

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. CB(1)818/16-17  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/DEV

**Panel on Development**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Tuesday, 28 February 2017, at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, MH, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Kenneth LEUNG  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon KWOK Wai-keung  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin

Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon SHIU Ka-chun  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon CHAN Chun-ying  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon LUK Chung-hung  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho  
Hon Nathan LAW Kwun-chung  
Dr Hon YIU Chung-yim  
Dr Hon LAU Siu-lai

**Members absent** : Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
Hon HO Kai-ming  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP

**Public officers attending** : **Agenda item IV**

Mr Vitus NG  
Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)3  
Development Bureau

Mr CHAU Sai-wai  
Assistant Director/Development  
Water Supplies Department

**Agenda item V**

Mr Francis LEUNG Lap-ki  
Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 4  
Development Bureau

Ms Winnie HO Wing-yin  
Project Director 1  
Architectural Services Department

Ms Monica LAM Sau-lai  
Chief Project Manager 101  
Architectural Services Department

Ms Cynthia LO Siu-han  
Departmental Secretary  
Electrical and Mechanical Services Department

Mr SZETO Wing-sum  
Senior Engineer/Project 7  
Electrical and Mechanical Services Department

Mr Louis KAU Kin-hong  
District Planning Officer/Hong Kong  
Planning Department

**Agenda item VI**

Ms Brenda AU Kit-ying  
Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office  
Development Bureau

Mr Frank WONG Tak-choi  
Deputy Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office  
Development Bureau

Mrs Doris FOK LEE Sheung-ling  
Assistant Director (Leisure Services)l  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mrs Alice YU NG Ka-chun  
Project Director 3  
Architectural Services Department

Mr Allen LEUNG Kin-tak  
Chief Project Manager 302  
Architectural Services Department

**Agenda item VII**

Mr Vitus NG  
Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)<sup>3</sup>  
Development Bureau

Mr WONG Chung-leung, JP  
Deputy Director of Water Supplies

Mr CHAU Sai-wai  
Assistant Director/Development  
Water Supplies Department

Mr WONG Man-ching  
Assistant Director/Mechanical & Electrical  
Water Supplies Department

Mr Robert CHAN  
Assistant Director (Administration)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

**Agenda item VIII**

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

Mr Ricky LAU Chun-kit, JP  
Head of Civil Engineering Office  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Francis LEE Man-chow  
Chief Engineer/Port Works  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Ms Amy CHEUNG Yi-mei  
Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial  
Planning Department

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

**Staff in attendance** : Miss Rita YUNG  
Senior Council Secretary (1)2

Mr Raymond CHOW  
Senior Council Secretary (1)6

Ms Mandy LI  
Council Secretary (1)2

Ms Christina SHIU  
Legislative Assistant (1)2

---

Action

**I Confirmation of minutes**

- |                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| (LC Paper No. CB(1)579/16-17 | — Minutes of the regular meeting on 16 December 2016 |
| LC Paper No. CB(1)580/16-17  | — Minutes of the special meeting on 6 January 2017)  |

The minutes of the meetings on 16 December 2016 and 6 January 2017 were confirmed.

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

- |                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| (LC Paper No. CB(1)501/16-17(01) | — Letter dated 25 January 2017 from Dr Hon LAU Siu-lai on the role of the Development Bureau in the Government's policy on bazaars |
| LC Paper No. CB(1)582/16-17(01)  | — Referral from the Public Accounts Committee on issues relating to small house grants in the New Territories)                     |

2. Members noted that the above information papers had been issued since the meeting on 24 January 2017.

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

(LC Paper No. CB(1)578/16-17(01) — List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)578/16-17(02) — List of follow-up actions)

3. Members agreed that the next regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, 28 March 2017, at 2:30 pm would be extended to end at 5:30 pm to discuss the following items proposed by the Administration:

- (a) Assist property owners to participate in "Smart Tender" Scheme;
- (b) PWP Item No. 363WF — Upgrading of Disinfection Facilities in Water Treatment Works;
- (c) PWP Item No. 356WF — Upgrading of Tung Chung Fresh Water Supply System;
- (d) PWP Item No. 7765CL — Development of Anderson Road Quarry Site — Phase 1 of the Remaining Works; and
- (e) Stage 1 Public Engagement for Pilot Study on Underground Space Development in Selected Strategic Urban Areas.

*(Post-meeting note: The Panel would continue the discussion on "PWP Item No. 751CL — Planning and engineering study on Sunny Bay reclamation" at the meeting on 28 March 2017. Item (e) above would not be discussed at the meeting.)*

**IV Rescheduling of the duty visit to the Dongjiang River Basin**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)517/16-17(01) — Letter dated 27 January 2017 from the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)578/16-17(03) — Paper on rescheduling of the duty visit to the Dongjiang River Basin prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

4. Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Works)<sup>3</sup> ("PAS/DEV(W)3") referred to the letter dated 27 January 2017 from the Administration (LC Paper No. CB(1)517/16-17(01)) advising that, as

more time was needed for the preparatory work and there had been some public holidays, i.e. the Lunar New Year holidays, in end-January, the original schedule for conducting a duty visit to the Dongjiang ("DJ") River Basin from 19 to 20 February 2017 could not be met. The Administration proposed that the duty visit be deferred to 14 and 15 April 2017 (Friday and Saturday, both being public holidays). He extended the Administration's apologies to the 19 Members who had confirmed that they would join the duty visit in response to the original schedule.

