

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1)139/18-19  
(These minutes have been  
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/ HG+DEV

**Panel on Housing and Panel on Development**

**Minutes of joint meeting**  
**held on Tuesday, 26 June 2018, at 9:00 am to 1:00 pm and**  
**from 5:45 pm to 7:45 pm**  
**in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Members of the Panel on Housing

- \* Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP (Chairman)
- \* Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
- \* Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
- \* Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP
- \* Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP
- \* Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP
- \* Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP
- \* Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
- \* Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
- \* Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
- \* Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP
- \* Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP
- \* Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
- \* Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP
- \* Hon CHU Hoi-dick
- \* Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
- \* Hon HO Kai-ming

- Hon SHIU Ka-fai  
Hon SHIU Ka-chun  
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan  
\* Hon Tanya CHAN  
\* Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
\* Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
\* Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
\* Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho  
\* Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Members of the Panel on Development

- Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, BBS, MH, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon CHAN Chun-ying  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai

**Members absent** : Members of the Panel on Housing

- Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP  
\* Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon LUK Chung-hung  
\* Hon KWONG Chun-yu  
Hon AU Nok-hin  
\* Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH

Members of the Panel on Development

- Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon HUI Chi-fung

- \* Also members of the Panel on Development

**Public Officers  
attending**

: Agenda Item II

Mr Michael WONG Wai-lun, JP  
Secretary for Development

Ms Bernadette LINN, JP  
Permanent Secretary (Planning & Lands)  
Development Bureau

Ms Selene TSOI Sze-long, JP  
Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands)  
Development Bureau

Dr Raymond SO Wai-man, BBS, JP  
Under Secretary for Transport and Housing

Mr Kenneth LEUNG Tak-yan  
Chief Civil Engineer/Public Works Programme  
Transport and Housing Bureau

Mr Tony MOYUNG Hon  
Deputy Director of Lands (Specialist)

Mr Gabriel WOO Tai-on  
Deputy Head of Civil Engineering Office  
(Project and Environmental Management)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Edward CHAN Cheuk-wing  
Chief Engineer (Housing Projects 2)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Stephen LAI Yue-hong  
Senior Agricultural Officer (Agri-Park & Land)  
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

**Attendance by  
Invitation**

: Session One

Mr PUN Hau-man  
Representative  
Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of  
Hong Kong

Miss WONG Lai-fan  
Contact Person  
Union of Kwu Tung North Residents

Mr CHAN Ki-kau

Mr LAU Ki-fung  
North District Council member

Mr AU Kwok-kuen  
成員  
土地維權中心

Mrs TANG Kwai-lin

盧永燊先生  
Member  
Ma Shi Po Environmental Concern Group

Miss LAM On-ki

Miss WU Man-yin

Miss CHENG Lai-tong

Mr AU YEUNG Yuen

曾樂欣小姐  
成員  
古洞支援組

Miss CHAN Hiu-wan  
成員  
東北支援組

Mr LAM Leung-choi

陳愛金先生

林義庭先生

林寶珠女士

Mr Michael YUNG Ming-chau  
Representative  
The Civic Party

何星行先生

Mrs LAW Kuen

Mr TANG Muk-wah

Mrs LAM Ching-wah

Mr WONG Kui-kan

Ms Josephine HO Yin-ping

Mr LI Siu-wah

Mr CHAN Chee-ping

**Session Two**

Mrs LI Yin-fong

Mr NGAN Fai-ming

Miss CHOW Koot-yin

Mr WONG Yiu-ming

Mr YIP Cheuk-yuen

Mr MAK Kam-gung

何竑先生  
中央委員  
自由黨

鮑修振先生  
發言人  
受重建影響的土瓜灣天台住戶組

潘詠珊小姐  
發言人  
土瓜灣天台關注組

李玉強先生

羅顯其先生  
Jointed Village Concern Group on Hung Shui Kiu New  
Development

湯彥珩小姐

許炳林先生  
村民  
乾坑村民自救組

吳卓恆先生  
成員  
土地正義聯盟

劉國安先生

秋吉爽小姐

Mr HO Chi-chung  
Member  
Concerning Grassroots' Housing Rights Alliance

Mr MAK Cheuk-wang  
Member  
關注洪水橋新發展區聯盟

Mr HO Hoi-fat

簡健龍先生

成員

一群正受困於水深火熱之中的農民

Mr LAI Chang

成員

一群正受洪水橋發展計劃影響的農民

簡家強先生

成員

守護農園

杜桂根先生

### **Session Three**

梁德明先生

成員

不是地產舖

羅崇傑先生

陳偉琛先生

成員

丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組

**Clerk in attendance** : Mr Derek LO  
Chief Council Secretary (1)5

**Staff in attendance** : Mr Fred PANG  
Senior Council Secretary (1)5

Ms Michelle NIEN  
Legislative Assistant (1)5

---

Action

**I. Election of Chairman**

Ms Alice MAK, Chairman of the Panel on Housing, advised that Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Chairman of the Panel on Development, had indicated his support for her to chair the joint meeting. With members' concurrence, Ms MAK chaired the joint meeting.

**II. Receiving public views on "General ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for Government's development clearance exercises and Head 711 project no. B780CL — Site formation and infrastructure works for public housing development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long"**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1165/17-18(01) — Administration's paper on Public Works Programme Item No. B780CL — Site formation and infrastructure works for public housing development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long)

Other relevant papers previously issued

(LC Paper No. CB(1)155/17-18(04) — Administration's paper on Public Works Programme Item No. B780CL — Site formation and infrastructure works for public housing development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long

LC Paper No. CB(1)155/17-18(05) — Paper on public housing development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Background brief)

LC Paper No. CB(1)308/17-18(01) — Administration's paper on Public Works Programme Item No. B780CL — Site formation and infrastructure



Action

works for public housing development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long (Follow-up paper)

- LC Paper No. CB(1)951/17-18(01) — Administration's paper on proposed enhancements to the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for Government's development clearance exercises
- LC Paper No. CB(1)996/17-18(06) — Paper on the proposed enhancements to the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for Government's development clearance exercises prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Background brief))

***Submissions from deputations/individuals not attending the meeting***

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/17-18(03) — Submission from Construction Industry Council (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/17-18(04) — Submission from Mr LAU (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/17-18(05) — Submission from 關注收地賠償安排小組 (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/17-18(06) — Submission from 一群受元朗南發展計劃影響的公庵路居民 (Chinese version only))

2. Members noted seven submissions tabled at the meeting.

Action

*(Post-meeting note: The submissions tabled at the meeting were issued to members in electronic form vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1200/17-18(01) to (07) on 27 June 2018.)*

Meeting arrangements

3. The Chairman advised that 135 deputations/individuals had submitted applications to present their views on "General ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for Government's development clearance exercises and Head 711 project no. B780CL — Site formation and infrastructure works for public housing development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long". The two Panels would receive the deputations/individuals views at this meeting, the first two sessions of which held from 9:00 am to 1:00 pm and the third session from 5:45 pm to 7:45 pm, and at the meeting scheduled for 29 June 2018 at 10:45 am.

