是否知道新世界其實擁有該幅地？你是否知道這件事？以及這與你chair的那個Taskforce有否關係？

行政長官：簡單答你最後問題，不知道。請張炳良局長答你前面的問題。

運輸及房屋局局長：你有兩個問題。我先答第二個問題，亦即為何我們沒有提到二、三期的發展？在我們交給元朗區議會的文件，說到正式諮詢的階段，我們很清楚說橫洲第一期，假如沒有了二、三期的話，不應該說橫洲第一期。文件裡面亦有提及餘下的部分，我們還需要再進一步去探討、去研究。如果在政府部門裡面都未能就二、三期在發展上具體地如何處理，我們貿然上會也是無可能的。所以無提及二、三期如何做，的確是無提及，這是我們部門正常的操作。

至於你第一個問題說，第一期都影響到一些居民，為何不諮詢他們？其實有諮詢他們，因為到了正式的法定程序，當我們提出來的時候，根據城規的程序，亦都有刊憲的公眾諮詢，事實上，城規會（城市規劃委員會）亦收到一定數量的陳述，包括一些反對意見，是完全透明公開地去做。可能你的疑問我稍後請署長／常秘再補補少少；亦即是說，當房屋署提出建議給我，作為局長，先進行第一期發展，他們是否有其他考慮？看一看他是否有甚麼補充？

運輸及房屋局常任秘書長（房屋）：正如剛才局長都強調過，在非正式諮詢時得到的意見，我們是重視的，但不能取代我們部門自己要作的一個分析，然後看看怎樣應對得到的意見，亦都不能取代應有的正式的諮詢。譬如剛才說到的第一期，當我們釐定好方案後，我們會進行各個諮詢程序。先到鄉事委員會作正式諮詢，相關文件及討論內容是大家可以看到的。跟着到元朗區議會，同樣有文件、有公開的討論。跟着的改劃涉及城市規劃委員會（城規會），城規會有法定的程序，我看過一些記錄，收到很多反對書。在城規會的會議上，大家公開討論，見到他們傾了些甚麼。

另外，還有一個程序，要刊憲修改一些道路。雖然我們說橫洲第一期可以比較快做，但仍然要做些道路，這些道路的規劃過程刊憲後亦收到一些反對書，政府仍在處理中，道路的修改程序仍未完。所以，我們必然不會繞過在法定上和習慣上的很多程序，亦會透過這些程序，讓居民大家知道我們提議些甚麼，各方面有何意見和我們有何分析。

記者：想問特首，你是這個專責小組主席，早前特首辦都說過你每個星期都開一些跨部門會議，正處理二、三十個土地發展項目。其實是否每一個跨部門會議你都是主席？而是否因為一些涉及很多棕地和地區人士的利益，所以你才會介入今次這個小組做主席？第二條問題，是想問一問張局長的。就是想問問上星期四，你見兩位候任議員時說不肯定是否有一些會議記錄。其實，到今日，行政長官和你都說了很多關於那些會議的一些詳情。其實當日是否有一些誤導成份，是否「講大話」？另外，想一起問曾司長，就是想問星期一時，行政長官說具體是由你的督導委員會負責，你會否覺得他是想卸責給你？

行政長官：簡單回答你的問題，就是「不是」。請張炳良局長。

運輸及房屋局局長：很多謝你給我機會去申冤，我被人指控我誤導等等，我想說一說，本來不應該公開說的，在我和陳茂波局長見兩位候任立法會議員的時候，最初朱凱迪候任議員問我，他說你做這些「摸底」，你當然說得出人、地、時。我大抵上的回應，我也沒有這樣一個會議記錄，但我憑記憶，因為不是太久之前，我說當然知道見過什麼人了，否則我們同事怎能去歸納意見呢？但有沒有一個正式的會議記錄，我說我不敢肯定，當時坐在我旁邊，我的左手邊是房屋署副署長馮宜萱女士，我就問一句，她叫Ada，我問Ada，有沒有什麼補充？有沒有？Ada說要回去check check。所以我當時便說我真的不知道有沒有，不敢肯定。如果我都不知道有沒有時，而我說有或沒有，便是誤導了。我後來見記者的時候，我剛才發言的時候讀的那些是我特地找回我當天見記者那份稿我是怎樣說的，當時我說就是未必一定有，我不知道就橫洲這一件事有沒有記錄，或者有記錄，是什麼記錄，我們要回去check。現在我們check出來，的確是沒有一個所謂會議記錄，我們現在說見面四次，日子及見過什麼人，全都是從同事的電郵，或者是一些匯報的文件裏面提及，有些詳盡一點，有些沒有那個詳盡，這樣展示出來。

財政司司長：我不知道為甚麼你會有這樣印象，即是你剛才問的那個問題。其實在專責小組未要求我去作出跟進前，其實就着橫洲這方面，我們已經開始了有些工作，所以剛才我告訴你，其實我們這個小組由二〇一〇年已經開始，開始了一段時間。就着這些事情，我們亦都做了不少工作。專責小組要求我們再跟進時，我們會繼續很積極地去跟進這件事，亦不時聽到有些進度報告等等，我們亦會繼續做好這件事。

行政長官：回答最後一個問題了，我去機場。

橫洲這件事，當橫洲和皇后山，今日沒有人說皇后山，皇后山都有很多困難。橫洲這件事或者都是一個幾好的機會，向社會展示一下我們做事的決心和我們碰到的一些困難。這亦是為何我過去很多時候，有機會見到傳媒朋友的時候，或者在其他場合，說起我們最新的土地供應、樓房供應，我們說我們現時在建的私人樓，亦即是未來三至四年可以落成的私人樓的數目又創新高，有九萬三千個單位，我接着說的一句是甚麼？我說很感謝各個有關部門的同事，包括公務員同事的辛勞。大家通過橫洲這件

事，大家可以看到我們有各個方面的考慮，有阻力、有困難。我過去都很多時候公開呼籲，希望社會各界、地區人士能夠乃念我們房屋問題的嚴重性，尤其是對基層市民的影響，很多人現時仍然住在劏房等等，希望大家支持、配合政府的工作。我真的要感謝政府的同事，無論公營房屋、私營房屋，我們做出來的成績粒粒皆辛苦。

（請同時參閱談話全文英文部分）

完

2016年9月21日（星期三）
香港時間20時36分

新聞公報

政府就橫洲發展回應傳媒查詢

* * * * *

就傳媒查詢橫洲公營房屋發展及元朗工業邨擴展計劃的政府土地數量及住戶數目，政府發言人今日（九月二十八日）表示，在二〇一二年開展的規劃及工程可行性研究，顧問推算當時發展範圍內（橫洲第1、2、3期公營房屋及元朗工業邨擴展）的政府土地約有14公頃，估計有40餘間房屋及約210間臨時搭建物，但並無住戶數目估計。政府會在推展有關計劃時作出詳盡的統計。

目前，為協助推展橫洲公營房屋第1期，地政總署已就第1期範圍內政府土地及私人土地的面積作出統計（分別約為3.4公頃政府土地及3.5公頃私人土地），並於二〇一五年十月就第1期所涉土地進行凍結登記，當時約180戶（涉及約400人）及數個商戶被登記，但由於有部分構築物的佔用人拒絕登記，有關數字目前未必完全反映受影響的戶數。

至於橫洲發展的規劃及工程可行性研究報告，政府發言人指，該研究共16份報告、有過千頁的內容，當中包含一些敏感資料，例如有關土地、工程財務資料等，公開有關資料可能會影響公眾利益。政府經適當地處理相關敏感資料後，會將16份報告於新一屆立法會正式開始工作時，提交立法會並予公開。