5. Noting that the rescheduled duty visit would be conducted during the Easter holidays, Mr YIU Si-wing asked whether the Panel would proceed with the visit if only a small number of Members could join it. The Chairman advised that according to the usual practice, the size of a delegation for a duty visit outside Hong Kong should be three Members or more.

6. Dr Helena WONG asked about the visit programme of the rescheduled duty. PAS/DEV(W)3 replied that the programme would be the same as the visit programme agreed by the Panel on 6 January 2017.

7. Members agreed that the Panel's duty visit to the DJ River Basin be rescheduled to 14 and 15 April 2017, and the visit should be open to non-Panel Members. The Chairman advised that the Clerk would issue a circular to invite all Members to re-indicate whether they would take part in the duty visit.

*(Post-meeting note: The circular was issued to Members on 1 March 2017 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)631/16-17. In response, 21 Members had indicated interest in taking part in the duty visit.)*

**V PWP Item No. 3794CL — The demolition of existing superstructures at Caroline Hill Road site, Causeway Bay**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)578/16-17(04) — Administration's paper on 3794CL — The demolition of existing superstructures at Caroline Hill Road site, Causeway Bay)

8. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)4, Development Bureau ("PAS(W)4/DEVB"), briefed members on the proposal to upgrade PWP Item No. 3794CL to Category A for the demolition of existing superstructures at Caroline Hill Road site

("the project site"), Causeway Bay at an estimated cost of about \$53 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices. Subject to the funding approval of the Finance Committee ("FC"), the Administration planned to commence the demolition works in the second quarter of 2017 for completion by the fourth quarter of 2018. Details of the proposal were given in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)578/16-17(04)).

*(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)626/16-17(01) by email on 1 March 2017.)*

9. The Chairman reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of 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.

#### Traffic implications of the proposed demolition works

10. Ms Tanya CHAN said that members belonging to the Civic Party supported the proposal in principle. She expressed concern on the traffic implications of the proposed demolition works given that the project site was located in the downtown areas with heavy traffic. Ms CHAN sought details about the additional traffic flow expected to be generated during the period of the demolition works.

11. Mr Paul TSE advised that he supported the proposal in principle. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said he had yet to decide whether to support the proposal. Both of them were concerned about the traffic implications of the proposed demolition works. They enquired about the temporary traffic arrangements to be implemented during the demolition period.

12. PAS(W)4/DEVB replied that there would be about 10-odd construction waste collection vehicles entering or leaving the project site every day during the demolition period. The anticipated traffic impact to be brought about on the existing road network would be acceptable. Project Director 1, Architectural Services Department ("PD1/ArchSD"), supplemented that due to the sizable area of the project site, the construction waste for disposal could be temporarily stored at the site during the heavy traffic periods. Moreover, during the period of the demolition works, the Administration would maintain close communication with the Hong Kong Police Force and other relevant parties, especially prior to any special events to be held in Hong Kong



Stadium, and implement temporary measures to control the traffic of construction vehicles, if necessary, to minimize the traffic impact on the surrounding areas. The Administration undertook to provide information after the meeting about the temporary traffic arrangements to be implemented during the demolition period.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)673/16-17(01) on 15 March 2017.)*

13. Mr Kenneth LEUNG said that he supported the proposal in principle. Taking in view that the traffic around the project site would be busy during rush hours, Mr LEUNG sought information about the time that construction waste collection vehicles would enter and exit from the project site every day during the demolition period.

14. PD1/ArchSD advised that the construction waste collection vehicles would only enter or exit from the project site during non-busy hours. Given that there would be roughly two vehicles entering or exiting from the project site per hour, the Administration considered the traffic impact minimal.

#### Environmental implications of the proposed demolition works

15. Ms Tanya CHAN noted that some asbestos-containing materials had been identified inside the buildings of the project site. She reminded the Administration to be cautious when carrying out the asbestos abatement works. PAS(W)4/DEVB assured members that the asbestos abatement works would be carried out by a specialist contractor.

16. Mr Jeremy TAM expressed support for the proposed demolition works. He added that, however, he had reservation about the Administration's plan on the development of the project site. Mr TAM and Ms Tanya CHAN enquired about the measures to be taken to protect the three important trees, including two Old and Valuable Trees ("OVTs"), within the project site during demolition and development. They also urged the Administration to clearly specify in the land lease for the sale of the site that the developer was required to preserve these trees.

17. PAS(W)4/DEVB said the Administration had stipulated in the demolition works contract that the contractor(s) were required to preserve the three important trees within the project site. The Administration would also take into account the need to protect the OVTs in planning the

future use of the project site. The protection options available included adding tree preservation or compensation terms to the relevant land lease.

18. Mr LAU Kwok-fan said that members belonging to the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the proposal. He asked whether the contractor(s) concerned would be penalized for damaging the important trees during demolition. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung sought confirmation from the Administration that the two OVTs would be protected under the law.