Presentation of views by deputations/individuals

4. Out of the 105 deputations/individuals registered for the three sessions, 52 deputations/individuals were present and presented their views at the invitation of the Chairman. A summary of their views was in the **Appendix**.

Discussion

5. At the invitation of the Chairman, Secretary for Development ("SDEV") and Under Secretary for Transport and Housing ("USTH") gave the following responses to the views expressed by the deputations/individuals –

- (a) To address the problem of inadequate land in Hong Kong, the Administration had been adopting multi-pronged land supply measures as there was no single measure that could provide sufficient land to address the needs of the community. The Administration would tackle brownfields; there was no such policy as developing green belts first and brownfield sites later. There were more than 300 hectares of brownfield sites in the development areas of Kwu Tung North ("KTN"), Fanling North ("FLN") and Hung Shui Kiu ("HSK") new development areas ("NDAs") and Yuen Long South development, and the Administration would resume the majority of these sites for development. Of the 1 300 hectares of brownfields in the territory, more than 500 hectares were located in the above development areas and the New Territories North;

Action

- (b) The Administration had sought the Town Planning Board ("TPB")'s agreement to amend the statutory plans in relation to the Government's proposals to develop NDAs in KTN, FLN and HSK, and public housing in Wang Chau. As part of the planning process, members of the public presented their views to TPB directly. Taking into consideration, amongst others, the public views and the impacts of the proposals, TPB had made its decisions. While the TPB's decisions might not be agreeable to all, the Administration had followed the proper procedures as laid down in the relevant legislation in formulating the development plans;
- (c) The Administration had discussed with stakeholders its proposed development projects over the past few years. The Administration considered that the proposal of "no relocation, no demolition" was not practicable as accepting it in the areas affected by its development projects underway would render it impossible to meet the demand for public housing and other developments needs of the community. Having regard to the stakeholders' views and suggestions, the Administration worked out the proposal to enhance the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements to be offered to eligible domestic occupants in squatters and business undertakings affected by Government's development clearance exercise as set out in LC Paper No. CB(1)951/17-18(01)("the Proposal"). Under the Proposal, the Administration would offer non-means tested rehousing as an option to eligible households affected by Government's development clearance exercises, in the form of rental units and subsidized sale flats ("SSFs") in Dedicated Rehousing Estates. The Administration also proposed to relax the eligibility criteria for ex-gratia allowances ("EGAs") and enhance the EGA rates;
- (d) Before Dedicated Rehousing Estates were ready for population intake, eligible households would be offered one-off transitional units in the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HS")'s rental or the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA")'s public rental housing ("PRH") estates and an option to relocate to the Dedicated Rehousing Estates when available;

Action

- (e) The amount of EGA for Permitted Occupiers of Licensed Structures and Surveyed Squatters affected by Clearance ("EGAPO") offered to an eligible household in a particular location was based on their length of continuous residence in and size of their squatter structure. The Administration had indicated that the maximum EGAPO amount offered to an eligible household might reach \$1.2 million under the Proposal, but not all households would be eligible for that amount; and
- (f) Public housing development projects, such as the one proposed in Wang Chau, comprised not only the construction of public housing blocks, but also the provision of supporting facilities, including road and transport infrastructures. The ancillary facilities provided in Wang Chau Phase 1 included a carriageway with a connected underpass, footpaths and pick-up/drop-off areas, a footbridge across Long Ping Road with associated lifts, etc. The Administration had not given up the plan of developing Wang Chau Phases 2 and 3 for providing about 13 000 public housing units. After obtaining the relevant funding approval from the Finance Committee in March 2017, the Administration had commenced "Engineering Feasibility Study for Site Formation and Infrastructural Works for Remaining Phases of Public Housing Developments at Wang Chau, Yuen Long" which was expected to be completed in early 2019.

*[At 10:15 am, 10:26 am, 10:27 am and 10:28 am, when the Administration was speaking in response to the deputations, some deputations shouted in their seats and the Chairman reminded deputations to keep silent.]*

*[At 10:29 am, a deputation kept shouting in her seat despite repeated warnings given by the Chairman. The Chairman ordered the deputation to withdraw from the meeting. The Chairman declared that the meeting be suspended in order that the deputation could leave the conference room with the assistance of the security assistants. The meeting resumed at 10:31 am.]*

*[At 12:19 pm, some deputations stood up and shouted. The Chairman asked deputations to sit down and keep silent. At 12:20 pm, a deputation left her seat, walked towards an aisle of the conference room and kept shouting. The Chairman ordered the deputation to withdraw from the meeting and declared that the meeting be suspended. The meeting resumed at 12:21 pm. ]*

Action

Eligible households under the Proposal

6. The Chairman enquired about how the Proposal would increase/change the number or percentage of eligible households for rehousing and compensation arrangements. Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) ("PS/DEV(P&L)") replied that the Administration had not yet obtained all the information about the continuous years of occupation of the households registered in relevant Pre-clearance Surveys ("PCSs"), and hence the exact number of households eligible for the proposed rehousing and ex-gratia compensation arrangements was not known at this stage. According to the Administration's preliminary estimates, for the squatter occupants registered in PCSs for the KTN and FLN NDAs, HSK NDA and Wang Chau Phase 1 development, about 10% to 20% of them who were originally not entitled to any allowances because they were residing in structures that were not recorded in the 1982 Squatter Control Survey nor licensed would at least be eligible for the Domestic Removal Allowance ("DRA") under the Proposal. About 20% to 30% of them who were residing in surveyed/licensed non-domestic structures might be entitled to rehousing or ex-gratia compensation arrangements under the Proposal after they had registered in and fulfilled the requisite requirements of the one-off voluntary registration exercise for domestic occupiers of those structures to be implemented by the Lands Department ("LandsD"). The Chairman requested the Administration to provide written information to address her enquiry.

*(Post-meeting note: The Chinese version of the Administration's supplementary information was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1221/17-18(01) on 3 July 2018.)*

7. The Chairman enquired about the validity of some deputations' claim that about 70% of the villagers affected by Wang Chau Phase 1 development would be eligible for DRA only, but not rehousing or ex-gratia compensation. Deputy Director of Lands (Specialist) ("DD of L(S)") replied that, as a preliminary estimate, after the implementation of the relevant arrangements under the Proposal, households eligible for rehousing to public housing would be 45% of the households registered in the PCS for Wang Chau Phase 1 development, households eligible for ex-gratia compensation would increase from 15% of all registered households to 55%, and households which were entitled to DRA would increase from 70% to 100% of all households registered in PCS. In response to the Chairman's request, DD of L(S) undertook to provide the information in writing.

Action

*(Post-meeting note: The Chinese version of the Administration's supplementary information was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1221/17-18(01) on 3 July 2018.)*

8. Mr CHU Hoi-dick asked whether about 45% of registered households affected by Wang Chau Phase 1 development would be entitled to DRA only but not the rehousing and ex-gratia compensation arrangements under the Proposal, and cast doubt on whether the Proposal would be widely accepted by the households affected by the Government's development clearance exercises.

