

Panel on Development

List of follow-up actions
(Position as at 22 January 2018)

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
<p>1. Briefing by the Secretary for Development on the Chief Executive's 2017 Policy Address and the overall land supply situation (Development Bureau, Food and Health Bureau, Commerce and Economic Development Bureau)</p>	<p>24 January 2017</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information:</p> <p><u>Land supply</u></p> <p>(a) elaboration on the work to be undertaken by the Urban Renewal Authority in redeveloping aged-buildings in built-up areas with a view to increasing housing land supply;</p> <p>(b) whether there would be any funding proposals in relation to the Kwu Tung North new development area ("NDA") and Fanling North NDA to be submitted to the Finance Committee for consideration by the current-term Government;</p>	<p>Response from the Development Bureau was issued to members on 27 February 2017 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)618/16-17(01).</p> <p>Response from the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau on (h) was issued to members on 11 April 2017 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)796/16-17(01).</p> <p>Response from the Food and Health Bureau on (f) is awaited</p>

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p><u>Brownfield sites</u></p> <p>(c) information on the distribution of brownfield sites in the New Territories, with breakdown by the following categories of the sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) the brownfield operations thereon which were in existence immediately before the first publication of the draft plans of the "Development Permission Areas" ("DPAs");(ii) sites that were not designated as DPAs;(iii) sites zoned "Undetermined";(iv) enclaves; and(v) government land leased out by Short Term Tenancy for use as open storage. <p>(d) in respect of the possibility of accommodating some brownfield operations into multi-storey buildings, whether the Administration would consider conducting a pilot scheme for such a proposal, rather than taking no action and waiting for the relevant studies to be completed in the next few years;</p>	

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p><u>Land use</u></p> <p>(e) elaboration on the proposed setting up of a conservation fund to further promote the revitalization of remote rural areas; whether the Development Bureau would review the compensation and rehousing mechanisms for various parties affected by development projects in the New Territories, such as the compensation for people affected by land resumption, taking reference from the proposed conservation fund; if yes, the details;</p> <p>(f) written response to Dr Hon LAU Siu-lai's letter dated 25 January 2017 on the role of the Development Bureau in the Government's policy on bazaars (LC Paper No. CB(1)501/16-17(01));</p> <p>(g) the justification for considering allocating land on the periphery of country parks for housing development, whereas only about 1% of the land of the Green Belt zone had been rezoned to residential or other uses;</p>	

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>(h) the justification for proposing to use the Wan Chai Sports Ground for comprehensive development, including convention and exhibition venues, whereas land in Lantau had been reserved for the expansion of Asia World Expo;</p> <p><u>Land administration</u></p> <p>(i) the justification for renewing the land lease of the Sha Tin Racecourse for a further 50 years; the amount of land premium paid by The Hong Kong Jockey Club ("HKJC") for the renewal of the land lease; whether the above land lease was available for public inspection;</p> <p>(j) the justification for rezoning a site of 4.67 hectares in the Hong Kong Sports Institute from "Government, Institution or Community" to "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Race Course"; whether the Administration had signed/would sign a land lease with HKJC in respect of the above site;</p>	

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p><u>Enforcement against domestic use in industrial buildings</u></p> <p>(k) in view of the proposed stepping up of the enforcement efforts to combat the problem of illegal domestic units in industrial buildings, whether the Administration would enhance the rehousing arrangements for the affected inhabitants; if yes, the details; and</p> <p><u>Water safety</u></p> <p>(l) details of the follow-up actions taken by the Development Bureau and the Water Supplies Department relating to the recommendations put forward by the Commission of Inquiry into Excess Lead Found in Drinking Water, including the number of meetings held by the International Expert Panel appointed by the Development Bureau on the various items of follow-up work, and the relevant expert reports.</p>	