19. PD1/ArchSD confirmed that the two OVTs would be protected under relevant regulations. She further advised that these trees were located at some distance away from the superstructures to be demolished and the contractor(s) concerned should deploy an independent tree specialist to regularly monitor the tree conditions. If it was found that the contractor(s) concerned had caused any damage to the trees, the Administration would pursue their responsibility under the contract.

#### Impact of the proposed demolition works on the community

20. Mr YIU Si-wing indicated support for the proposal. Mr Kenneth LEUNG and Mr YIU expressed concern on the impact of the proposed demolition works on the community living in the areas nearby. Mr LEUNG enquired about the noise and dust mitigation measures to be taken during demolition to minimize the impact on the residents living in the vicinity. Meanwhile, Mr YIU sought information about the proposed measures to mitigate the impact on the users of the open playground of the South China Athletic Association, which was situated next to the project site.

21. PD1/ArchSD replied that the contractor(s) concerned would be required to use silencers, mufflers, acoustic lining or shields for noisy demolition activities. To minimize dust generation arising from the demolition work, mitigation measures such as frequent cleaning and watering of the project site, as well as the provision of wheel-washing facilities inside the project site, would be taken. The Administration would also maintain close communication with the parties that would be affected by the proposed demolition works, such as the South China Athletic Association and Po Leung Kuk (the Headquarters of which were close to the project site).

22. Mr KWONG Chun-yu said he had yet to decide whether to support the proposal. He asked about the aggregate impact of the proposed

redevelopment of the Po Leung Kuk Headquarters and the proposed demolition works at the project site on the community living in the areas nearby, and whether the community concerned had been consulted on the proposed demolition works.

23. PAS(W)4/DEVB advised that the proposed demolition works would complete before the commencement of the proposed redevelopment project of the Po Leung Kuk Headquarters. PD1/ArchSD supplemented that the Wan Chai District Council had been consulted on the proposed demolition works in June 2016. She assured members that the Administration/contractor(s) would maintain close communication with the affected parties before and during the demolition works.

#### Time taken in releasing the project site for development

24. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen expressed support for the proposal. Given that the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("EMSD") and the Civil Aid Service ("CAS") had vacated their headquarters at the project site more than 10 years before, Mr CHAN asked why the Administration had not planned the demolition works earlier to release the site for other uses. Dr Helena WONG and Mr HUI Chi-fung said they had yet to decide whether to support the proposal. Dr WONG expressed dissatisfaction on the Administration's slow action in planning the demolition, whereas Mr HUI was concerned that the Administration had failed to formulate a land use plan for the site over the past decade.

25. PAS(W)4/DEVB explained that the EMSD Headquarters had been relocated to Kowloon Bay in 2005 and the CAS Headquarters to Yau Ma Tei in 2006. The ex-EMSD Headquarters and ex-CAS Headquarters had been used by various bureaux/departments since then until they were vacated in 2014 for demolition. The Director of Audit had looked into the matter and recommended in his Report No. 62 that the Administration should expedite the demolition works and return the project site for development as soon as possible, and inform the Panel of the ten-year slippage in releasing the site for development. The Administration agreed to the Director of Audit's recommendations.

26. Mr YIU Si-wing enquired about the time that the Post Office Recreation Club and the PCCW Recreation Club ("the two Recreation Clubs"), both situated within the project site, had to be vacated, and whether the Administration had to compensate the two Recreation Clubs for their relocation.

27. PAS(W)4/DEVB said the Administration had reached an agreement with the two Recreation Clubs and they would vacate the premises within the site before June 2017. No compensation would be payable to the Hong Kong Post and PCCW for the relocation.

Future use of the project site

28. Noting that the project site would be rezoned for commercial development and other uses including "Government, Institution and Community" ("G/IC") uses, Ms Tanya CHAN and Mr HUI Chi-fung were worried that the traffic capacity of the road network around the site could not cope with the additional traffic arising from the development.

29. Mr Kenneth LEUNG and Mr KWONG Chun-yu asked whether the Administration had consulted the public on the future use of the project site before making a submission to the Town Planning Board ("TPB") for rezoning; if not, whether the Administration would do so.

30. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said he was opposed to the proposal. He held the view that the present policy of selling land to private developers resulted in soaring land premium and failed to meet the development need of the community. Mr CHU opined that, in addition to seeking public views on the future use of the project site, the public consultation to be conducted should include a question on whether or not the project site should be sold for private development.

31. Mr Nathan LAW said he could not support the proposal for the time being. In view of the fact that a large area of land in Causeway Bay was being used for commercial development, Mr LAW saw no reason why the project site should be rezoned for the same use without first consulting the local community. Both Mr Nathan LAW and Mr CHU Hoi-dick requested the Administration to conduct a public consultation on the future use of the project site with no pre-conceived position.

32. PAS(W)4/DEVB explained that the rezoning of the project site was still at the planning stage and the Administration would make use of the time required for the demolition of the existing superstructures at the site to consult Wan Chai District Council on the rezoning proposal for the site.