完

2016年9月28日（星期三）
香港時間14時53分

新聞公報

回應傳媒就橫洲公共房屋發展計劃的查詢

* * * * *

就傳媒關於橫洲公共房屋發展計劃提出的一些查詢，政府發言人今日（九月三十日）表示，在翻查多項資料後綜合回覆如下：

我們以往曾解釋，在二〇一二年開展的橫洲發展的規劃及工程可行性研究，涵蓋多個技術環節，包括交通及運輸影響、地質可行性和地盤平整、天然地形危險、渠務影響、污水收集系統影響、供水及公用設施影響、環境影響、空氣流通、土地需求、樹木普查、財務評估等，而各部分在不同時間陸續完成。政府原擬同時發展第1、2、3期及元朗工業邨擴展。但隨着政府在二〇一四年初決定先推行第1期，第2、3期則延後，我們要求顧問在正進行的研究中，就交通及運輸、空氣流通、渠務、污水收集系統、供水及環境等方面作補充評估，以確認發展第1期的可行性。

我們早前指出橫洲發展的規劃及工程可行性報告包含一些敏感資料，政府經適當地處理相關敏感資料後，會於新一屆立法會正式開始工作時，將報告提交立法會並予公開。

在為第1期進行土地用途改劃時須向城市規劃委員會（城規會）提交就第1期的影響評估。因此就交通及運輸和空氣流通方面，我們把可行性研究中的補充評估附載於二〇一四年十月十七日提交給城規會鄉郊及新市鎮規劃小組委員會的文件（文件編號：RNTPC Paper No. 13/14）。

我們在把這些補充評估呈交鄉郊及新市鎮規劃小組委員會前確認了它們並沒有敏感資料，只是相關同事在準備文件時，沒有把要求保密的字句刪除。

在上述有關交通及運輸的補充評估中指出「planning parameters are yet to be confirmed at the stage of the study. As for a conservative approach, it is assumed that the total number of flats is capped at 5,000 units with PRH/HOS ratio of 50:50 for technical assessment purpose……」這段文字說明，第1期房屋項目的「規劃參數」並未敲定；評估採用了「保守方法」（conservative approach），「假定」單位總數「上限」（capped at）為5,000個；而公屋／居屋比例「假定」為50:50亦只是為了「技術評估目的」（technical assessment purpose），以保留彈性，確保技術評估結果適用於日後的發展項目。文件RNTPC Paper No. 13/4本身明確表示，擬建單位是4,000個。至於未來實際單位總數及出租房屋與資助出售房屋的比例，目前還未決定。

我們在提交給鄉郊及新市鎮規劃小組委員會的交通評估中，橫洲第1期連接道路的走線，與土木工程拓展署在二〇一五年五月二十一日提交元朗區議會交通及運輸委員會的文件（交委會文件2015/第39號）中所提供的走線有所分別。

至於改變走線的原因，土木工程拓展署已在上述的元朗區議會文件中詳細交代：「土木工程拓展署透過優化該道路設計，及將其走線於發展用

地範圍內向北移，以方便有關公眾人士更直接地進出發展用地外北面的葬區，毋須穿過未來的屋邨範圍。」

就在橫洲公共房屋發展計劃附近的私人發展規劃申請，規劃署諮詢各部門時，房屋署表示不能接受該私人發展建議的道路入口進佔橫洲第1期公共房屋發展計劃的地界；以及橫洲第1期原本的道路設計並無計入該私人發展。

另外，有意見提及為何我們先推行橫洲第1期，第2、3期則延後。我們重申，這決定是希望能較早完成橫洲第1期的4,000個公共房屋單位。就此我們簡介一些技術細節。

道路交通方面，發展橫洲第1期只需要改善朗屏路及鳳池路交界處路口，以及興建通往橫洲第1期的通道。若橫洲第1、2、3期一併發展，則需要在元朗區內多處進行道路工程，例如朗屏路、宏樂街、福喜街、水邊圍交匯處等，並需要興建公共交通交匯處，工程更複雜，以及需要更長的時間制定方案及完工。

排污設備方面，發展橫洲第1期僅需要改善第1期當區的污水渠。橫洲第1、2、3期一併發展，則除了需要更大規模地改善當區及元朗區內的污水渠，亦要改善元朗污水處理廠，牽涉更複雜的工程，以及更長的時間制定方案和完工。

電力供應方面，現時的變壓站足以應付橫洲第1期的需求。橫洲第1、2、3期一併發展則需要覓地興建新的132kV變壓站。

棕地作業方面，橫洲第1期內只有約0.1公頃的棕地作業，第2、3期及元朗工業邨擴展範圍則共有約17公頃的棕地作業。第2、3期的大規模棕地作業，包括對物流、港口後勤、廢物回收和車輛維修等具支援作用的活動，亦提供就業機會，政府希望能更妥善處理。

此外，橫洲第1、2、3期內，有各類須處理的環境問題。其中較嚴重的是區內棕地作業帶來的污染。在地理位置上，第1期遠離第2、3期內的棕地作業及其帶來的污染。要推進第2期必須處理北面第3期棕地作業帶來的污染問題，而要發展第3期則須處理北面工業邨擴展範圍內的棕地作業帶來的污染。因此要推進第2、3期需要更長時間處理環境污染問題，包括處理第2、3期及工業邨擴展範圍內的棕地帶來的污染問題。

基於上述考慮，二〇一四年初政府決定先行推出橫洲第1期，在相對較短時間內啟動各項正式程序，務求4000個公共房屋單位可在二〇二四／二五年落成。

完

2016年9月30日（星期五）
香港時間19時33分

新聞公報

橫洲發展須顧及實際操作情況等因素

對於昨日公布的橫洲公營房屋發展及元朗工業邨擴展的規劃及工程可行性研究報告，政府發言人今日（十月十九日）重申，該份於二〇一二年至二〇一五年由顧問公司進行的研究報告只屬可行性研究，並不能完全反映時間因素及實際情況。

發言人表示，研究報告中提到，開展橫洲第二及三期並沒有「不可克服」（insurmountable）的困難，正因如此，政府一直計劃開展橫洲第一、二及三期，最終一共發展17 000個公營房屋單位。

發言人說：「此外，橫洲發展第一、二及三期各有需要克服的困難，而我們一直指出，橫洲第二及三期所需克服的困難較複雜，需要更多時間。」

「我們過往已指出研究報告的目的是探討項目在技術層面上的可行性。儘管技術上可行，惟在工程以外的前期程序，實際所需時間往往比工程技術探討時所作的估計長。例如，報告預計諮詢鄉事委員會及區議會只需兩個月。以我們的經驗，如果我們一併發展第一、二、三期，非正式及正式諮詢鄉事委員會及區議會，加上其他社區參與和諮詢，需時會多於兩個月。」

「除了各種交通、電力供應、排污等配套及有關處理環境影響的緩解措施外，鑑於橫洲第二、三期涉及大量棕地作業（共約七公頃），政府有必要制訂妥善方案去處理這些棕地作業。正如署理發展局局長在九月二十一日記者會上提到，政府正在檢討一套較為全面、適切可行的政策和措施處理棕地作業。」

完

2016年10月19日（星期三）

香港時間22時03分

新聞公報

回應傳媒關於橫洲規劃及工程研究的查詢

就近日傳媒關於「橫洲公共房屋發展及元朗工業邨擴展規劃及工程研究」（研究）的查詢，政府發言人今日（十月二十五日）有以下回應：

政府在公布該研究時附了一份「簡介」（www.thb.gov.hk/tc/popup/wangchau_report.htm），解釋一般而言規劃及工程研究的作用和局限，及就橫洲項目進行的研究本身的一些背景。就傳媒提出的一些問題，該簡介及政府早前回應傳媒問題時，已有就相關事宜作介紹，現總結有關資料以作參考。

該研究開始原打算將橫洲第1、2、3期及元朗工業區擴展以一個工程項目推出。但該研究的內容其後因應政府的推展策略而有所調整。政府在二〇一四年初決定先推行橫洲第1期發展，故該研究須加入內容針對為第1期改劃土地用途所須的技術評估。因此，我們指示顧問抽取適切的資料及作適當更新，增加五份技術報告及兩份技術資料摘記。