9. PS/DEV(P&L) replied that in general, squatter occupants who would only be entitled to DRA under the Proposal included occupants in non-surveyed/non-licensed squatter structures which were totally unauthorized and were not tolerated under the prevailing Squatter Control Policy, and households residing in surveyed/licensed structures who were not eligible for any form of rehousing or EGAPo by virtue of their having domestic properties in Hong Kong and/or less than two years of continuous residence immediately preceding the date of the relevant PCS.

10. The Chairman requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the number or percentage (if available) of households which were affected by Wang Chau Phase 1 development and would only be eligible for DRA under the Proposal, and the reasons for their ineligibility for the rehousing/other compensation arrangements.

*(Post-meeting note: The Chinese version of the Administration's supplementary information was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1221/17-18(01) on 3 July 2018.)*

11. The Chairman said that the Administration should arrange briefings to residents in the areas affected by the Government's development clearances with a view to increasing their understanding of the compensation and rehousing arrangements under the Proposal. PS/DEV(P&L) replied that following the announcement of the Proposal on 10 May 2018 at a press conference, the Administration had started to brief local stakeholders, such as relevant District Councils, Rural Committees, residents' groups, etc. in the North District, Yuen Long and Tuen Mun, on the Proposal. With the assistance of social service teams, LandsD's representatives had started meeting with households affected by Wang Chau Phase 1 development, KTN and FLN NDAs projects to explain the relevant arrangements under the Proposal.

Action

Rehousing arrangements

12. Mr CHU Hoi-dick opined that deputations requested "no relocation, no demolition" because the Administration allowed indigenous villagers to continue residing in the areas affected by its development projects, but forced other villagers to move out from their homes. Affected villagers also considered it unfair that the Administration retained the Fanling Golf Course for recreational use by a small group of people. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed similar views, and opined that the Administration had ignored non-indigenous villagers' aspirations for maintaining their existing rural living style. Dr CHENG Chung-tai criticized that SDEV's response to the deputations' request for "no relocation, no demolition" at the meeting had given an impression that the Administration considered that villagers should sacrifice their interests and make way for the development projects, and opined that SDEV should withdraw the relevant remarks. Given that the Administration did not accept the request for "no relocation, no demolition", the Administration should ensure that it would rehouse the households affected by its development projects before land clearances.

13. SDEV replied that to enable Hong Kong to move forward, it was not practicable for the Administration to accept the request for "no relocation, no demolition" from households affected by development projects. The Administration was also unable to guarantee that all affected households would be rehoused before clearances. The Administration considered that while it should make the best efforts to meet the clearances' needs and aspirations, to safeguard the overall public interest, the Administration should take forward the development projects in a timely manner.

14. Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that the Administration should paid due regard to the suggestions of the affected villagers that a village resite should be provided for reprovisioning of their villages houses. Mr Andrew WAN expressed a similar view. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung opined that squatter occupants in rural villages might have difficulty in adapting to the living environment in public housing blocks. The Administration had previously provided special arrangements for some villagers affected by development clearance exercises to construct cottage houses for rehousing purpose. If villagers in the affected areas could identify a suitable village resite area, the Administration should, in line with the people-oriented principle, allow villagers' reprovisioning of their village houses.

Action

15. SDEV replied that under the prevailing Squatter Control Policy, squatter structures remained unauthorized in nature and were only tolerated on a temporary basis until they had to be cleared for development, environmental improvement or safety reasons, or until they were phased out through natural wastage. Such tolerance did not create any legal rights or interests or obligations, and did not confer on any person the right of occupation of land. The special arrangement of permitting construction of two-storey cottage houses for rehousing eligible villagers of Chuk Yuen Village several years ago had taken into account the unique special circumstances of the village being located in the remote Frontier Closed Area ("FCA") whereby the non-indigenous villagers and indigenous villagers had been living together within the remote FCA for a long time, forming a closely-knitted community. The purpose of the Proposal was to provide a unified as well as enhanced ex-gratia compensation and rehousing package that would be offered to eligible occupants in squatters and business undertakings affected by all Government's development clearance exercises over the territory. In view of shortage of land resources, providing special arrangements for affected villagers such as the one for Chuk Yuen Village was not a practicable and sustainable solution. SDEV further advised that under the Proposal, eligible households would be offered non-means tested rehousing to high-density public housing estates. The Administration understood that squatter occupants moving to public housing might not be able to maintain their existing rural living style. In order to take forward the proposals of increasing land and housing supply for the benefit of the community, the Administration might not be able to fully meet the individual aspirations on rehousing and compensations.

16. Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that it was unreasonable for the Administration to require existing squatter occupants to move out, and provided rehousing arrangements to them only if they met the relevant eligibility criteria. The Administration's advice that it was not practicable to provide resite areas for reprovisioning of the affected village houses was not acceptable to him, given that private developers were allowed to develop low-density luxurious houses in rural areas. He enquired whether the Administration would provide in the vicinity of the affected villages higher-density residential developments for rehousing the affected villagers, and allow them to continue to live on farming near the residential developments.



Action

17. SDEV replied that under the Proposal, the Administration would provide Dedicated Rehousing Estates, including the more imminent ones at Pak Wo Road, Fanling and HSK NDA. As it would take time to develop these estates, eligible households would be offered one-off transitional units in HS's rental or HA's PRH estates and an option to relocate to the Dedicated Rehousing Estates when available. Given the space constraints, it might not be practicable to take forward Dr CHEUNG's suggestion of providing sites near the Dedicated Rehousing Estates for farming. In response to Dr CHEUNG's concern that some households might not opt to relocate for a second time from the transitional units to the Dedicated Rehousing Estates, SDEV advised that the households residing in transitional units would be allowed to choose whether to stay in the units or relocate to Dedicated Rehousing Estates when the latter were ready for population intake.

18. Mr LAU Kwok-fan said that households affected by the KTN and FLN NDAs projects requested that the Administration should rehouse them first before land clearances. Some households which would be temporarily rehoused to HA's or HS's transitional units might wish to move to the other Dedicated Rehousing Estate to be provided in KTN Area 24 when it was ready for population intake, instead of the Dedicated Rehousing Estate at Pak Wo Road, Fanling. He suggested that the Administration should put in place a mechanism to address these households' aspirations. PS/DEV(P&L) replied that the Administration would explore with HA and HS, which were responsible for the transitional arrangement, the possibility of meeting households' aspirations to move to the Dedicated Rehousing Estate in KTN Area 24. She advised that as it was estimated that the Dedicated Rehousing Estate in KTN Area 24 would be completed in 2027 or 2028 at the earliest, households concerned might have to stay in the transitional units for a longer period of time until that estate was ready for population intake.