33. In response to Mr KWONG Chun-yu's enquiry about the future use of the project site in case the rezoning proposal was rejected by TPB, PAS(W)4/DEVB advised that the Administration considered it an opportune time to commence the proposed demolition works as the demolition would help release the project site for any land use in future.

34. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Jeremy TAM and Mr Paul TSE sought elaboration from the Administration about the future land use of the project site, including (a) the proposed maximum plot ratio of the site; (b) whether the maximum plot ratios for sites for commercial use and G/IC use were different; (c) the respective floor areas to be allocated for commercial and G/IC development at the site; and (d) the exact uses of the areas to be allocated for commercial (hotel, office, etc.) and G/IC development (park, community hall, etc.).

35. PAS(W)4/DEVB advised that as stated in the 2016 Policy Address, the project site would be rezoned for commercial development. To allow flexibility, the Administration planned to rezone the project site for both commercial and G/IC uses. The maximum total floor area of the project site after development would amount to 170 000 square metres. Yet, the respective floor areas to be allocated for commercial and G/IC development were yet to be decided and would be subject to the views of Wan Chai District Council and the agreement of TPB.

36. As regards the plot ratio of the project site, District Planning Officer (Hong Kong), Planning Department ("DPO(HK)/PD"), said that according to the Building (Planning) Regulations (Cap. 123F), the maximum plot ratio of a site for non-domestic use (including commercial or G/IC use) was 15. However, having regard to the traffic conditions in the vicinity of the project site, the plot ratio of the project site was proposed to be about 6.5.

37. Taking in view that the respective floor areas to be allocated for commercial and G/IC development had yet to be decided, Mr HUI Chi-fung commented that the Administration had failed to set out a direction for the future development of the project site.

38. PAS(W)4/DEVB reiterated that the rezoning of the project site was at the planning stage. The Administration would brief the Panel the development proposal for the project site in due course.

39. Mr LAU Kwok-fan urged the Administration to make good use of the time to be taken for the demolition works to consult the local community on the future use of the project site.

40. The Chairman advised that members belonging to the Liberal Party supported the proposal. Mr CHAN Kin-por expressed support for the proposal. In view of the shortage of office space in Hong Kong, Mr CHAN urged the Administration to expedite the rezoning of the project site for commercial development. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok said that members belonging to the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong supported the proposal. Dr LO opined that the demolition works should be carried out to give way for land development.

#### Alternatives to demolition

41. Mr Nathan LAW queried whether the conditions of the buildings within the project site were so deteriorated that they should be demolished; if not, whether the buildings concerned could be renovated for re-use, and the difficulties and costs for pursuing this alternative option.

42. PD1/ArchSD replied that the buildings of the project site had been constructed in the 1960s to 1970s and the condition was deteriorating. The proposed demolition works could help release the site for optimal land use.

43. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired whether the Administration, for the sake of environmental protection, had considered options other than demolishing all the buildings within the project site, such as demolishing shorter building(s) for redevelopment, while keeping the taller building(s) for re-use; if not, the reasons. The Administration undertook to provide the information requested by Mr CHU after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)673/16-17(01) on 15 March 2017.)*

44. Dr Helena WONG opined that if the conditions of the office buildings within the project site were acceptable, the Administration could make use of these building to accommodate the Office of the Chief Executive-elect, instead of renting office space in Champion Tower at Garden Road, Central, to accommodate the aforesaid Office.

Dr WONG asked whether the Administration had explored such an option; if not, the reasons.

45. PAS(W)4/DEVB advised that the demolition of the office buildings within the project site would be commenced in the second quarter of 2017. That said, he undertook to provide a written response to Dr WONG's question after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)673/16-17(01) on 15 March 2017.)*

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

46. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that members belonging to the Liberal Party, the Civic Party, the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong and the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the Administration's submission of the funding proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") for consideration. One member was opposed to the proposal and a number of other members, including those belonging to the Democratic Party, had yet to decide whether to support the proposal.

#### **VI PWP Item No. 3281RS — Reprovisioning of Tsun Yip Street Playground facilities to Hong Ning Road Park and Ngau Tau Kok Fresh Water Service Reservoir**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)578/16-17(05) — Administration's paper on 3281RS — Reprovisioning of Tsun Yip Street Playground facilities to Hong Ning Road Park and Ngau Tau Kok Fresh Water Service Reservoir)

47. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office, Development Bureau ("Head/EKEO/DEVB"), briefed members on the proposal to upgrade PWP Item No. 3281RS to Category A, mainly for the reprovisioning of the ball courts at Tsun Yip Street Playground ("the Playground"), including a 7-a-side soccer pitch and two basketball courts, affected by project 3450RO (converting Tsun Yip Street Playground as Kwun Tong Industrial Culture Park) to Hong

Ning Road Park ("the Park") and Ngau Tau Kok Fresh Water Service Reservoir ("the Reservoir"), at an estimated cost of \$397.1 million in money-of-the-day prices. The project also included the reprovisioning of the existing ball courts and the jogging track at the Park, as well as the provision of barrier-free access and related facilities, etc. Subject to the funding approval of FC, the Administration planned to commence the project in the fourth quarter of 2017 for completion between mid-2019 and late-2020 by phases. Details of the proposal were given in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)578/16-17(05)).