由於政府決定不會將橫洲第1期與第2、3期及工業邨擴展一併發展，該研究沒有再深入跟進一併發展所需的公眾諮詢或環境影響評估等。根據《環境影響評估條例》，研究範圍包括20公頃以上或涉及總人口超過100 000人的市區發展工程項目的工程技術可行性研究，方須進行環境影響評估報告。因第1期發展只佔地約5.6公頃及將來入住人口只有約12 000人，故此並不須要進行有關的環境影響評估。

另外，雖然該研究在早期階段曾討論一併發展橫洲第1、2、3期及工業邨擴展所需的公眾諮詢及社區參與，但因政府在二〇一四年初決定先行發展第1期，故該研究最終沒有建議和推行針對一併發展第1、2、3期及工業邨擴展所須的諮詢，而只是提議進行非正式諮詢及估計用2個月時間諮詢鄉事委員會及區議會。

關於非正式諮詢，我們曾經向傳媒澄清，該研究的第TR-4B報告第3.2.1.2段內所提及的兩次非正式諮詢，應該是二〇一三年七月及九月而不是二〇一二年七月及九月，此乃手民之誤。正確日期可參考該報告的第3.4.1.1段，同樣提及兩場非正式諮詢。這兩次會面正是運輸及房屋局局長於二〇一六年九月二十一日記者會上提及的二〇一三年七月及九月的非正式諮詢。詳情請參閱以下連結（www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/201609/21/P2016092100721.htm）。

該研究對各項工作的完成時間估計，部分是按橫洲第1、2、3期及元朗工業區擴展一併發展的最早期構思進行估計；此外，這些估計一般是假設相關程序順利，但往往未必符合實際情況。

該研究的結論的確是第1、2、3期沒有「不可克服的困難」。正因為如此，我們一直認為應繼續推進橫洲第2、3期公共房屋發展。反過來說，該研究指出第1、2、3期各有需要克服的困難，且第2、3期較為複雜；正因為克服第1期的困難需時較短而克服第2、3期的困難需時較長，故我們決定先推進第1期，延後2、3期。

有意見認為該研究未有考慮項目範圍內的住戶及棕地作業。一般而言，規劃及工程研究的目的是考慮項目的技術可行性，因項目仍屬前期研究階段及考慮到其保密性，過程中顧問公司會收集所需要的資料來進行研究，包括實地視察（如構築物數量等）及向相關部門（如土地註冊處）查詢，但並不包括詳細的人口調查、家庭數目等等或為棕地使用者登記。相關之調查或登記會在項目推展確定下來後適時由有關部門進行。

關於橫洲公共房屋計劃範圍，該研究的確提議剔除幾幅綠化地，另外加入三幅綠化地。政府同意這些改動。被剔除的綠化地包括一些「認可鄉村範圍」。根據政府既有政策，一般而言，考慮到認可鄉村範圍存在已久（認可鄉村範圍乃為於一九七二年十二月一日實施小型屋宇政策之前，在認可鄉村興建最後一間鄉村屋邊沿起計三百呎的範圍），原意為配合小型屋宇政策的實施，而任何收縮甚至取消認可鄉村範圍的建議難免引起另覓其他土地以作補足的訴求，就村界範圍內的土地，一般會建議避免包括在發展用地內。於橫洲進行規劃時也同樣沒有把認可鄉村範圍納入建議發展公共房屋的範圍。

這些改動，和傳媒問及的橫洲第1期內道路設計、與第1期西面的私人發展建議無關。事實上，該私人申請與第1期發展存在衝突之處。正如政府於二〇一六年九月三十日的新聞公報表示，規劃署就該私人發展規劃申請諮詢各部門時，房屋署表示不能接受該私人發展建議的道路入口進佔橫洲第1期公共房屋發展計劃的地界；以及第1期原本的道路設計並無計入該私人發展。就該私人建議將未來的公用道路西邊的盡頭路改作迴旋處，以通往該私人發展項目，房屋署表示該建議會影響公共房屋發展的道路設計，並會延誤公共房屋發展的進度，因此，私人發展須另行規劃連接道路。政府部門亦提出多方面的意見，包括：政府並無計劃將為公共房屋發展而建議興建的公用道路，延伸至該私人發展；以及為公共房屋發展而建議興建污水渠，只供公共房屋排污之用等等。

至於道路設計調整的原因，政府於二〇一六年九月三十日的新聞公報中已指出，土木工程拓展署在二〇一五年五月二十一日提交元朗區議會交通及運輸委員會的文件中，詳細交代了改變連接路走線的原因：「透過優化該道路設計，及將其走線於發展用地範圍內向北移，以方便有關公眾人士更直接地進出發展用地外北面的葬區，無須穿過未來的屋邨範圍。」

據我們的理解，上述私人申請仍未獲批。相關的發展商於本年九月二十九日再向城市規劃委會（城規會）為土地改劃的申請提交修訂資料。政府將會向城規會再次反映我們的意見。

完

2016年10月25日（星期二）
香港時間21時14分

新聞公報

立法會五題：中資財團購入香港商住用地和物業的影響

以下為今日（十一月九日）立法會會議上謝偉俊議員的提問和署理運輸及房屋局局長邱誠武的答覆：

問題：

近年，中資財團斥巨資購入本港商住用地和物業的個案越來越多。過去數月，三分之二甲級商業大廈均由中資財團掃入，涉款高達200多億元，遠超過去十年總數。此外，過去兩年，政府出售50多幅住宅用地當中，約兩成由中資財團購入。在水漲船高下，首個按「港人港地」政策（即設有只限將單位轉售予港人地契條款）興建並由中資財團發展的住宅樓盤，其單位售價高達每平方呎一萬八千多元。與此同時，本地發展商為爭逐發展用地，亦加入高價競投土地，導致很多200至300平方呎蝸居的呎價動輒高達兩萬元，遠超一般市民負擔能力。就此，政府可否告知本會：

（一）有否評估中資財團持續購入本港商住用地及物業，對市民置業及營商能力有否影響；如有評估，詳情為何；如沒有評估，會否盡快進行；所謂「北水湧港」情況會否將行政長官期望藉增加土地供應以冷卻過熱樓市的政策效果抵銷；如會，詳情為何；

（二）會否因應樓價仍不斷上升的情況，提出和落實更有效的房屋政策，以協助首次置業家庭及紓緩青年人居住問題；及

（三）鑑於政府進行橫洲公營房屋發展時據說採取「先易後難」方式（即拆遷非原居民鄉村，然後才發展棕地），政府會否調整該做法，改為先收回被違法佔用的官地以發展大面積棕地，從而更快增加住宅用地供應？

答覆：

主席：

在整合發展局及相關部門提供的資料後，我現就謝偉俊議員提出的各部分答覆如下：

（一）在過去兩年多（由二〇一四／一五年財政年度至二〇一六年十一月二日），政府售出的68幅住宅、商業／商貿／酒店，以及工業用地中，根據投標者在投標表格裏提供的資料分析（註一），有11幅用地由內地企業（包括與內地企業有關或合資公司）的發展商中標。

政府積極增加土地和房屋供應，並致力管理需求。現屆政府於二〇一二年引入買家印花稅，並於二〇一三年引入雙倍從價印花稅，遏抑外來和投資需求。樓價在去年第四季至今年第一季期間下跌11.3%。今年第三季，涉及非本地個人及非本地公司買家的住宅物業交易為每月平均105宗，佔住宅物業總成交的1.5%，遠低於引入買家印花稅前十個月的平均每月365宗或4.5%。

不過，自今年四月起，樓市回升及再出現亢奮跡象，樓價急速上升，目前已回復至接近去年九月的歷史高位。其實，在環球超低利息及資金充裕的大環境下，房價高企並非香港獨有，其他一些大城市（註二）亦面對同樣挑戰。

儘管住宅物業供應穩步增加，但短期內供求仍然失衡。為穩定樓市，防止泡沫風險惡化，並優先照顧未持有任何其他香港住宅物業的香港永久性居民的置居需求，政府於十一月四日（即上星期五）決定全面提高住宅物業交易的從價印花稅稅率至15%。現行機制下的豁免安排不變（註三）。