19. Dr Junius HO opined that households which were affected by the Administration's development projects and would be rehoused to PRH should be exempted from the Well-off Tenants Policies ("WTP"). USTH replied that the purpose of implementing WTP was to ensure a more rational allocation of limited public housing resources, and HA would review the policies on a continuous basis. To meet their housing needs, tenants who were required to surrender their PRH units under WTP might consider purchasing flats under the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme or SSFs with premium unpaid in the Home Ownership Scheme Secondary Market. The Chairman said that households moving from a PRH estate upon redevelopment to a new PRH estate were exempted from asset and income tests for a period of 10 years. The Administration should study whether households affected by the

Action

Government's development clearances should also be offered the same arrangement. USTH took note of the Chairman's suggestion.

Ex-gratia compensation

20. The Chairman asked about the validity of some deputations' claim that the proposed amount of EGA to which occupants in squatter structures with a size of 400 square feet was entitled was lower than the amount offered under the existing ex-gratia compensation regime. Mr Andrew WAN opined that the Administration should address the deputations' concern in this regard.

21. PS/DEV(P&L) replied that deputations had the concern as mentioned by the Chairman because the EGAPO amount entitled by some squatter occupants under the Proposal might be lower than the maximum level of the Special Ex-gratia Cash Allowance ("SEGCA"), i.e. \$600,000, offered to eligible households in KTN and FLN NDAs and HSK NDA. PS/DEV(P&L) explained that the basic SEGCA amount which individual households in these NDAs were entitled to receive took into account only the years of continuous residence in the surveyed/licensed structures immediately preceding the date of PCS. The size of the structures was not taken into account, but that was meant to be an exceptional arrangement confined to a finite number of projects. To introduce a unified general ex-gratia compensation package for all development clearance projects, the Administration considered that the amount of EGAPO offered to eligible households in a particular location should, following the usual practice, take into account not only the years of continuous residence in the surveyed/licensed structures immediately preceding the date of PCS but also the size of the structures. Citing the Wang Chau Phase 1 development as an example, PS/DEV(P&L) advised that the amounts of EGAPO offered to individual households residing in the surveyed/licensed domestic structures in the affected area of Wang Chau Phase 1 development under the Proposal would not be lower than those offered under the existing ex-gratia compensation regime.

Voluntary registration exercise

22. The Chairman enquired about the details of the proposed one-off voluntary registration exercise and the households which would benefit from the registration. PS/DEV(P&L) replied that as surveyed/licensed non-domestic structures were not supposed to be used for domestic purposes and such a change in use should not be encouraged under the Squatter Control Policy, the Administration proposed that LandsD would implement a one-off territory-wide voluntary registration exercise for the occupants of these structures. The exercise would ensure that the proposed relaxation of the eligibility criteria for

Action

rehousing or ex-gratia compensation arrangements would be extended to a finite number of occupants of surveyed/licensed non-domestic structures who fulfilled the requirements of the registration exercise. In response to the Chairman's enquiry whether the Administration would continue to tolerate surveyed/licensed non-domestic structures in the territory, PS/DEV(P&L) advised that under the prevailing Squatter Control Policy, the Administration tolerated surveyed/licensed non-domestic structures, provided that their location, dimensions, building materials and use were the same as those on the relevant records kept by the Administration.

23. In view that the one-off voluntary registration exercise was territory-wide, the Chairman enquired whether apart from NDAs, the Administration would take measures to increase awareness of the registration exercise in districts where squatter structures were built, such as arranging briefing sessions in urban districts. PS/DEV(P&L) replied that after seeking the Finance Committee's approval for the EGA arrangements set out in the Proposal, LandsD would announce the implementation details of the voluntary registration exercise in due course. LandsD would also roll out territory-wide publicity to draw public attention to the exercise.

24. Dr CHENG Chung-tai noted that squatter occupants in non-surveyed/non-licensed structures would not be entitled to certain compensation and rehousing arrangements which would be offered to households which met the registration requirements. Dr CHENG was concerned that this would create division among non-indigenous villagers affected by the Government's development clearances. The Chairman and Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired whether the Administration would register the non-domestic structures or the occupants of the structures in the voluntary registration exercise. PS/DEV(P&L) advised that as the one-off voluntary registration exercise was a measure to confine the number of households in 1982-surveyed/licensed non-domestic structures which would be eligible for the proposed rehousing or ex-gratia compensation arrangements, the exercise would register the occupants in these structures.

25. Mr CHU Hoi-dick opined that apart from the occupants of the non-domestic structures, the Administration should further consider whether LandsD should also register the structures in the registration exercise and whether future occupants who moved to the same structures and had met the seven years' continuous residence requirement would also be entitled to rehousing or compensation arrangements upon future land clearances. In reply, PS/DEV(P&L) advised that when working out the Proposal, the Administration considered that the voluntary registration exercise should register the occupants of the surveyed/licensed non-domestic structures at the

Action

time of registration, as this would help protect these occupants from being evicted in future and also prevent abuse of the ex-gratia compensation arrangements. The Chairman opined that to register occupants of non-domestic structures in the registration exercise would ensure that the eligible households residing in the structures for many years would be entitled to compensation or rehousing arrangements, and discourage lot owners or those who claimed to be owners from evicting the occupants and lease the structures at higher rent to new occupants.

26. Mr CHU Hoi-dick expressed concern that lot owners might force the existing occupants in surveyed/licensed non-domestic structures to move out so that the lot owners' relatives or friends could register as new occupants of the structures in the voluntary registration exercise. SDEV and PS/DEV(P&L) replied that in order to register in the voluntary registration exercise, households residing in surveyed/licensed non-domestic structures had to meet the registration requirement of continuous occupation of the structures for a minimum of two years immediately preceding the announcement of the exercise made on 10 May 2018. Hence, households moving into such non-domestic structures after 10 May 2016 could not meet the requisite registration requirement.

Further enhancements to the proposed rehousing or compensation arrangements

27. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung opined that the Proposal had made certain improvements to the existing compensation and rehousing arrangements offered to squatter occupants affected by clearance exercises, and the Administration might consider further enhancements to the arrangements taking into account deputations' views. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting opined that to keep pace with changing circumstances, the Administration should conduct reviews on the land resumption and compensation policies more frequently. Mr Andrew WAN enquired whether the Administration would relax further the eligibility criteria for the proposed non-means tested rehousing arrangements, such as waiving the "no-domestic-property" requirement, reducing the required length of continuous residence, etc. Mr CHU Hoi-dick considered it misleading for the Administration to state that the proposed rehousing arrangement was non-means tested, given that households eligible for the arrangement must fulfill the "no-domestic-property" requirement. Dr Junius HO opined that the Administration should consider whether the proposed rehousing arrangement should also be offered to households which did not fulfil the "no-domestic-property" requirement. In reply, SDEV advised that the Administration had made clear about the "no-domestic-property" requirement when explaining the proposed rehousing arrangement to the

Action

public. Waiving the requirement would be a deviation from the established policies.

28. Dr Junius HO opined that the Administration should take the opportunity to enhance the compensation and rehousing arrangements as far as possible. He suggested that eligible households should receive higher rates of the existing EGAP0 than those proposed under the Proposal. The proportions of EGAP0 rate should be 100%, 80% and 60% for households occupying surveyed/licensed domestic structures between 21 and 25 years, between 16 and 20 years and between 10 to 15 years immediately before PCS respectively.