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
<p>2. Receiving public views on Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030 (Development Bureau)</p>	<p>10 March 2017</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information:</p> <p>(a) the projection methodology in respect of the estimation that an outstanding area of 200 hectares of land was required in the long term for other specific uses (including science/research and development parks and industrial estates), as mentioned in the "Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030" ("Hong Kong 2030+"), in particular, whether the estimation had included the 87 hectares of land in the Lok Ma Chau Loop; and</p> <p>(b) in respect of each piece of land proposed to be developed under Hong Kong 2030+, the location, development area, population to be accommodated and use, so as to illustrate how the total area of outstanding land demand and total population to be accommodated was arrived at.</p>	<p>Administration's response awaited</p>

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
<p>3. Briefing by the Secretary for Development on the Chief Executive's 2017 Policy Address (Development Bureau)</p>	<p>24 October 2017</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) whether the Administration would consider putting in place a mechanism to ensure that idle government sites under the purview of various government bureaux/departments would be timely surrendered to the Planning Department for converting into suitable uses; (b) whether the Administration would step up inspections to ensure the building safety of those aged buildings for which the developers, while having acquired most of the buildings' property ownerships and pending redevelopment, had delayed the building maintenance and repair works; (c) how the Administration would consider the suggestion made by a non-official member of the Task Force on Land Supply that Plover Cove Reservoir be filled up to provide land for housing; (d) whether and how the Administration would enforce against those cases in 	<p>Administration's response awaited</p>

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>which the owners of shopping centres located at public housing estates or Home Ownership Scheme courts, such as Yung Shing Shopping Centre under the Link Real Estate Investment Trust ("the Link"), and Kam Ying Court Shopping Centre under a company that had acquired the shopping centre from the Link, had failed to provide the community or welfare facilities required under the relevant land lease conditions; and</p> <p>(e) in respect of the new initiative of encouraging private developers to provide welfare facilities in their development projects, (i) of the specific details and timetable of implementation, including the number of private developers and development projects, as well as the types of welfare facilities to be involved; and (ii) whether the Administration would, as a better alternative, consider specifying the requirements of the provision of such facilities under the land sale conditions.</p>	

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
<p>4. Progress report on heritage conservation initiatives (Development Bureau)</p>	<p>31 October 2017</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information:</p> <p>(a) the justifications for the proposed development of a 25-storey private hospital within the Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui's Compound on Lower Albert Road in Central; and</p> <p>(b) the Administration's response regarding whether it would liaise with the church leaders of the Union Church Hong Kong (a Grade 3 historic building) to put on hold the redevelopment plan of the Church while pending reassessment of the grading of the Church by the Antiquities Advisory Board taking into account the public's request.</p>	<p>Administration's response awaited</p>
<p>5. Capital Works Reserve Fund ("CWRP") Block Allocations for 2018-2019 (Development Bureau)</p>	<p>28 November 2017</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information:</p> <p><u>Head 701 Subhead 1100CA</u></p> <p>(a) in respect of the item on the resumption of land for development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long, the number of</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued to members on 8 January 2018 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)436/17-18(01).</p>

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>non-indigenous villagers affected by the village clearance and land resumption thereof, and among which the respective numbers of those who were properly rehoused/rendered homeless;</p> <p>(b) in respect of the item on the formation, roads and drains in Area 54, Tuen Mun phase 2 stage 4B — construction of road L54B, the traffic impact assessment and latest forecast of the traffic flow in the area arising from the planned public and private housing developments;</p> <p>(c) in respect of the items on the resumption of land and road works in relation to the establishment of an agricultural park ("the park") in Kwu Tung South (phase 1), the details including:</p> <p>(i) the timetable of the related land resumption exercise and the areas of land involved, the respective numbers of indigenous and non-indigenous households, licensed structures and business operations that would be affected,</p>	

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>as well as the number of objections received;</p> <p>(ii) the mode of operation of the park, and the number of farmers expected to be benefited from agricultural rehabilitation in the park; and</p> <p>(iii) while the relevant District Council was consulted about the details of the park development, whether and why the Administration considered it appropriate and sufficient to include the relevant funding proposals in the CWRP block allocations for scrutiny by the Legislative Council without providing any details of the park development;</p> <p><u>Head 705 Subhead 5001BX</u></p> <p>(d) details including the works locations and progress in respect of the item on landslip prevention and mitigation programme, 2012, package D, landslip prevention and mitigation works in Lantau Island;</p>	