（二）目前房屋需求殷切，不分年齡層。只有盡快增加整體供應，重建房屋階梯，才可切實回應首次置業者及青年人的長遠住屋需要。就此，政府把二〇一六／一七至二〇二五／二六年度的十年期總供應目標訂為46萬個單位，當中28萬為公營房屋。

資助出售單位，例如居者有其屋（居屋），是不少家庭自置居所的第一步。香港房屋委員會（房委會）已復建居屋，並於二〇一四年和今年預售新建居屋單位，亦於上月開始預售綠表置居先導計劃單位。此外，房委會分別在二〇一三年及去年推出兩輪「擴展居者有其屋計劃第二市場至白表買家的臨時計劃」（坊間俗稱「白居二」），讓符合白表資格的人士在居屋第二市場購買未補價的居屋單位。

截至今年九月底，預計未來3至4年一手住宅物業的供應量達93 000個單位。全球各大城市的經驗皆顯示，供應緊絀和低息貸款是導致房價租金上升的原因。若政府及社會不下定決心，咬緊牙關，覓地建屋，問題不會輕易解決，最終受困的亦是低下收入階層或年青一代。

（三）政府自二〇一四年初起決定分階段開展橫洲公共房屋發展計劃，先發展第1期，務求令4 000個單位早日落成，納入十年期建屋計劃內，第2、3期則延後；但總共興建17 000個單位的目標不變。這個決定是基於一併發展第1、2、3期會涉及較複雜的基建建設配套，包括交通、排污及電力供應；而第2、3期用地亦較第1期用地涉及更多棕地作業及環境問題，令工程更複雜，需要更長時間去制定方案及施工。政府早前已解釋有關分析，詳細有附件供大家參考。

有意見認為我們應該只發展第2、3期，或者先發展第2、3期然後再發展第1期。部分人士可能以為第2、3期的政府土地較第1期多，收地較容易；或者以為第2、3期主要是「棕地」，不涉及「綠化地帶」；或者第2、3期不需要遷徙民居。事實並非這樣簡單。

首先，第2、3期用地上政府土地比例低於第1期：第1期佔38%，第2、3期佔30%。

「綠化地帶」方面，第1期用地在二〇一五年六月分區大綱圖改劃前全部是「綠化地帶」。第2、3期用地在大綱圖的「綠化地帶」佔總面積是55%，雖然比例較低一些，但總面積則頗大，達7.3公頃。

居民方面，目前未有第2、3期用地上居住的戶數及人口的正式數據，但根據「規劃及工程研究」觀察，相信各期用地均有人居住。

因此，當政府推展第2、3期發展時，跟第1期一樣須先申請改劃「綠化

地帶」，亦同時須遷徙民居。

發展第1期較第2、3期需時明顯較短的另一個因素，是第1期用地上幾乎沒有「棕地作業」，而第2、3期則估計有7公頃「棕地作業」。因此，把第1期與第2、3期分階段發展，於整體規劃及相關部署安排而言，實屬「先易後難」的做法。

多謝主席。

註一：當中不涉及公司股權。

註二：溫哥華的住宅物業價格在去年上升約19%，今年首七個月再急升22%。悉尼的住宅物業價格在去年上升約14%，今年上半年再升2.2%。倫敦的住宅物業價格在去年上升約12%，今年首七個月再升7.7%。

註三：當中主要的豁免是買家為代表自己行事的香港永久性居民，而在購買該住宅物業時，並不是香港任何其他住宅物業的實益擁有人。在這情況下，有關交易可獲豁免按新稅率繳付從價印花稅，而只需按較低的從價印花稅第2標準稅率繳稅。

完

2016年11月9日（星期三）
香港時間17時50分

新聞公報

回應傳媒關於橫洲發展項目的查詢

就有傳媒今日（十一月十三日）關於橫洲發展項目的報道，政府發言人有以下回應：

首先，關於顧問報告。運輸及房屋局局長張炳良教授昨日（十一月十二日）提及的是香港房屋委員會（房委會）為「橫洲公共房屋發展及元朗工業邨擴展計劃」所進行的「規劃及工程」研究，發展局提及的是土木工程拓展署為推行橫洲第一期公共房屋等項目所須的「基建工程項目」研究。上述是兩項不同的研究，涉及兩份不同的合約。

關於「規劃及工程」研究，顧問公司在二〇一四年十二月，向房委會申報為鄰近私人發展項目的改劃工作。在二〇一五年一月，房委會原則上接納該公司的申報，但前設是要遵守顧問研究合約內的保密和不披露資料的條件。房委會目前未發現「規劃及工程」研究所得的資料被未經同意用於其他用途，但就該公司有相同的人員同時出現在橫洲規劃及工程研究報告及該改劃申請報告內，以及報告內的資料問題，房委會已去信要求該公司澄清有關事項。在收悉回覆後，房委會會約見該公司，並研究是否需要根據房委會的規管機制及房委會與該公司的合約條款，考慮採取適當的跟進行動，包括索償行動。

就橫洲第一期發展內的道路走線，政府發言人已在九月三十日的新聞公報清楚交代：

「我們在提交給鄉郊及新市鎮規劃小組委員會的交通評估中，橫洲第1期連接道路的走線，與土木工程拓展署在二〇一五年五月二十一日提交元朗區議會交通及運輸委員會的文件（交委會文件2015/第39號）中所提供的走線有所分別。」

「至於改變走線的原因，土木工程拓展署已在上述的元朗區議會文件中詳細交代：『土木工程拓展署透過優化該道路設計，及將其走線於發展用地範圍內向北移，以方便有關公眾人士更直接地進出發展用地外北面的葬區，毋須穿過未來的屋邨範圍。』」

「就在橫洲公共房屋發展計劃附近的私人發展規劃申請，規劃署諮詢各部門時，房屋署表示不能接受該私人發展建議的道路入口進佔橫洲第1期公共房屋發展計劃的地界；以及橫洲第1期原本的道路設計並無計入該私人發展。」

發言人隨後在十月二十五日回應傳媒查詢時亦再清楚說明：

「據我們的理解，上述私人申請仍未獲批。相關的發展商於本年九月二十九日再向城市規劃委會（城規會）為土地改劃的申請提交修訂資料。政府將會向城規會再次反映我們的意見。」

完

2016年11月13日（星期日）
香港時間22時18分

Press Releases

Transcript of remarks at press conference on Wang Chau development

The Chief Executive, Mr C Y Leung, together with the Financial Secretary, Mr John C Tsang; the Secretary for Transport and Housing, Professor Anthony Cheung Bing-leung; the Acting Secretary for Development, Mr Eric Ma; the Permanent Secretary for Transport and Housing (Housing), Mr Stanley Ying; and the Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands), Mr Thomas Chan, held a press conference on the development of Wang Chau this afternoon (September 21). Following is the transcript of remarks at the press conference:

Reporter: Mr Leung, you said you are responsible to decide the project to be carried out in phases. Are you in any ways involved in those informal negotiations with the rural representatives? And, Professor Cheung, some reports said phase 2 and 3 has to be suspended because some rural leaders are unhappy about it. I mean, is it still true now? And last question is for Mr Tsang. C Y Leung has claimed the responsibility over this issue. Do you agree with him, and do you think you have any responsibility in this?

Chief Executive: The exact words I used were that I was in charge. As the Chief Executive of Hong Kong and Chief Executive of the Hong Kong Government, I should be in charge of matters like this, and these two sites are huge sites. They are very rare opportunities for the Government to be able to build large numbers of housing units, and they are all public housing units - either public rental housing units or Home Ownership Scheme units to help people who cannot afford decent housing in the private market. And I would ask everyone to look at our decision and our work on these two sites against the background of what we have done for Hong Kong to ease the housing shortage problem in the last four years. Prices and rents have dropped since we took over, against the general background of a rising trend in the Asia-Pacific markets, so that's the background.