*(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)626/16-17(02) by email on 1 March 2017.)*

48. The Chairman reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure 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.

#### The use of the third-generation artificial turf

49. Dr Helena WONG said that Members belonging to the Democratic Party in general supported the proposal. She however expressed concern on health-related issues in relation to the third-generation ("3G") artificial turf pitches managed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD"). She said that some laboratory test results had revealed the finding of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, a carcinogenic substance, and toxic heavy metals exceeding some kind of standards in three 3G artificial turf pitches of LCSD. Dr WONG sought clarification on whether the Administration would use 3G artificial turf for the construction of the ball courts to be reprovisioned to the Park; if yes, what kind of rubber-filled materials (e.g. recycled rubber granules) would be used.

50. Head/EKEO/DEVB advised that taking into account the 7-a-side soccer pitch originally provided at the Playground was a hard-paved ball court, the Administration would provide the same at the Park. In addition, the Administration planned to use natural turf for constructing the reprovisioned gateball courts.

51. Pointing out that the Administration would provide a 7-a-side artificial turf pitch in the open space at Hing Wah Street West in response to the request made by the Sham Shui Po District Council and local



residents, Dr Helena WONG opined that the Administration should take the initiative to consult the Kwun Tong District Council ("KTDC") on whether they would prefer the Administration to provide a hard-paved soccer pitch or one with artificial turf at the Park.

52. Head/EKEO/DEVB responded that the Administration had discussed the proposal with KTDC for three times but no request for converting a hard-paved soccer pitch into an artificial turf pitch had been received. Assistant Director (Leisure Services)l, Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("AD(LS)1/LCSD"), supplemented that there were currently three 7-a-side artificial turf pitches in Kwun Tong. KTDC considered it appropriate for the Administration to provide a hard-paved soccer pitch at the Park. The hard-paved soccer pitch would be open for public use free of charge and allow flexibility for holding different activities thereat.

53. Dr Helena WONG further sought confirmation from the Administration on whether it would no longer use toxic substances as fillers in all recreation and sports venues managed by LCSD. AD(LS)1/LCSD responded that some overseas authorities were conducting comprehensive studies on health concerns relating to the use of recycled rubber in making artificial turf pitches. LCSD would keep in view the latest scientific knowledge and follow up closely with international authorities and relevant parties. The Chairman advised that the wider issue in respect of the LCSD's control of the materials to be used in the construction of turf for pitches was outside the scope of the funding proposal.

#### Tsun Yip Street Playground

54. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired about the distance and the travelling time between the Playground and the Park for the reprovisioning of the ball courts. Head/EKEO/DEVB advised that while the Park was about 900 m away from the Playground, soccer pitches were also available at Kwun Tong Recreation Ground (next to Kwun Tong Swimming Pool), which was closer to the Playground.

55. While supporting the provision of additional ball courts at the Park, Mr CHU Hoi-dick considered that the site for reprovisioning the ball courts were too far away from the Playground. He further opined that the original ball courts at the Playground should have been retained, since the ball courts, constructed for the workers in Kwun Tong in the 1980s, were symbols of the industrial culture of Kwun Tong in the past.

Mr CHU called on the Administration to adopt appropriate strategies to acknowledge the history of Kwun Tong and retain the elements of the "industrial culture" when taking forward the Energizing Kowloon East project.

56. Head/EKEO/DEVB said that the Playground project had been thoroughly discussed in the funding approval process, and the construction works at the Playground had commenced in July 2016. The Playground project would facilitate the transformation of Kowloon East from an industrial area into an additional core business district and cater for the needs of present-day business workers.

Facilities to be provided at Hong Ning Road Park and the Reservoir

57. Noting that a barrier would normally be constructed around a service reservoir to restrict public access so as to avoid contamination of potable water, Ms Tanya CHAN questioned why the Administration would provide public leisure space at the Reservoir, and how the design of the sitting-out area on top of the Reservoir could facilitate the use of elderly residents, such as whether any measures would be taken to level the uneven ground of the area.

58. Head/EKEO/DEVB advised that the Administration would fully utilize the space on top of the Reservoir for passive recreational activities, which would not cause damage to the Reservoir or contamination to the potable water stored therein. The proposed project included provision of barrier-free access and related facilities including a lift tower, staircases and a footbridge connecting the Park and the Reservoir.

59. Dr Helena WONG enquired about: (a) the feasibility of providing a jogging track along the whole site boundary; (b) whether the Administration would provide paving materials in the sitting-out area above the Reservoir; and (c) whether the Administration would consider designating an area at the Park, e.g. near the roundabout of the jogging track, as a dogs' garden.

60. Head/EKEO/DEVB advised that it was not feasible to provide a jogging track along the entire site boundary of the Park, taking into account the limited size of the site. Notwithstanding this, members of the public could make use of the sitting-out area above the Reservoir for jogging. While the Administration had adopted an open attitude towards the provision of a pet garden, it should be noted that there were diverse views among members of KTDC on the subject matter. As

such, the Administration currently had no plan to provide a pet garden at the Park or above the Reservoir.