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p><u>Head 705 Subhead 5101CX</u></p> <p>(e) details including the scope and progress in respect of the item on the study on the technical issues related to the potential reclamation site at Ma Liu Shui;</p> <p><u>Head 707 Subhead 7100CX</u></p> <p>(f) whether the various items related to the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area ("NDA") were part of the existing package of works under the development proposals for the NDA, or were newly proposed items;</p> <p><u>Others</u></p> <p>(g) a consolidated list of the planned new development/housing projects of various scales in the New Territories, together with the estimated numbers of population intakes and jobs to be created in these new developments; and</p>	

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>(h) a consolidated list of the studies proposed to be funded under the CWRP block allocations, together with the relevant details including the deliverables of the studies.</p> <p><i>(Note: Some members had asked about information on items that were beyond the purview of the Panel on Development. The Chairman had suggested that members could raise the relevant questions during the discussions on the CWRP block allocations for 2018-2019 at meetings of the Public Works Committee and the Finance Committee.)</i></p>	
<p>6. PWP Item No. 7804CL — Site Formation and Infrastructure Works for Development at Kam Tin South, Yuen Long — Advance Works (Development Bureau)</p>	<p>28 November 2017</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information:</p> <p>(a) the ecological impact of the proposed re-provisioning of wetland;</p> <p>(b) the rationale for not terminating the engineering consultancy agreement with AECOM Asia Company Limited in respect of the relevant site formation and infrastructure works for the development</p>	<p>Administration's response awaited</p>

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>at Kam Tin South, Yuen Long, even after the Company was found to have improperly used the data obtained from the engineering consultancy agreement in other non-government projects and violated the requirements of the consultancy agreement; and how the Administration could prevent recurrence of similar acts of violation by the consultants; and</p> <p>(c) whether the Administration would consider providing more parking spaces at the housing development projects in Kam Tin South on top of the number required in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines; if it would, the details; if not, the reason.</p>	
<p>7. Supply of Dongjiang Water (Development Bureau)</p>	<p>28 November 2017</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide a copy of the new agreement for the supply of Dongjiang water in the next three years between 2018 and 2020 to be signed between the Hong Kong and Guangdong sides.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued to members on 21 December 2017 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)388/17-18(01).</p>

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
<p>8. PWP Item No. 163TB — Kwun Tong Town Centre Redevelopment — provision of grade-separated pedestrian linkages (Development Bureau)</p>	<p>20 December 2017</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information:</p> <p>(a) while the construction cost of the first phase of PWP Item No. 163TB, i.e. Yuet Wah Street Pedestrian Linkage, was about \$95 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices, an explanation on the much higher estimated cost of about \$153.5 million in MOD prices for the proposed construction of the footbridge across Hip Wo Street near the junction of Hip Wo Street/Mut Wah Street ("the proposed footbridge");</p> <p>(b) given that the proposed footbridge would connect with a footbridge constructed by the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA"), linking the Main Site and the Park Metropolitan of the Kwun Tong Town Centre ("KTTC") Redevelopment Project to form an integrated footbridge system, (i) whether the Administration would request URA or developer(s) involved in the KTTC Redevelopment Project, to share the construction cost of the proposed footbridge; (ii) the estimated</p>	<p>Administration's response awaited</p>

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>number of users of the proposed footbridge, and the proportion of those who would be residents of the Park Metropolitan; (iii) the recurrent expenditure including the annual maintenance costs to be incurred for the proposed footbridge and its lift and whether URA would bear the pro-rata share of such costs based on the proportion in (ii); and (iv) a comparison of the construction costs per square metre of the two footbridges;</p> <p>(c) whether the Administration had considered other design options of the proposed footbridge, such as placing the lift and staircase side by side to share the same space on the main deck and shortening the bridge arms, with a view to reducing the construction cost; and</p> <p>(d) the width of the footpath along Mut Wah Street, and that of the residual footpath space after having constructed the staircase of the proposed footbridge, and whether it was feasible to provide a set of escalator and staircase.</p>	