We'll continue to increase housing supply and I want to be in charge of these projects because they are rare opportunities for Hong Kong to address, in each of these situations, the acute shortage of public housing in Hong Kong, and each of them produces, we expect them to produce in due course, over 10,000 units, and they are very rare opportunities. It is only right for me as the head of the Government, as the head of Hong Kong, to take charge. And that's what I did. And to answer your earlier question, no, I did not take part in any of the consultation with, or the lobbying of, anyone outside of government, and I believe that the opening remarks of the Secretary for Transport and Housing, Professor Anthony Cheung, at the beginning clearly stated that fact.

Secretary for Transport and Housing: On the question of local informal consultation, lobbying work, I did not take part because this was the normal function of the Department, the Housing Department colleagues. I could tell you that those colleagues

from Housing Department who took part were from the professional grades and sometimes an Assistant Director led the team.

Phases 2 and 3 of Wang Chau development have never been dropped.

In the paper to the Yuen Long District Council in April 2014 when we talked about the various sites in Yuen Long for development, it was very clearly stated in the appendix that the Wang Chau site was Wang Chau Phase 1. Whenever we were asked questions by the LegCo, we stated that it was Wang Chau Phase I because Phases 2 and 3 remained on our planning radar. But of course there are challenges that we have to face in developing Phases 2 and 3, the contamination issue because of environment concerns, the brownfield operations that we have to deal with, these remain to be challenges. But as I said earlier, we are now planning to commence another technical study because we are going to move along and because we are concurrently doing this with the Development Bureau's study on how to handle the brownfield operations, so hopefully we will be able to come up with some proposals. But at the end of the day, we still need the community support, we still need the District Council support in taking forward phases 2 and 3. I have heard some commentators these days (said) that we should touch brownfield. I hope they would not eat their words. I hope eventually they would support our efforts.

Financial Secretary: You asked me whether I agree with my boss. You always agree with your boss. No question about that. You know, I take my responsibility very seriously as the Chairman of the Steering Committee on Land Supply. Actually, the former name was Steering Committee on Housing (Land) Supply, which started back in 2010 in the previous administration, and I was also the Chairman of that and then we changed the name to Land Supply when this administration began. And we have made all the efforts that we can, involving all the departments and bureaus that are responsible for land and different matters, in terms of co-ordinating Government's effort in identifying the land that could be used for all different purposes, from housing to other purposes that could generate economic gains for the community. We also deal with a lot of the planning issues and hopefully that we could build up a reserve for future, but that is another issue because we are in such great demand for land, so we're actually using up everything that we have been able to identify. So we do take our responsibility extremely seriously. Thank you.

Reporter: My questions are for both CE and FS. First of all, at the meeting where all the Principal Officials were present, did anyone object or raise query over the deferral of phase 2 and phase 3 of the scheme? And second question is, now we know that it's a collective decision to defer the scheme, why didn't the CE tell us earlier that it's a collective decision? Because a few days ago you only mentioned that the FS committee were to follow up the detailed issues. Were you trying to shift the blame to FS? And also for the FS, you gave us in your reply that your committee did not take part in the decision to phase the project. Didn't it mislead the public that you have no role at all? And my final question is the target date for completion for phase 2 and 3 - that's the year 2026 and 2027 - still valid?

Chief Executive: It is a fact, as I mentioned, and as announced by the Financial Secretary, by John, that the Steering Committee on Land Supply was asked to carry out detailed discussions on Queen's Hill and Wang Chau by the task force, which I chaired. If

you listen to our opening remarks, that's what we exactly stated. Now, when questions are asked of the Government as to what happened three years ago, what happened at a meeting in 2013, three years ago, we cannot rely just on our personal recollection. We have to go back and ask all the departments to dig out their files and so on, so forth, and come up with a government position to make sure we do not mislead our friends in the media and the general public. And that's why I said a couple of days ago I will answer that question as to whether I took part in the decision at that task force meeting at the press conference today, which is exactly what we are doing.

Financial Secretary: Actually, referring to that question, I was asked, you know, pointedly that whether the Steering Committee had made the decision in terms of splitting the staging of the housing production, and I mean it was obviously a yes or no answer. No, it wasn't the decision of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was responsible in identifying the land that was necessary. So I was asked that question by the reporter, and so we answer it in the simplest way we can.

Chief Executive: Perhaps I should repeat this in English, what I said, and this is supported by what my colleagues have said. The departments, based on their professional expertise and based on their informal consultation and the results of the lobbying efforts on the ground, made their recommendation to the Secretary. So it's a filtering out process. And when they got to the three C meeting - incidentally, it wasn't a meeting attended by all Principal Officials. It's a meeting that I chair attended by the three senior Secretaries of Government, namely Chief Secretary, Financial Secretary and Secretary for Justice. It is a forum where we discuss and steer departments on major issues, not just land and housing and planning issues. We also hear progress reports. At this three C meeting三司會, we get progress reports on major planning, land supply and housing issues. So that's the forum. And the progress report got to this meeting and I supported, as I said in my opening remarks, I supported the proposal of the department and asked them to move in this general direction. The important thing is we did not abandon the rest of the phases.

(Please also refer to the Chinese portion of the transcript.)

Ends/Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Issued at HKT 20:09

NNNN

Press Releases

Government response to media enquiries on development at Wang Chau

In response to media enquiries on the amount of government land and the number of households affected by the public housing development and Yuen Long Industrial Estate Extension (YLIEE) at Wang Chau, a Government spokesman said today (September 28) that when conducting the Planning and Engineering (P&E) feasibility study in 2012, the consultant made a projection that there were approximately 14 hectares of government land within the development boundary (Phases 1, 2 and 3 of the public housing development and YLIEE), some 40 houses and about 210 temporary structures. But there was no projection of the number of households affected. The Government will conduct detailed surveys when rolling out the development.

To assist in taking forward Phase 1 of the public housing development at Wang Chau, the Lands Department has worked out the area of government and private land within Phase 1 of the development (about 3.4 hectares of government land and 3.5 hectares of private land). The Department also conducted a freezing survey in October 2015 within the area affected by Phase 1 of the development, during which about 180 households (involving about 400 persons) and a few business undertakings were registered. However, since occupants of some structures refused to be registered, the figures at present may not reflect the total number of households and business undertakings affected.

As regards the P&E feasibility study for the development at Wang Chau, the spokesman pointed out that the study, comprising 16 reports with over 1,000 pages, contains some sensitive information such as land matters, project financial information and so on. Disclosure of such information may affect public interest. The Government, after processing the related sensitive information in an appropriate manner, will submit the 16 reports to the Legislative Council when the new term comes into session officially and make them available to the public.

Ends/Wednesday, September 28, 2016

Issued at HKT 18:36

NNNN

Press Releases

Government response to media enquiries on public housing development plan at Wang Chau

In response to media enquiries on the public housing development plan at Wang Chau, a spokesman for the Government said today (September 30) that, after checking various documents, a consolidated reply is given as follows:

As explained earlier, the Planning and Engineering (P&E) feasibility study for the public housing development plan at Wang Chau, which commenced in 2012, comprised a number of technical parts, including assessments on traffic and transport impact, geotechnical feasibility and site formation, natural terrain hazard, drainage impact, sewerage impact, water and utility impact, environmental impact, air ventilation, land requirement, tree survey, financial assessment and so on. Different parts were completed at different periods. The Government originally planned to develop Phases 1, 2, 3 and Yuen Long Industrial Estate Extension (YLIEE) at the same time. But after the Government decided in early 2014 to develop Phase 1 first, followed by phases 2 and 3 later, we asked the consultant, who were carrying out the study then, to conduct supplementary assessment on the traffic and transport impact, air ventilation, drainage impact, sewerage impact, water supplies and environmental impact to confirm the feasibility of commencing Phase 1 first.

We have stated earlier that the P&E feasibility study reports for the public housing development plan at Wang Chau contain some sensitive information, and the Government will submit them to the Legislative Council when the new term comes into session officially and make them available to the public after processing the relevant sensitive information in an appropriate manner.

Assessment reports have to be submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) when processing the rezoning application for the Phase 1 development. Therefore, the supplementary assessments on traffic and transport impact and air ventilation in the feasibility study were attached to the submission to the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the TPB on October 17, 2014. (Reference number: RNTPC Paper No. 13/14).