61. Dr Helena WONG further enquired whether rain shelters would be provided at the Park to cater for the needs of morning walkers and visitors. Head/EKEO/DEVB responded that there would be about 50 rain shelters with a total of 200 seats scattered across the Park and above the Reservoir.

#### Other views

62. Mr Jeremy TAM expressed support for the proposed project. Noting that the proposal had been enhanced in consultation with KTDC, he expressed appreciation for the efforts made by the Administration in preparing the proposal. Mr TAM urged the Administration to expedite the reprovisioning of the facilities affected by the conversion of the Playground.

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

63. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that members raised no objection to the Administration's submission of the funding proposal to PWSC for consideration.

### **VII Regrading of Assistant Director of Water Supplies posts in Water Supplies Department**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)578/16-17(06) — Administration's paper on regrading of Assistant Director of Water Supplies posts in Water Supplies Department)

64. Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)3, Development Bureau ("PAS(W)3/DEVB"), advised that the Administration proposed the regrading of four Assistant Director of Water Supplies ("ADWS") (D2) posts to four Government Engineer ("GE") (D2) posts in the Water Supplies Department ("WSD") to meet operational needs and enhance staff planning. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Assistant Director/Development, WSD, elaborated on the justifications for the proposed regrading. Details of the proposal were given in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)578/16-17(06)).

*(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)626/16-17(03) by email on 1 March 2017.)*

### Justifications for the proposed regrading

65. The Panel noted that under the regrading proposal, four ADWS posts would be regraded to four GE posts, which were open for promotion appointment to all Chief Engineers (D1) of the Engineer grade, and an ADWS post would be retained exclusively for the promotion of other non-Engineer professional grade officers in WSD. The regrading proposal would tie in with the Administration's plan of merging the two streams of the Engineer grade under the Director of Civil Engineering and Development ("DCED") and the Director of Water Supplies ("DWS") in late 2017. Dr YIU Chung-yim enquired about the benefits of the merger and whether it would give rise to operational issues. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung sought clarification about the rationale for the regrading.

66. Deputy Director of Water Supplies ("DDWS") replied that the merger proposal was well supported by the Engineer grade officers of both streams as they considered the proposal conducive to their career development. The Administration considered that by pooling the Engineer grade officers of the two streams together, staff planning and succession management could be enhanced. Assistant Director (Administration), Civil Engineering and Development Department, added that after the merger, all the Engineer grade officers would be under DCED but deployed to different bureaux/departments, including WSD and other works departments.

67. Dr Helena WONG observed that under the regrading proposal, the post of Assistant Director of the Development Branch ("AD/Dev"), who led the Water Science Division, would no longer be filled by promoting the head of the Water Science Division, namely Chief Chemist (D1) of the Waterworks Chemist grade. Instead, the Chief Chemist, as well as other chief professionals of the Mechanical Engineer and the Electrical Engineer grades, could only be promoted to the Assistant Director of the Mechanical and Electrical Branch ("AD/M&E"). In other words, the Chief Chemist, once promoted under the regrading proposal, could no longer lead the Water Science Division. Dr WONG considered such an arrangement unreasonable and asked if the Administration would revise its proposal so that AD/Dev could also be filled by promoting a Chief Chemist of the Waterworks Chemist grade.

68. DDWS advised that the job nature of AD/Dev was predominately related to civil engineering, such as steering the planning studies of waterworks projects and formulating the Total Water Management Strategy, including the waterworks projects for implementation of the Strategy. In fact, the post of AD/Dev had been filled by Assistant Directors promoted from Chief Engineers of the Engineer grade in recent years. The Water Science Division headed by the Chief Chemist of Directorate grade had sufficient expertise to support the work of WSD in the area of water quality. The Administration considered it more appropriate for the AD/Dev post to be filled by promoting an Engineer grade professional.

69. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok expressed support for the regrading proposal. He advised that the Engineer grade officers of the two streams welcomed the proposal.

70. Mr LAU Kwok-fan said that members belonging to the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the regrading proposal. He sought confirmation from the Administration that the professional staff concerned had been consulted on the regrading proposal.

71. DDWS confirmed that the Administration had consulted extensively staff members of both streams of the Engineer grades, as well as the Mechanical Engineer, the Electrical Engineer and the Waterworks Chemist grade staff members of WSD on the regrading proposal.

#### Impact of the regrading proposal

72. While indicating support for the regrading proposal in principle, Ms Tanya CHAN expressed concern on whether the improvement of the career prospect of the Engineer grade officers under the proposal would be made at the expense of the advancement opportunities of other professional grade officers.

73. DDWS explained that at present, there were 12 chief professionals of Engineer Grade and three chief professionals of the Mechanical Engineer, the Electrical Engineer and the Waterworks Chemist grades in WSD eligible for promotion to the five ADWS posts, representing a promotion ratio of 15:5 or 3:1. Under the regrading proposal, the post of AD/M&E would be filled by promoting the three chief professionals of the Mechanical Engineer, the Electrical Engineer and the Waterworks

Chemist grades only, thereby preserving the promotion ratio of 3:1 for these chief professionals.