29. Noting that there might be cases where more than one household resided in a squatter structure, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the handling of requests for splitting households. PS/DEV(P&L) replied that established policies were in place to deal with requests for splitting households from PRH tenants, and LandsD would follow the same policies in dealing with such requests from squatter occupants being rehoused to Dedicated Rehousing Estates or transitional units in future. As regards ex-gratia compensation offered to households residing in surveyed/licensed structures in a particular location, the amount of EGAP0 was based on the length of continuous residence in and size of the structure attributable to the concerned households.

30. Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired about the Administration's response to a deputation's suggestion that the affected squatter occupants in HSK NDA should be entitled to the proposed non-means tested rehousing as well as ex-gratia compensation arrangements. PS/DEV(P&L) replied that under the Proposal, the Administration would offer a non-means tested rehousing option for eligible households, in the form of rental units and SSFs in Dedicated Rehousing Estates. The household which would purchase SSFs at Dedicated Rehousing Estates would be offered a reduced amount of EGAP0, which was payable at about 83% of the EGAP0 amount to which the household would have been entitled had they not opted for purchasing SSFs at Dedicated Rehousing Estates. As regards households which accepted the option to move to rental units in Dedicated Rehousing Estates, the Administration proposed that they would not be provided with EGAP0 as they no longer needed to rent a private housing unit for residential purpose.

31. In response to Dr Fernando CHEUNG's enquiry whether the household opted for SSFs would be provided allowance that covered their moving expenses, PS/DEV(P&L) advised that under the Proposal, all squatter occupants registered in the relevant PCS, including those who opted for rehousing to rental units or SSFs at Dedicated Rehousing Estates, would be entitled to DRA, which would range from about \$9 000 to about \$28 000 at the

Action

present level upon enhancements, depending on the number of household members.

Flexibility in implementation of the proposed arrangements

32. The Chairman said that certain households had resided in squatter structures for decades but were subsequently evicted by lot owners before PCS. She enquired whether the Administration would introduce a mechanism for exercising discretion in allowing these households to apply for ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements on compassionate grounds. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting raised a similar enquiry. He opined that the Administration should put in place a mechanism for exercising discretion and announce relevant details. Relevant government departments should exercise discretion under the mechanism based on the people-oriented principle. Mr LAU Kwok-fan opined that the PCS conducted by the Administration for KTN and FLN NDAs in 2014 no longer protected the registered squatter occupants as many of them had been evicted afterwards. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the Administration's measures to assist the households who had been evicted from their squatter structures before PCS or before the actual land clearances, and the squatter occupants who were facing high and frequent rent increases. Dr CHENG Chung-tai enquired whether the Administration would conduct afresh PCS in all affected areas of its development projects.

33. PS/DEV(P&L) replied that for households registered in PCS but subsequently evicted from surveyed/licensed structures before the actual clearances, the Administration would consider introducing a discretionary mechanism allowing them to apply to the Director of Lands for ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements on compassionate grounds. As regards households evicted before PCS, the Administration believed that it was not practicable to introduce a discretionary mechanism for them.

34. Mr LAU Kwok-fan opined that as some development projects such as the KTN and FLN NDAs projects would be implemented by phases, households affected by later phases had to stay in the vicinity of works areas once the earlier phases of construction had commenced. The Administration should consider pursuing land resumption in one go in lieu of the current phased land resumption plan. Affected villagers hoped that one-off land resumption would also help ensure that eligible households from the same village would be rehoused to transitional units in the same housing estate, such as Po Shek Wu estate in Sheung Shui. Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired about the Administration's measures to deal with the degrading living environment faced by the squatter occupants living in the vicinity of works projects undertaken by private developers.

Action

35. SDEV replied that the Administration was considering a mechanism allowing eligible households affected by clearances in the later phases of NDAs to voluntarily apply for early surrender of and departure from their squatter structures and in turn early application for the rehousing arrangement. He considered it not practicable to carry out one-off land resumption and clearance across different phases of NDAs, as some households might wish to continue residing in their squatter structures until clearances.

36. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired how households could demonstrate that they had been residing in the structures. DD of L(S) replied that the household concerned might provide relevant documentary proof, such as utility bills, bank statements, student handbooks, etc., for LandsD's consideration.

Compensation for farming households

37. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that as the Administration had not conducted PCS for farmers, farming households in various NDAs were concerned that if they had been evicted by lot owners before clearances, they would not be entitled to any compensation package and would not be offered any arrangements that helped them to continue farming practices. Farmers also considered that the current mechanism for assessing EGA for crops was undesirable as the amount of the allowance was determined by taking stock of the crops concerned only, and the assessment had not taken into account other relevant factors such as farm productivity, business losses suffered by farmers due to land clearances, etc. In view that the Administration had put in place the New Agricultural Policy to promote the sustainable development of agriculture in Hong Kong, he enquired whether and how the Administration would address the concerns of these farmers.

38. PS/DEV(P&L) replied that a farming household residing in a squatter structure in the same affected area where its farm was located would be registered in the PCS to be conducted for squatter occupants. As farmers might vary the species planted and their quantities from time to time, for farmers who were not squatter occupants in the affected areas where they practised farming, the Administration would, nearer the time of land resumption, invite bona fide farmers who farmed at the concerned locations to claim for EGAs related to farming activities. Senior Agricultural Officer (Agri-Park & Land), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department ("SAO (Agri-Park & Land), AFCD") advised that the supportive measures under the New Agricultural Policy included provision of an Agricultural Park in Kwu Tung South to promote the modernization and sustainable development of local agriculture. The Administration would lease farmland in

Action

the Agricultural Park as far as practicable to accommodate farmers affected by the Government's land development projects to enable them to resume their farming practices. To meet the aspirations of some affected farmers in KTN NDA to continue their agricultural practices in situ, the Administration had designated the core area of Long Valley as a Nature Park where existing farmers could continue operating their farming activities in the same area.

39. Mr CHU Hoi-dick opined that farmers in the affected areas of NDAs projects were uncertain whether the Administration would allow them to resume farming in the Agricultural Park upon the future clearances. Instead of just putting these farmers on the waiting list for allocation of agricultural land under the Agricultural Land Rehabilitation Scheme, the Administration should arrange these farmers to visit the Agricultural Park in a timely manner and allow them to identify suitable farms for their cultivation.

40. SAO (Agri-Park & Land), AFCD replied that the Administration had made arrangements for existing farmers affected by the land resumption for the development of the Agricultural Park to resume their farming practices in the Park. Farmers affected by Government's development projects which would take place around the same timeframe as the Agricultural Park would be accorded priority to apply for renting farmland in the Agricultural Park. The Administration would brief the Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene on the implementation progress of the major initiatives under the New Agriculture Policy in July 2018.