Prior to the submission to the RNTPC, we had ascertained that there was no sensitive information in it. But the staff concerned did not delete the wording "please keep confidential" when preparing the submission.

The aforesaid traffic and transport impact assessment stated that "planning parameters are yet to be confirmed at the stage of the study. As for a conservative approach, it is assumed that the total number of flats is capped at 5 000 units with PRH/HOS ratio of 50:50 for technical assessment purpose....." This illustrates clearly that the "planning parameters" of the Phase 1 housing project has not yet been decided. The assessment adopted a "conservative approach" that "assumed" the total number of flats was to be "capped at" 5 000 and, for "technical assessment

purpose", the proportion of public rental housing/home ownership scheme flats was "assumed" to be 50:50 so as to maintain the flexibility to ensure that results of the technical assessments will be applicable to future development. The paper (RNTPC Paper No. 13/14) itself stated clearly that the proposed number of flats was 4 000. As regards the actual number of flats and the proportion of rental housing and subsidised sales flats, it has yet to be decided.

In the traffic impact assessment submitted to the RNTPC, routing of the road connecting Wang Chau Phase 1 was different from the one outlined in the paper submitted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) to the Yuen Long District Council's Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC Paper No. 39/2015) on May 21, 2015.

As for the reason for the re-routing, the CEDD had already given a detailed account in the paper for the aforesaid meeting of the Yuen Long District Council. It was stated that "Through enhancing the road routing and moving it northward within the development boundary by the CEDD, members of the public will have the convenience of passing in and out the burial ground located to the north of the development area without the need to enter into the future housing estate."

As regards the planning application by a private development at the locality of the Wang Chau public housing development, when the Planning Department consulted related government departments on it, the Housing Department raised objection on the ground that ingress of the road proposed by the private development would encroach into the boundary of the Phase 1 public housing development at Wang Chau and the original design of the public road for Wang Chau Phase 1 had not taken into account the private development.

There are views commenting on our decision of rolling out firstly Phase 1 of the Wang Chau public housing development and then phases 2 and 3 later. We reiterate that the decision aims at an early production of 4 000 public housing flats in the Phase 1 of the Wang Chau public housing development. Some of the technical details are outlined herein.

On the part of road traffic, Phase 1 only involves the improvement of the junction at Long Ping Road and Fung Chi Road and the construction of a road to the Phase 1 of Wang Chau development. The concurrent development of phases 1, 2 and 3 of Wang Chau will require road works at various locations in Yuen Long District such as Long Ping Road, Wang Lok Street, Fuk Hi Street, Shui Pin Wai Interchange and so on as well as the construction of a public transport interchange. It involves more complicated works and requires longer time for working out a proposal and completing the works.

On drainage facilities, it only needs to improve local drainage pipes there in Phase 1. The concurrent development of phases 1, 2 and 3 will require a larger scale of improvement works on drainage pipes in the area concerned and in Yuen Long District. The Yuen Long Sewage Treatment Works will also need to be improved, involving more complicated works and longer time for working out a proposal and completing the works.

In respect of power supply, the existing transformer station can cope with demand generated by Phase 1. If phases 1, 2 and 3 are to be developed simultaneously, a new 132kV transformer station will have to be constructed.

As regards brownfield operations, about 0.1 hectare of land on the sites of Phase 1 are occupied while such operations occupy about 17 hectares on the sites of phases 2 and 3 and YLIEE. The sizeable brownfield operations in phases 2 and 3 include supportive activities such as logistics, port back-up, waste recycling, car repair and so on. They also offer employment opportunities. The Government wishes to handle them more properly.

Moreover, there are various environmental issues that have to be dealt with in phases 1, 2 and 3. The more critical one is pollution generated by operations on the brownfield sites in the district. In terms of location, Phase 1 is farther away from those brownfield operations at phases 2 and 3 and the pollution brought by it. When bringing forward Phase 2, we have to resolve the pollution problem caused by brownfield operations at Phase 3 on the north of the development. When we move on with Phase 3, we have to resolve the pollution problem caused by brownfield operations on site of YLIEE on the north. Thus, it will require more time to resolve the environmental pollution problem when we implement phases 2 and 3, including the pollution caused by brownfield operations on sites of phases 2 and 3 and YLIEE.

Taking the above into account, the Government decided in early 2014 to roll out the Phase 1 development at Wang Chau first with the objective of completing 4 000 public housing flats in 2024/25 with the early commencement of various formal procedures within a relatively short period of time.

Ends/Friday, September 30, 2016
Issued at HKT 23:04

NNNN

Press Releases

Development at Wang Chau has to take into account the actual circumstances and other factors

Regarding the Planning and Engineering Feasibility Study for Public Housing Site and Yuen Long Industrial Estate Extension at Wang Chau (P&E Study) report conducted between 2012 and 2015 by a consultancy firm, which was released yesterday, a Government spokesman reiterated today (October 19) that the study aimed to explore feasibility and therefore may not have fully considered time factor and actual circumstances.

It was mentioned in the report that there is no "insurmountable" difficulties in the development of Wang Chau Phases 2 and 3, the spokesman noted, adding that this is exactly why the Government has been planning all along to develop Wang Chau Phases 1, 2 and 3 so as to construct 17 000 public housing units in the end.

"Besides, developing each of Phase 1, 2 and 3 of the Wang Chau development involves certain difficulties. We have been pointing out all along that Phases 2 and 3 involve more complicated issues, which require more time to tackle.

"We have pointed out that the purpose of the P&E Study was to study the technical feasibility of the development. Although technically feasible, preliminary procedures, in addition to works programme, will often take more time than what the technical works assessment expects. For example, the P&E Study estimated that the consultation with the Rural Committee and the District Council would take only two months. But experience tells us that, if we have to develop Phases 1, 2 and 3 in one go, formal and informal consultations with the Rural Committee and the District Council, together with other community engagement activities and consultation, would take more than two months.

"Apart from associated works such as transport, electricity supply, sewage and the mitigation measures for tackling environmental issues, the Government also has to work out suitable measures to handle the large amount of brownfield operations, which is about 7 hectares, at Wang Chau Phases 2 and 3. Just as the Acting Secretary for Development has stated at the press conference on September 21, the Government is reviewing the relevant policies and measures with an aim of handling brownfield operations in a more comprehensive and suitable manner," the spokesman said.

Ends/Wednesday, October 19, 2016

Issued at HKT 22:03

NNNN

Press Releases

Response to media enquiries on Planning and Engineering Study for Wang Chau

In response to media enquiries on the Planning and Engineering Study for the Public Housing Site and Yuen Long Industrial Estate Extension at Wang Chau (P&E Study), a Government spokesman replied today (October 25) as follows:

When releasing the P&E Study, an introduction to the study to give an account on the objectives and constraints of planning and engineering studies in general, as well as some background information of the Wang Chau project, was attached (www.thb.gov.hk/eng/popup/wangchau_report.htm). The introduction and earlier replies in response to media enquiries have already addressed some of the recent questions by the media. The relevant information is summarised here for public reference.

When the study was first started, the original plan was to develop Wang Chau Phases 1, 2 and 3 as well as the Yuen Long Industrial Estate Extension as one works project. However, the scope of the study was adjusted in accordance with the Government's strategy. In early 2014, the Government decided to launch Wang Chau Phase 1 development first. The P&E Study had to add in content on technical assessments specifically required for the rezoning of Phase 1. In this connection, we had instructed the consultant to extract appropriate information and make necessary updates, thereby producing an additional of five technical reports and two technical data summaries.

As the Government decided not to develop Phase 1 along with Phases 2 and 3 and the Industrial Estate Extension in one go, the P&E Study did not pursue further on subjects associated with a joint development, such as public consultation or environmental impact assessment required for a joint development. According to the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance, environmental impact assessment reports are required for engineering feasibility study of urban development projects with a study area covering more than 20 hectares or involving a total population of more than 100 000. Since the Phase 1 development only involves a site of about 5.6 hectares with a future population of about 12 000 persons, an environmental impact assessment is not required.