74. Dr Junius HO said that he had reservation on the regrading proposal. Dr HO asked whether (a) the regrading proposal was to ensure that the promotion ratio of Chief Engineers to GE would be kept as 3:1; and (b) the Administration would have to submit another staffing proposal to the Panel for consideration in case there was a change to the number of Chief Engineers in WSD, resulting in a change to the 3:1 promotion ratio.

75. DDWS advised that after the merger of the two streams of the Engineer grade, the GE posts in WSD as well as other works departments would be promotable from Chief Engineers of the Engineer grade in all works departments, including WSD, thus the ratio of GE posts to Chief Engineers of the Engineer grade after the merger should be based on the overall GE posts and Chief Engineer posts in the merged Engineer grade.

#### Workload of the Assistant Directors in the Water Supplies Department

76. Given that both the Assistant Director of the Supply and Distribution (Urban) Branch ("AD/Urban") and the Assistant Director of the Supply and Distribution (New Territories) Branch ("AD/NT") were responsible for, among others, overseeing the enforcement of the Waterworks Ordinance (Cap. 102) ("WWO"), in particular, AD/NT oversaw the review of WWO and the Waterworks Regulations (Cap. 102A) ("WWR"), Ms Tanya CHAN asked whether the workload of these two Assistant Directors would increase with the Administration's on-going work on reviewing WWO and WWR.

77. DDWS replied that AD/Urban and AD/NT were tasked with overseeing the operation and maintenance of the waterworks installations and water supply networks in urban areas and the NT respectively. Moreover, AD/Urban looked after the policy and procedure formulation for water supply and distribution, whereas AD/NT was responsible for that related to customer services. WSD had deployed additional manpower resources to cope with the workload generated from the proposed legislative amendments to WWO and WWR under AD/NT.

#### Other concerns

78. Mr Holden CHOW noted that some remote villages in Hong Kong (e.g. Tai Long Village on Lantau Island) had yet to be supplied with

treated water, Mr CHOW considered the situation unacceptable. He requested the Administration to provide a list of villages in Hong Kong where the supply of treated water was not available, and enquired whether the Administration had followed up the issue of unavailability of treated water in the aforesaid villages and formulated a timetable for supplying treated water to these villages; if so, the details; if not, the reasons.

79. DDWS explained that at present the supply of treated water was available to about 99.9% of the population in Hong Kong. Areas without the supply of treated water were mainly those remote villages far away from the existing government water supply system. Given the sparse population of these villages, the per capita capital cost for extension of the water supply system to these villages would be high. That said, the Administration had kept these villages under review regarding the provision of treated water supply to them, and had been studying water supply alternatives which were more economical, such as augmenting the raw water supply systems in these villages as and when necessary. He undertook to provide the information requested by Mr CHOW after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)827/16-17(01) on 18 April 2017.)*

80. Expressing concern over the discharge of rainwater into the sea due to overflow from reservoirs, Mr Jeremy TAM criticized the slow progress of the Administration in taking forward the Inter-Reservoirs Transfer Scheme ("IRTS"), a project to construct an overflow transfer tunnel from the Kowloon Byewash Reservoir to the Lower Shing Mun Reservoir to conserve water resources. Mr TAM asked if the adoption of the regrading proposal would help put forth IRTS.

81. DDWS advised that, under IRTS, the Drainage Services Department ("DSD") would construct a tunnel connecting the Kowloon Byewash Reservoir and the Lower Shing Mun Reservoir to transfer the overflow from the Kowloon Group of Reservoirs to the Lower Shing Mun Reservoir for achieving the dual objectives of reducing run-off flowing into the Lai Chi Kok drainage system and converting overflow into potable water resources. PAS(W)3/DEVB undertook to convey Mr TAM's view on expediting the implementation of IRTS to DSD. DDWS further explained that overflow mainly occurred in small to medium reservoirs as their capacities, which were to cater for the water

demand at the time of their construction decades before, were insufficient to accommodate the rainfall collected in their catchments during heavy rainstorm.

82. Taking in view that fresh water was being used for toilet flushing in Sheung Shui and Fanling, Mr LAU Kwok-fan considered it a waste of water resources and asked about the latest progress of supplying reclaimed water to these areas for non-potable uses.

83. DDWS replied that WSD would commission the supply of reclaimed water to Northeast New Territories in phases starting from 2022, covering Sheung Shui and Fanling.

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

84. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that, while a few members had expressed reservation on the proposal, no member raised objection to the Administration's submission of the regrading proposal to the Establishment Subcommittee for consideration.

### **VIII PWP Item No. 751CL — Planning and engineering study on Sunny Bay reclamation**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)578/16-17(07) — Administration's paper on 751CL — Planning and engineering study on Sunny Bay reclamation

LC Paper No. CB(1)578/16-17(08) — Paper on proposed reclamation at Sunny Bay prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Updated background brief))

85. Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Works)5 ("PAS/DEV(W)5") said that dating back to 2007, the Revised Concept Plan for Lantau had recommended to develop the proposed Sunny Bay reclamation into a leisure, entertainment and tourism node. During the public engagement ("PE") exercise on the "Enhancing Land Supply Strategy: Reclamation outside Victoria Harbour and Rock Cavern Development" in 2013, many views expressed support for developing Sunny Bay reclamation for commercial and tourism-related uses. In addition, in the PE exercise conducted by the Lantau Development



Advisory Committee and the Administration in early 2016 for Lantau development, it was found that the proposal of developing the North-eastern Lantau (where the proposed Sunny Bay reclamation formed a part) into a leisure, entertainment and tourism node was generally supported by the public.