41. Mrs Regina IP enquired about the details of the Administration's agricultural resite/rehabilitation arrangement being provided for the villagers/farming households of Choi Yuen Tsuen affected by the project of the Hong Kong Section of Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link, and the number of villagers/farming households who had continued farming under the arrangement. SDEV replied that the Administration would provide supplementary information to address Mrs IP's enquiry.

*(Post-meeting note: The Chinese version of the Administration's supplementary information was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1246/17-18(01) on 13 July 2018.)*

Wang Chau development

42. Mr SHIU Ka-chun enquired about the timetable to develop the brownfield sites in the remaining phases of Wang Chau development. USTH replied that the Administration had not given up the plan to develop the remaining phases of Wang Chau development, i.e. Phases 2 and 3, for



Action

providing about 13 000 public housing units, and had commissioned the "Engineering Feasibility Study for Site Formation and Infrastructural Works for Remaining Phases of Public Housing Developments at Wang Chau, Yuen Long" for completion in 2019.

43. Mr SHIU Ka-chun enquired about the details of the engineering feasibility study, including the organization commissioned to carry out the study and how the Administration would consult the public on the outcomes of the study. He also enquired about the Administration's response to the allegations of some deputations that the Administration had replaced formal consultation with informal lobbying when planning development projects. Deputy Head of Civil Engineering Office (Project and Environmental Management), Civil Engineering and Development Department advised that the Administration had commissioned a consultancy in mid-2017 to conduct the engineering feasibility study. The Administration would make reference to the results of the study to work out the proposal to implement the remaining phases of development, including the proposed site coverage of public housing development. When preparing the relevant rezoning proposals in future, the Administration would consult local stakeholders, including district councils. Chief Civil Engineer/Public Works Programme, Transport and Housing Bureau advised that the Administration all along conducted informal consultations to understand the needs and concerns of the local community regarding a development project. However, informal consultations would not replace formal consultations conducted in accordance with established procedures.

44. In view that the Administration had commissioned a study relating to green belts in earlier years whereas the studies on brownfields had only commenced recently, Mr CHU Hoi-dick opined that the Administration had accorded priority to rezoning green belts over developing brownfields, and hence it was not true that the Administration had been adopting multi-pronged measures to increase land supply. Mr SHIU Ka-chun queried whether according priority to rezoning green belts over developing brownfields in Wang Chau was not in line with the approach of "tacking relatively easier tasks first" previously claimed by the Administration. USTH replied that the Administration had not given up the progressive approach of developing Phase 1 first, followed by development of Phases 2 and 3 in order to tackle relatively easier tasks first. Compared with Phase 1, the sites of Wang Chau Phases 2 and 3 involved more complicated issues. The total size of green belts in Phases 2 and 3 was more than that in Phase 1, and hence development of the remaining phases might involve clearance of more green belts than those of Phase 1.

Action

45. Mr Andrew WAN and Mr LAM Cheuk-ting opined that members of the public were concerned that the Administration implemented Wang Chau Phase 1 development but had yet to proceed to the remaining phases of the development to resume the brownfields for providing the about 13 000 public housing units because it had succumbed to pressure exerted by privileged. In view that the Administration had made clear at the meeting that it would not give up its plan to develop the remaining phases of Wang Chau, Mr WAN enquired why the Administration did not commence in a timely manner the PCS for brownfields in Wang Chau. SDEV replied that PCS would be conducted only after the boundary of the area to be developed was known. Pursuant to its established practice, the Administration usually considered conducting a PCS after or around the time of the gazettal of the relevant Outline Zoning Plan. As the engineering feasibility study for the remaining phases of Wang Chau was underway, it was not an appropriate time to conduct the survey at this stage.

46. Mr SHIU Ka-chun and Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired why the Administration allowed indigenous villagers to continue building new houses in Wang Chau, but required the non-indigenous villagers in Wang Chau Phase 1 to move out. SDEV replied that in the New Territories including NDAs, not all land would be used for providing public housing. Some sites might be zoned "Village Type Development" on the relevant Outline Zoning Plan, and New Territories Exempted Houses within the "Village Type Development" areas would be permitted.

Impact of land clearances on animals

47. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired whether the Administration would allow occupants in squatters affected by the Government's development clearances to continue keeping their dogs/animals after they had moved to Dedicated Rehousing Estates. Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr CHU Hoi-dick raised a similar enquiry, and asked whether the Administration had put in place any measures to keep the dogs/animals given up by squatter occupants in future.

48. USTH replied that the Administration noted Mr CHAN's suggestion of allowing dog/animal keeping in Dedicated Rehousing Estates. As regards the transitional units used for rehousing eligible squatter occupants, since they were housing units in HS's rental or HA's PRH estates, keeping of unauthorized dogs/animals in these units was not allowed under the relevant policies. SAO (Agri-Park & Land), AFCD advised that during the land resumption process, some pet animals might be abandoned by owners and AFCD would collect these animals to prevent animal cruelty and nuisance issues. These animals would be sent to AFCD's animal management centres

Action

for examination by veterinary officers. The Administration all along encouraged members of the public to adopt stray animals, and AFCD had formed partnerships with various animal welfare organizations for pet rehoming services.

49. Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr CHU Hoi-dick expressed concern on whether dogs/animals given up by carees would be euthanized if they remained not adopted. Mr CHU suggested that the Administration should put in place measures to deal with the situation in future that villagers/occupants in squatters affected by the Government's development clearance exercises who would be rehoused to public housing estates would be forced to give up a large number of dogs/animals, and requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on its response to his suggestion. He further opined that AFCD should assess whether its animal management centres had space to take in more dogs/animals, and the Administration should plan ahead to allocate additional resources for implementing suitable measures to address the issues, such as stepping up publicity to draw the public attention about the large number of dogs/animals waiting for being adopted.

*(Post-meeting note: The Chinese version of the Administration's supplementary information was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1246/17-18(01) on 13 July 2018.)*

Town Planning Board

50. Mr CHU Hoi-dick opined that as the Chairman of TPB was the incumbent PS/DEV(P&L) and TPB members were appointed by the Government, the TPB's decisions on the Administration's development proposals might not take into account the public views that had been presented directly to the Board. Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that the various NDAs projects affecting squatter occupants were proposed by the Administration and the Chairman of TPB was a government official. Although it was TPB to approve the amendments to the statutory plans associated with these projects, the Administration should be held responsible for the development projects. SDEV replied that the Administration had all along respected the independent operation of TPB. For instance, TPB had recently disapproved the Administration's proposal to develop a public housing site in Tseung Kwan O. The Administration believed that TPB members adopted a serious attitude in considering the proposals submitted to the Board.