Besides, although the P&E Study had suggested at an early stage that public consultation and community engagement were required when developing Wang Chau Phases 1, 2 and 3 and Yuen Long Industrial Estate Extension in one go, the Government decided in early 2014 to develop Phase 1 first. Thus, the P&E Study, in the end, did not recommend the implementation of consultation specifically for the concurrent development of Wang Chau Phases 1, 2 and 3 and Yuen Long Industrial Estate Extension. Instead, informal consultations, as well as using about two months to consult the Rural Committee and District Council, were suggested.

In respect of informal consultations, we had clarified to the media that the two informal consultations as mentioned on

paragraph 3.2.1.2 of the TR-4B report of the P&E Study should have taken place in July and September 2013, not July and September 2012. The correct dates can be found on paragraph 3.4.1.1 of the same report which also touched on the two informal consultations. These two informal meetings were exactly the two informal consultations on July and September 2013 mentioned by the Secretary for Transport and Housing at the press conference on September 21, 2016. Please refer to the following link for details (Chinese only):
www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/201609/21/P2016092100721.htm.

The completion time estimated by the P&E Study for various types of work was based on the original assumption of developing Wang Chau Phases 1, 2 and 3 and Yuen Long Industrial Estate Extension in one go. In addition, the estimate was generally made on the assumption that the relevant procedures would proceed smoothly, which is not necessary to be the case in reality.

The conclusion of the P&E Study was that there was no "insurmountable" difficulty in the development of Phases 1, 2 and 3. It was exactly on this basis that we had all along considered that the public housing development in Phases 2 and 3 should go ahead. Yet the P&E Study showed that each of Phase 1, 2 and 3 had to overcome their own respective difficulties and the difficulties facing Phase 2 and 3 were more complicated. The time needed to overcome the difficulties in Phases 2 and 3 will be longer than the time needed for Phase 1. Thus, we decided to go ahead with Phase 1 first and Phases 2 and 3 later.

There are views that the P&E Study had not taken into consideration of households and brownfield operations within the project area. In general, the objective of planning and engineering study is to assess the technical feasibility of a project. As a project is still at an early study stage and having taken into account the factor of confidentiality, a consultancy firm will collect necessary information for study, including conducting site visits to count the number of structures and making enquiries with government departments concerned (such as Land Registry). However, this will not include detailed household survey, number of families and so on and registration of brownfield operators. Government departments concerned will undertake related surveys or registration at an appropriate time after the implementation programme of the project is confirmed.

As regard the scope of the housing plan in Wang Chau, the P&E Study did suggest the exclusion of some green belt sites and adding three other green belt sites. The Government agreed to these changes. The removed green belt sites included some Village Environs (VEs). According to established government policy, generally speaking, considering that VEs have existed for a long time (VEs refers to a 300-foot radius from the edge of the last village type house built before the introduction of the Small House Policy on December 1, 1972), its original intent is to cope with the implementation of the Small House Policy. Any suggestion of shrinking or even canceling the VEs would inevitably induce demand for compensation for other lands. In general, it is suggested that the lands within the village boundaries will not be included in development areas. In the planning of Wang Chau, VEs was also not included in the proposed public housing development areas.

These adjustments, as well as media questions on the highway plan within Wang Chau Phase 1, have nothing to do with the private development located to the west of Phase 1. In fact, the private development application has direct conflict with Phase 1. Just like what was stated in the Government's response to media enquiries on September 30, 2016, when the Planning Department consulted various government departments on the planning application by the private developer, the Housing Department (HD) raised objection on the ground that ingress of the road proposed by the private development would encroach into the boundary of the Phase 1 public housing development at Wang Chau and the original design of the public road for Wang Chau Phase 1 had not taken into account the private development. With regard to a proposal by the private developer of changing the west end of the public road to a roundabout for the access of the private development, the HD had expressed that the suggestion would affect the road design of the public housing development and hold over its development progress. Therefore, the private developer should plan an alternative road. The government departments had also raised various other views, including the Government had no plan to extend the proposed public road, to be constructed for the public housing development, to the private development; and that the proposed sewerage facility for public housing development just caters for sewage discharged from the public housing.

Regarding the cause of road design adjustment, the Government had already pointed out in the press release issued on September 30, 2016 that the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), in a paper submitted to the Traffic and Transport Committee of the Yuen Long District Council on May 21, 2015, had fully explained the change of the road routing: "by optimising the road design and relocating it northward within the development area, it would be convenient for the public to get in and out of the burial area, which is located on the north outside the development area, without the need to pass through the future estate area."

As we understand, the application of the private development has not yet been approved. The private developer submitted revised information on rezoning application to the Town Planning Board (TPB) on September 29 this year. The Government will give its views again to the TPB accordingly.

Ends/Tuesday, October 25, 2016

Issued at HKT 22:45

NNNN

Press Releases

LCQ5: Impact of Mainland-funded consortia buying commercial and residential sites and properties in Hong Kong

Following is a question by the Hon Paul Tse and a reply by the Acting Secretary for Transport and Housing, Mr Yau Shing-mu, in the Legislative Council today (November 9)

Question:

In recent years, cases of Mainland-funded consortia investing huge sums of money to buy commercial and residential sites and properties in Hong Kong have been on the rise. Over the past several months, two thirds of Grade A commercial buildings were gobbled by Mainland-funded consortia, involving an amount as high as some \$20 billion, which far exceeded the total amount in the past decade. In addition, in the past two years, among the 50-odd residential sites sold by the Government, 20% of which were bought by Mainland-funded consortia. Like a rising tide that lifts all boats, the price of the units of the first residential project built under the "Hong Kong property for Hong Kong residents" policy (i.e. with land lease conditions restricting the resale of such units to Hong Kong people only) and developed by a Mainland-funded consortium is as high as \$18,000 per square foot (ft²). Meanwhile, local developers also offer high prices in land auctions in order to compete for development sites, resulting in many small flats with an area of 200 to 300 ft² fetching \$20,000 per ft², which is far beyond the affordability of the general public. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

(1) whether it has assessed if the continuous buying of commercial and residential sites and properties in Hong Kong by Mainland-funded consortia has any impact on the abilities of the general public to buy homes and conduct business; if it has assessed, of the details; if not, whether it will expeditiously do so; whether the so-called "influx of capital from the Mainland into Hong Kong" will offset the effect of the Chief Executive's policy initiative of increasing land supply in the hope of cooling down the overheated property market; if so, of the details;

(2) whether it will, in view of the incessant rise in property prices, put forward and implement a more effective housing policy to assist first-time home buying families and relieve the youth housing problem; and

(3) as the Government has adopted the approach of "working on the easier tasks first and the more difficult ones later" (i.e. to proceed with the removal and relocation of non-indigenous villages before developing brownfield sites) in taking forward the public housing development at Wang Chau, whether the Government will adjust the approach and resume illegally occupied Government land for the development of large brownfield sites first, so as to increase the supply of residential sites more quickly?

Reply:

President,

Having consolidated information from the Development Bureau (DevB) and relevant departments, my reply to the various parts of the question raised by the Hon Paul Tse is as follows:

(1) For the past two years or so (from the financial year of 2014-15 to November 2, 2016), the Government sold a total of 68 residential, commercial / business / hotel and industrial sites. Analysis based on the information provided by the tenderers in their tender forms (Note 1) indicates that 11 sites were awarded to developers of Mainland enterprises (including those associated with Mainland enterprises or joint venture companies).

The Government has actively increased the supply of land and housing and has endeavoured to manage demand. The current term of Government introduced the Buyer's Stamp Duty (BSD) in 2012 and the doubled ad valorem stamp duty in 2013 to curb external and investment demand. The property prices dropped by 11.3% between the fourth quarter of 2015 and the first quarter of 2016. In the third quarter of 2016, the monthly average number of residential property transactions involving non-local individuals and non-local company buyers was 105 (or 1.5% of the total transactions of residential property), markedly below the average figure of 365 cases (or 4.5%) for the ten months before the introduction of BSD.