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
<p>9. Operation Building Bright 2.0 (Development Bureau and Urban Renewal Authority)</p>	<p>20 December 2017</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) a further elaboration to convince members on how effective the existing measures as well as those to be put in place for Operation Building Bright ("OBB") 2.0 for preventing bid-rigging in building repair contracts, including the "Smart Tender" Building Rehabilitation Facilitating Services Scheme of the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA"), could combat the bid-rigging problem and eradicate collusion between consultants and contractors; (b) details of the support services to be provided to property owners through the Building Rehabilitation Platform to be launched by URA; (c) statistics on the number of suspected cases of bid-rigging received in relation to building repair contracts of OBB; among which the number of cases handled and the number of convictions made; and 	<p>Administration's response awaited</p>

Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office)	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		(d) an evaluation on the effectiveness of OBB including a comparison of (i) the number of target buildings, (ii) the number of applications received and the number of buildings involved, vis-à-vis (iii) the final number of buildings that had received assistance under OBB, together with an analysis of the reasons for the shortfall between (i) and (iii).	
10. Implementation arrangements for the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area Project (Development Bureau, Lands Department, Planning Department and Civil Engineering and Development Department)	20 December 2017	The Administration was requested to provide information in response to questions/concerns raised by members at the meeting (See Appendix I).	Administration's response awaited

Panel on Development

Meeting on 20 December 2017

Implementation arrangements for the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area

Summary of questions and concerns

Questions / concerns	Raised by
Overall land use planning	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the purposes of developing Hung Shui Kiu ("HSK") New Development Area ("NDA") into a "Regional Economic and Civic Hub" for the North West New Territories ("NWNT") and maximizing the benefits of the related Transit-oriented Development planning, whether the Administration would consider relaxing the plot ratio and height restriction within the commercial core near the proposed HSK railway station to optimize land use, enable the formation of a critical mass of commercial activities, and accommodate a landmark building of an appropriate height; if it would, of the details. 	Hon Jeffrey LAM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Administration would consider dividing some oversized development sites near the proposed HSK railway station into smaller plots to allow developments of different scales? 	Hon Jeffrey LAM Hon LEUNG Che-cheung
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the sites reserved for education and related uses now situated next to the proposed HSK railway station could be relocated farther north to adjoin the sites for the Enterprise and Technology Park and released for other uses? 	Hon Frankie YICK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How the Administration would address the concerns of the residents of Hung Fuk Estate over the planned location of a large refuse collection point right outside Hung Fuk Estate? 	Hon CHU Hoi-dick
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Administration would accede to the request of the indigenous villagers in Kiu Tau Wai to adjust downward the height of the proposed high-rise developments in planning area number 19B fronting the village? 	Hon CHU Hoi-dick
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Administration would reconsider prioritizing the planning for housing land uses in HSK NDA, instead of aiming too high for self sustainability of population and employment with a diversity of land uses? 	Hon Abraham SHEK