Action

**III. Any other business**

51. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 7:26 pm.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
6 November 2018

**Panel on Housing and Panel on Development**

**Joint meeting on Tuesday, 26 June 2018, from 9:00 am to 1:00 pm,  
and from 5:45 pm to 7:45 pm  
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex  
Meeting to receive public views on "General ex-gratia compensation  
and rehousing arrangements for Government's development clearance  
exercises and Head 711 project no. B780CL — Site formation and  
infrastructure works for public housing development at  
Wang Chau, Yuen Long"**

**Summary of views and concerns expressed by deputations/individuals**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Name of deputation/individual</b>	<b>Submission / Major views and concerns</b>
<b><u>Session One</u></b>		
1.	Mr PUN Hau-man Representative Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● It was appropriate for the Administration to develop Wang Chau by phases for providing public housing.</li> <li>● The Administration should offer affected households non-means tested rehousing to public housing.</li> <li>● The Administration should provide multi-storey buildings at appropriate sites in Wang Chau for reprovisioning existing brownfield operations.</li> </ul>
2.	Miss WONG Lai-fan Contact Person Union of Kwu Tung North Residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Villagers affected by the Kwu Tung North ("KTN") new development area ("NDA") project were concerned about the rehousing arrangements offered to them, and wished to continue living in KTN.</li> <li>● Land resources in Hong Kong should be used for meeting the needs of the public at large.</li> <li>● The Administration should observe the people-oriented principle when planning the KTN NDA project.</li> </ul>
3.	Mr CHAN Ki-kau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Presentation of views as set out in LC Paper No. CB(1)1165/17-18(02) (Chinese version only)</li> </ul>
4.	Mr LAU Ki-fung North District Council member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Presentation of views as set out in LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/17-18(01) (Chinese version only)</li> </ul>

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
5.	Mr AU Kwok-kuen 成員 土地維權中心	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There was a lack of democracy in the land planning process in Hong Kong, and the Administration all along succumbed to pressure exerted by privileged when planning and implementing its development projects.</li> <li>● Affected villagers wished to continue living in their existing villages and the Administration's proposal to offer them ex-gratia compensation could not address their aspirations.</li> <li>● The Administration should conduct freezing surveys for brownfield sites in Wang Chau immediately.</li> </ul>
6.	Mrs TANG Kwai-lin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration had not consulted villagers affected by Wang Chau development on the development project.</li> <li>● The Administration should improve the land planning process to enhance communications with villagers affected by its development projects.</li> <li>● Affected villagers in Wang Chau were worried about the difficulties in securing alternative accommodations upon clearances.</li> </ul>
7.	盧永燊先生 Member Ma Shi Po Environmental Concern Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Presentation of views as set out in LC Paper No. CB(1)1200/17-18(01) (Chinese version only)</li> </ul>
8.	Miss LAM On-ki	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration had paid no regard to the needs and concerns of non-indigenous villagers in Wang Chau when planning the Wang Chau development project.</li> <li>● The proposal to enhance the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements to be offered to eligible domestic occupants in squatters and business undertakings affected by Government's development clearance exercises ("the Proposal") was aimed at expediting the implementation of the Administration's development projects, and it could not address villagers' request for "no relocation, no demolition".</li> </ul>

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should make clear the factors for considering whether to invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance (Cap. 124) ("LRO") to resume land.</li> </ul>
9.	Miss WU Man-yin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration had yet to address many villagers' doubts and concerns about Wang Chau development including the justification for rezoning green belts.</li> <li>● The Administration should explain why indigenous villagers in Wang Chau were allowed to build new houses while the non-indigenous villages would be cleared.</li> <li>● The Administration should explain why it did not invoke LRO to resume the brownfield sites in Wang Chau.</li> </ul>
10.	Miss CHENG Lai-tong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration had not consulted the non-indigenous villagers on its proposals to develop Wang Chau, and the Proposal could not address their aspirations to continue living in their villages.</li> <li>● Shortage of land should not be accepted as a reason for clearing the non-indigenous villages as there were idle land sites in Yuen Long.</li> <li>● The Administration should develop brownfield sites instead of clearing green belts in Wang Chau.</li> </ul>
11.	Mr AU YEUNG Yuen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration's land resumption plan in Wang Chau involved confiscation of private properties.</li> <li>● The Administration's claim that the land in Wang Chau was resumed for providing public housing was invalid, as the land plot where his house was located would be resumed and used for providing roads and schools only.</li> <li>● The Administration should explain why indigenous villagers in Wang Chau were allowed to build new houses while the non-indigenous villages would be cleared.</li> </ul>
12.	曾樂欣小姐 成員 古洞支援組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The affected villagers requested "no relocation, no demolition" in view that the Administration's development projects, such as the one in KTN, involved transfer of benefits</li> </ul>

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration had not adequately consulted the affected villagers on the Proposal.</li> <li>● The Administration should pay due regard to the impact of its development projects on dogs/animals.</li> </ul>
13.	Miss CHAN Hiu-wan 成員 東北支援組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration had paid no regard to the villagers' request for "no relocation, no demolition".</li> <li>● The Administration had paid no regard to the situation that villagers affected by land clearances and would be rehoused to public housing had to give up thousands of dogs/animals.</li> </ul>
14.	Mr LAM Leung-choi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should work out effective proposals to increase supply of public housing on one hand and address the needs and concerns of the residents affected by its development projects on the other.</li> <li>● The public fund used for compensating and rehousing affected residents was much less than the capital cost of its road infrastructure project.</li> <li>● The Administration paid no regard to the views expressed by the affected residents in Wang Chau, but just requested them to sacrifice their interests to make way for the implementation of its development projects.</li> </ul>
15.	陳愛金先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● He opposed the Administration's plan to resume land from non-indigenous villagers in Wang Chau.</li> <li>● The proposed compensation and rehousing arrangements could not address the needs and aspirations of the affected villagers in Wang Chau.</li> </ul>
16.	林義庭先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The proposed compensation arrangements were not desirable, and 70% of the affected villagers in Wang Chau were eligible for Domestic Removal Allowance only.</li> <li>● It was not reasonable that a 7-person household residing in a squatter structure was not eligible for rehousing or ex-gratia compensation arrangement merely because the household owned a subsidized sale flat.</li> </ul>



No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should have sufficient finances to provide better arrangements for villagers and farmers affected by its development projects.</li> </ul>
17.	林寶珠女士	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Only a small proportion of non-indigenous villagers in Wang Chau would be eligible for the proposed non-means tested rehousing or ex-gratia compensation.</li> <li>● Affected villagers in Wang Chau hoped that the Administration would provide a village resite area for reprovisioning their village houses.</li> </ul>
18.	Mr Michael YUNG Ming-chau Representative The Civic Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Presentation of views as set out in LC Paper No. CB(1)1200/17-18(02) (Chinese version only)</li> </ul>
19.	何星行先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Presentation of views as set out in LC Paper No. CB(1)1132/17-18(02) (Chinese version only)</li> </ul>
20.	Mrs LAW Kuen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Non-indigenous villagers who practiced farming in Wang Chau would be adversely affected by Wang Chau development.</li> <li>● The Administration should allow villagers in Wang Chau to continue living in their villages.</li> <li>● The Administration should suspend the Wang Chau development project.</li> </ul>
21.	Mr TANG Muk-wah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should make use of the idle sites in Yuen Long and other districts for providing public housing instead of private housing, to save the need for resuming land in Wang Chau.</li> <li>● The Administration should redevelop the sites currently occupied by civil servants' quarters and increase their development intensity to maximize the supply of public housing units.</li> <li>● The Administration should clarify whether the land resumed from the non-indigenous villagers in Wang Chau would be used for providing public housing or for private developments.</li> </ul>