86. PAS/DEV(W)5 advised that during the term of the Fifth Legislative Council, the Administration had submitted the proposal for upgrading PWP Item No. 751CL to Category A to the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC"). Though the proposal had been discussed at PWSC meetings, it had not received majority support from members. After the meetings, with a view to addressing PWSC members' concerns, the Administration had completed some technical assessments, the details of which were provided in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)578/16-17(07)).

87. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Head of Civil Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department ("Head/Civil Engineering Office/CEDD"), briefed members on the proposal to upgrade PWP Item No. 751CL to Category A at an estimated cost of \$99.8 million in MOD prices for carrying out a planning and engineering ("P&E") study on Sunny Bay reclamation and the associated site investigation works. Details of the proposal were given in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)578/16-17(07)).

*(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)626/16-17(04) by email on 1 March 2017.)*

#### Reclamation as a way to increase land supply

88. Taking into account that Hong Kong had a serious land shortage problem, the Deputy Chairman, Mr YIU Si-wing and Mr Holden CHOW expressed support for reclamation outside Victoria Harbour to create new land. The Deputy Chairman said that reclamation was a less controversial option for creating new land than developing the land where there were existing residents or business operators. He and Mr YIU noted that according to the Chinese White Dolphin ("CWD") survey, Sunny Bay was unlikely a CWD hotspot and had only low and probably occasional dolphin activities. Overall, the cumulative environmental impact assessment had revealed that there was no insurmountable environmental problem with respect to the key environmental aspects for the proposed reclamation at Sunny Bay. The Administration had

addressed the public's concern about the impacts of the proposed reclamation on marine ecology and fisheries.

89. Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that the Administration should study all other sources of land supply, and reclamation should only be a last resort to provide land given the environmental impact. He said that a 60-hectare site had been reserved for many years for the Phase 2 development of the Hong Kong Disneyland Resort ("HKDL"), the Administration should first use the site for the proposed leisure, entertainment and tourism development, instead of proposing reclamation at Sunny Bay. He asked about the timetable for taking forward the Phase 2 development of HKDL.

Admin 90. PAS/DEV(W)5 advised that the Administration and The Walt Disney Company would continue to keep and explore the Phase 2 development of HKDL as a long-term development plan for the resort. The Administration reiterated that it would be appropriate to develop the proposed Sunny Bay reclamation for leisure, entertainment and tourism uses no matter the reserved site would eventually be used for the expansion of HKDL or not. At the request of the Chairman, the Administration would provide a written response to Dr Fernando CHEUNG's question after the meeting.

#### Proposed uses of the reclaimed land

91. Mr Michael TIEN suggested that the Administration should consider constructing permanent racetracks, together with other recreational, catering and entertainment facilities, on the Sunny Bay reclamation site, so as to develop a new tourist attraction in Hong Kong. Referring to the successful motorsports events staged in neighbouring cities in Asia, Mr TIEN said that the staging of such events would help attract more overnight visitors to Hong Kong. In addition, the permanent racetracks could be used for holding local car racing events and driving training activities, as well as to support the research and development of the motor industry in Hong Kong.

92. Mr YIU Si-wing supported the Administration's recommendation that the proposed reclamation site at Sunny Bay be used mainly for recreation and tourism-related activities. In particular, he suggested that a resort be developed at Sunny Bay. To support the development of the tourism industry in Hong Kong, Mr YIU further suggested that the Administration should consider setting up a tourism institute at the proposed reclamation site.

93. The Deputy Chairman expressed reservation on the development of a resort at the proposed reclamation site at Sunny Bay, given the problem of aircraft noise due to the proximity of the site to the airport. He suggested that shopping outlets could be set up at the site. Moreover, a government-managed promenade should be developed for public enjoyment.

94. In response, PAS/DEV(W)5 and Head/Civil Engineering Office/CEDD said that the Administration took note of the suggestions on the land uses of the site made by Mr TIEN, Mr YIU and the Deputy Chairman, and these suggestions would be duly considered under the proposed P&E study, in which detailed land use proposals would be formulated.

95. Mr YIU Si-wing asked when the proposed reclamation was expected to be completed. Head/Civil Engineering Office/CEDD replied that it would take at least 8 to 10 years after the commencement of the proposed P&E study.

96. Mr Holden CHOW suggested that the Administration should explore the feasibility of developing a route connecting the reclamation site and Tsing Lung Tau so as to provide a new vehicular access to Lantau. In response, PAS/DEV(W)5 said that the Transport and Housing Bureau planned to conduct a feasibility study on Route 11, which would link up North Lantau and Yuen Long via Tsing Lung Tau.

97. At 5:25 pm, taking in view that 10 members were still waiting to speak on the agenda item, the Chairman advised that the discussion on the item would be continued at the next meeting. He added that he had received from members two proposed motions, which would be dealt with at the next meeting.

## **IX Any other business**

98. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:25 pm.