Nevertheless, the property market showed renewed signs of exuberance since April 2016, with accelerated rise in property prices, which are now close to the historical peak in September 2015. In fact, under the global context of ultra-low interest rates and abundant liquidity, high property price is not a phenomenon unique to Hong Kong. Some other major cities (Note 2) also face the same challenge.

Although the supply of residential properties has been steadily increasing, the demand-supply imbalance remains tight in the short run. In order to stabilise the property market, to guard against further increase in the risks of a housing bubble, and to accord priority to the home ownership needs of those Hong Kong permanent residents (HKPR) who do not own any other residential property in Hong Kong, the Government decided to raise the ad valorem stamp duty (AVD) rates chargeable on transactions for residential property to 15% across different value bands on November 4, 2016 (last Friday). The exemption arrangements under the existing regime remain unchanged (Note 3).

(2) The prevailing housing demand is keen irrespective of age group. The only way to concretely address the long term housing needs of first-time home buyers and younger generation is to increase the overall supply as quickly as possible and to build an effective housing ladder. Therefore, the Government has set the total supply target for the ten-year period from 2016-17 to 2025-26 at 460 000 units, among which 280 000 units are public housing units.

Subsidised sale flats, such as the Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) flats, serve as the first step for many families to achieve

home ownership. The Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA) has resumed the HOS and pre-sold newly-built HOS flats at the end of 2014 and this year respectively. HA has also commenced the pre-sale of flats under the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Pilot Scheme last month. Besides, HA has introduced two rounds of Interim Scheme to Extend the Home Ownership Scheme Secondary Market to White Form Buyers (the Interim Scheme) in 2013 and 2015 respectively to allow eligible White Form applicants to purchase flats with premium not yet paid in the HOS Secondary Market.

As at end September 2016, the projected supply from the first-hand private residential property market for the coming three to four years is approximately 93 000 units. Experiences from major cities around the world show that tight supply and cheap credit are the main reasons of rising property prices and rents. If the Government and the community do not bite the bullet and make determined efforts in searching land for housing, the problem is not going to be resolved easily. At the end of the day, it will be the low-income group and the younger generation who suffer.

(3) Regarding the development of public housing at Wang Chau, the Government decided in early 2014 to develop the site in phases by proceeding first with Phase 1 with a view to providing 4 000 units as early as possible and including these units in the Ten-year Housing Construction Programme. Phases 2 and 3 will be deferred, but the target of developing a total of 17 000 units remained unchanged. This decision was based on the considerations that developing Phases 1, 2 and 3 concurrently would involve more complicated problems in terms of the provision of infrastructure, including traffic and transport, sewerage and power supply. Furthermore, the sites of Phases 2 and 3 involved more brownfield operations and environmental problems than that of Phase 1. This would lead to more complicated development works and required a longer lead time to formulate an implementation plan and for the construction process. The Government has explained the relevant analyses, details are at Annex.

There are views that we should only develop Phases 2 and 3; or develop Phases 2 and 3 first and postpone Phase 1. People holding these views may think that there was more government land in the sites of Phases 2 and 3 than that of Phase 1 and hence the resumption of such land would be easier. Some may also think that most land on the sites of Phases 2 and 3 is "brownfield" site and no "Green Belt" site is involved; or developing Phases 2 and 3 does not require relocating people residing in the area. The case is not that simple.

Firstly, the ratio of government land in Phases 2 and 3 is smaller than that in Phase 1. While 38% of the Phase 1 site is government land, only a total of 30% of the Phases 2 and 3 sites is government land.

Regarding "Green Belt", the entire Phase 1 site was "Green Belt" under the outline zoning plan before re-zoning in June 2015. For Phases 2 and 3, although the ratio of "Green Belt", at 55% of the total area under the outline zoning plan, is lower, the actual size is larger at 7.3 hectares.

As regards people residing in the area, at present we do not

have official data on the number of households and population for the Phases 2 and 3 sites. However, according to the observations in the Planning and Engineering Study, it is believed that there are people living in the sites of all three Phases.

Therefore, when the Government proceeds with the development of Phases 2 and 3, similar to Phase 1, application for rezoning the "Green Belt" site therein and relocation of local residents are also required.

Another reason for the obviously shorter development time for Phase 1 than that of Phases 2 and 3 is that there is almost no "brownfield operations" in Phase 1 site. On the other hand, it is estimated that there is an area of seven hectares of "brownfield operations" in Phases 2 and 3. Hence, develop Phase 1 first, followed by development of Phase 2 and 3 in stages is a progressive approach to tackle relatively easier tasks first in terms of overall planning and relevant strategic arrangements.

Note 1: Without examination of the shareholding information therein.

Note 2: The residential property prices in Vancouver increased by 19% last year, followed by another 22% increase in the first seven months of this year. The residential property prices in Sydney increased by 14% last year, followed by another 2.2 % increase in the first half of this year. The residential property prices in London increased by about 12% last year, followed by another 7.7% increase in the first seven months of this year.

Note 3: The major exemption is where the buyer is a HKPR acting on his/her own behalf and is not a beneficial owner of any other residential property in Hong Kong at the time of acquisition of a residential property. Under such circumstances, the new AVD rate will not apply and the relevant transaction is only subject to the lower AVD rates at Scale 2.

Ends/Wednesday, November 9, 2016
Issued at HKT 17:51

NNNN

Press Releases

Response to media enquiries on development of Wang Chau

Regarding media reports today (November 13) on the development project at Wang Chau, a Government spokesman gave the following response:

First, on the question of consultancy reports, what the Secretary for Transport and Housing, Professor Anthony Cheung Bing-leung, was referring to yesterday (November 12) was the Planning and Engineering Study for the Public Housing Site and Yuen Long Industrial Estate Extension at Wang Chau development (P&E Study) commissioned by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA). The study mentioned by the Development Bureau was commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), on infrastructural works for the Wang Chau Phase 1 public housing development and so on. These are two different studies involving two different contracts.

In respect of the P&E Study, the consultant has declared to the HA in December 2014 that it would also work on a rezoning study for a private development project at the vicinity. The HA approved the application by the consultancy in principle in January 2015 on the conditions that it should observe the requirement of confidentiality and non-disclosure in accordance with the consultancy study contract. The HA has so far not found that information collected for the P&E Study has been used for other purposes without approval. However, the HA has written to the consultant requesting clarifications on the questions of the same staff appearing at the same time on the P&E Study report and the rezoning application report as well as certain information in the reports. After receiving the reply, the HA will follow up with the consultant and consider if there is a need to take appropriate follow-up actions according to the regulatory regime of the HA and terms of the contract between the HA and the consultant, including claims for damages.

On the question of road routing at Wang Chau Phase 1, the Government spokesman has already stated clearly on the press release on September 30 that:

"In the traffic impact assessment submitted to the RNTPC (Rural and New Town Planning Committee), routing of the road connecting Wang Chau Phase 1 was different from the one outlined in the paper submitted by the CEDD to the Yuen Long District Council's Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC Paper No. 39/2015) on May 21, 2015.

"As for the reason for the re-routing, the CEDD had already given a detailed account in the paper for the aforesaid meeting of the Yuen Long District Council. It was stated that 'Through enhancing the road routing and moving it northward within the development boundary by the CEDD, members of the public will have the convenience of passing in and out the burial ground located to the north of the development area without the need to enter into the future housing estate.'

"As regards the planning application by a private development at the locality of the Wang Chau public housing development, when the Planning Department consulted related government departments on it, the Housing Department raised objection on the ground that ingress of the road proposed by the private development would encroach into the boundary of the Phase 1 public housing development at Wang Chau and the original design of the public road for Wang Chau Phase 1 had not taken into account the private development."

The spokesman further stated clearly in his response to the media on October 25 that:

"As we understand, the application of the private development has not yet been approved. The private developer submitted revised information on rezoning application to the Town Planning Board (TPB) on September 29 this year. The Government will give its views again to the TPB accordingly."

Ends/Sunday, November 13, 2016

Issued at HKT 22:25

NNNN