Questions / concerns	Raised by
Village type development	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How the respective boundaries of "Village Type Development" ("V") zones and "Village Environs" within the area of HSK NDA had varied between 1999 and 2017; and whether the Administration had increased the area of "V" zones to favour the development of small houses in the expense of developing more public housing in HSK NDA? 	Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Housing mix	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why the public-to-private housing ratio proposed for HSK NDA (i.e. 51:49) had fallen short of that recommended in the Long Term Housing Strategy (i.e. 60:40); and what would be the ratio of public rental housing units, "Starter Homes" Pilot Scheme units and Green Form Subsidized Home Ownership Scheme units to be developed within the 69.44 hectares of "Residential (Group A)" land in HSK NDA? 	Hon KWONG Chung-yu
Transport infrastructure	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How the Administration would improve the transport network connecting the commercial core of HSK NDA and avoid possible traffic congestion? 	Hon Jeffrey LAM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Administration had assessed the travel time between the proposed HSK railway station and those residential housing estates located far away from it? 	Hon KWONG Chung-yu
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How the road network in NWNT (such as Deep Bay Link) could cope with the anticipated traffic growth arising from HSK NDA; and whether the Administration would consider reprovisioning Tin Ying Road in the form of a tunnel? 	Hon LEUNG Che-cheung
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Administration had planned to reserve suitable site(s) within HSK NDA to dovetail with the development of a new heavy rail to directly connect NWNT to the urban areas if required? 	Hon LEUNG Che-cheung
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Administration would provide an update on the details of the study on the provision of the Environmentally Friendly Transport Services ("EFTS"), including whether a fully-automated and driverless rail system was considered feasible, and whether the proposed EFTS would run at ground level? 	Hon LEUNG Che-cheung
Provision of employment opportunities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How the Administration had projected that HSK NDA would provide about 150 000 jobs, what were the details including the types of these jobs, and when such job opportunities would become available in phases between 2024 to 2038? In addition, the Administration was requested to provide the relevant industrial research report(s) to demonstrate how the economic activities in HSK NDA would create the job opportunities projected as sufficient for local residents. 	Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki Hon CHU Hoi-dick

Questions / concerns	Raised by
Arrangements for affected households	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Administration would relax the overly stringent criteria for consideration of lease modification under which the proposed site to be surrendered for in-situ land exchange should have an area of not less than 4 000 square metres? 	Hon LAU Kwok-fan Hon LEUNG Che-cheung
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Administration had assessed the possibility of judicial review applications to challenge decisions of the Government with regard to the resumption of private land for development on the ground of the stipulation under Article 105 of the Basic Law, and taking in view of this considered following a different approach to encourage private participation in the development projects? 	Hon Abraham SHEK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Administration would adopt a "rehouse first, develop later" approach in land resumption for development, and waive the income and asset test requirements for rehousing the affectees? 	Hon LAU KWOK-fan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Administration would review the rehousing options and provide more acceptable packages that could cater for the specific needs of all affected residents, including those indigenous/non-indigenous villagers, and defer any clearance actions before coming up with the agreeable arrangements? 	Hon Alice MAK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Administration would provide a choice of in-situ rehousing for non-indigenous villagers affected by the HSK NDA project? 	Hon CHU Hoi-dick
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether and how the Administration would step up efforts in making suitable arrangements and closely communicating with all indigenous and non-indigenous villagers affected by land resumption arising from developments to avoid disputes? 	Hon Kenneth LAU, Deputy Chairman
Arrangement for affected brownfield operations	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether and how the Administration had actively engaged and sought the consent of the relevant stakeholders on the reprovision arrangements of brownfield operations affected by the HSK NDA project? Whether the Administration had liaised with the operators of the affected brownfield sites on the reprovision arrangements either at multi-storey buildings ("MSBs") or other land-efficient means at suitable locations? 	Hon Alice MAK Hon LEUNG Che-cheung Hon KWONG Chun-yu
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether, by indicating that "[w]e will not rule out the possibility of accommodating certain operations not practically feasible to move into MSBs on suitable open-air sites", the Administration was regressing in its effort to accommodating the existing 190 hectares of brownfield operations within HSK NDA; and how many of the existing brownfield operations would be moved into MSBs as well as those needed to be accommodated on suitable open-air sites? 	Hon Frankie YICK

Questions / concerns	Raised by
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Whether the Administration would review the eligibility requirement of minimum 10-year operation at the same land lot under the extended ex-gratia allowance ("EGA") proposal to count also the years of operation before moving to another land lot within the same area?	Hon Frankie YICK
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Given that sublessors who were not the business operators but had made investment on the brownfield sites would not be entitled to the extended EGA under the proposal, whether the Administration would review the relevant arrangement?	Hon Frankie YICK
Enhanced Conventional New Town Approach	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Whether there were any updated arrangements under the Enhanced Conventional New Town Approach since its announcement by the former Chief Executive?	Hon KWONG Chun-yu
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In respect of the granting of in-situ land exchange to private land owners, whether the Administration would require the development of subsidized housing but not only private housing on the re-grant site?	Hon CHU Hoi-dick