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
22.	Mrs LAM Ching-wah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should allow villagers affected by Wang Chau development to continue residing in Wang Chau.</li> <li>● Given that a private developer would develop housing at a site near Wing Ning Tsuen, Wang Chau, the Administration should consider collaborating with the developer to rehouse the villagers to these housing units.</li> </ul>
23.	Mr WONG Kui-kan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● It was unreasonable that the Administration resumed lands in Wang Chau but did not make good use of other lands in Yuen Long/Tin Shui Wai for providing public housing.</li> <li>● The Administration should address the concern that villagers affected by land clearances and rehoused to public housing would be forced to give up many animals and trees.</li> </ul>
24.	Ms Josephine HO Yin-ping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should deal with the situation that villagers/farming households in Ma Shi Po, Fanling North registered in the freezing survey had been evicted by developers.</li> <li>● The Administration should conduct Pre-clearance Surveys for affected areas of its development projects in a timely manner and rehouse affected villagers before taking forward any clearance exercises.</li> <li>● It was not appropriate that under the Proposal, squatter occupants would not be eligible for the proposed non-means tested rehousing arrangement if they owned residential properties.</li> </ul>
25.	Mr LI Siu-wah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should address the villagers' request for "no relocation, no demolition".</li> <li>● The Administration should explain why villagers in KTN were not allowed to continue residing in their existing villages whereas private developers were allowed to take forward their housing projects at land sites near their villages.</li> <li>● The Administration had the responsibility to solve the housing problems faced by villagers affected by its development projects.</li> </ul>

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
26.	Mr CHAN Chee-ping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should not resume land from non-indigenous villagers in Wang Chau.</li> <li>● To increase land supply for providing public housing, the Administration should tackle developers' hoarding of agricultural land.</li> </ul>
<b><u>Session Two</u></b>		
27.	Mrs LI Yin-fong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● It was not appropriate for the Administration to resume land from villagers in the affected areas of its development projects.</li> <li>● The Administration should consider other land supply options to increase land supply, such as resuming the site where the Fanling Golf Course was located.</li> <li>● To increase land supply for providing public housing, the Administration should tackle developers' hoarding of agricultural land.</li> </ul>
28.	Mr NGAN Fai-ming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should make clear whether it would revise the Proposal in light of deputations' views at the meeting.</li> <li>● In line with the people-oriented principle, the Secretary for Development should visit the affected villages to communicate with villagers with a view to addressing their needs and concerns.</li> <li>● Majority of villagers in KTN demanded "no relocation, no demolition".</li> </ul>
29.	Miss CHOW Koot-yin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration and relevant stakeholders should observe the people-oriented principle when planning the development of land in Hong Kong.</li> <li>● The villagers affected by the development projects in the North East New Territories demanded "no relocation, no demolition"</li> </ul>
30.	Mr WONG Yiu-ming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should make good use of idle land sites and invoked LRO to resume land hoarded by private developers for providing public housing.</li> <li>● The Administration should resume the site where the Fanling Golf Course was located for providing public housing.</li> </ul>

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration all along paid no regard to the needs and concerns of non-indigenous villagers.</li> </ul>
31.	Mr YIP Cheuk-yuen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● It was not appropriate for the current-term Government to resume land from non-indigenous villagers to facilitate the implementation of private developers' projects.</li> <li>● Affected villagers had an impression that the Administration favoured property developers when planning the development of land in Hong Kong.</li> <li>● The land hoarded by developers in the New Territories was sufficient for providing public housing to meet the demand of waiting list applicants.</li> </ul>
32.	Mr MAK Kam-gung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Lands Department ("LandsD") should send personnel to To Kwa Wan to explain the compensation arrangements offered to shop operators affected by the Urban Renewal Authority's redevelopment projects</li> </ul>
33.	何竑先生 中央委員 自由黨	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should make clear the total area of brownfield and green belt sites in Hong Kong and their development potentials, the reclamation projects that would be taken forward, and the long-term strategy for cavern development.</li> <li>● It was important for the Administration to increase public housing to meet the demand of waiting list applicants currently residing at subdivided units, cubicle apartments, etc.</li> </ul>
34.	鮑修振先生 發言人 受重建影響的土瓜灣 天台住戶組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Presentation of views as set out in LC Paper No. CB(1)1200/17-18(03) (Chinese version only)</li> </ul>
35.	潘詠珊小姐 發言人 土瓜灣天台關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Members of the public affected by the Urban Renewal Authority's redevelopment projects in To Kwa Wan were not clear about the compensation arrangements offered to them, and LandsD should arrange briefing sessions in the district to explain the arrangements.</li> </ul>

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
36.	李玉強先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The affected villagers in Wang Chau were very worried of being forced to move out from their villages since the Administration's announcement of its proposal to develop Wang Chau.</li> <li>● Wang Chau development would deprive the affected villagers' homes and their existing social network.</li> <li>● The ex-gratia compensation arrangements offered to squatter occupants under the Proposal were not desirable.</li> </ul>
37.	羅顯其先生 Jointed Village Concern Group on Hung Shui Kiu New Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Presentation of views as set out in LC Paper No. CB(1)1200/17-18(04) (Chinese version only)</li> </ul>
38.	湯彥珩小姐	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Presentation of views as set out in LC Paper No. CB(1)1200/17-18(05) (Chinese version only)</li> </ul>
39.	許炳林先生 村民 乾坑村民自救組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should consult villagers before taking forward any plan to resume land from villagers.</li> <li>● The compensation and rehousing arrangements offered to residents affected by the Government's development clearance exercises should be worked out by the affected residents themselves.</li> <li>● It was not appropriate for the Administration to resume land from villagers to facilitate developers to implement projects to provide low-density luxurious flats.</li> </ul>
40.	吳卓恆先生 成員 土地正義聯盟	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration's development projects would deprive affected villagers' right to continue their rural living style.</li> <li>● Affected villagers demanded "no relocation, no demolition" to ensure that rural living style could be retained in Hong Kong.</li> <li>● Members of the public instead of the Administration should have the right to plan the land use in Hong Kong.</li> </ul>

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
41.	劉國安先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The KTN NDA project adversely affected the villagers and the Administration should not resume their land.</li> <li>● The Administration should visit affected villages in Kwu Tung and explain to them the details of the development project concerned.</li> <li>● The validity of the Administration's claim that there was not sufficient land in Hong Kong was in doubt.</li> </ul>
42.	秋吉爽小姐	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The land clearances associated with KTN NDA project would force many grassroots residents to move out from their villages in KTN, and they could not afford high flat rentals in other districts.</li> </ul>
43.	Mr HO Chi-chung Member Concerning Grassroots' Housing Rights Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Proposal could not address the affected villagers' aspirations for maintaining their existing way of living.</li> <li>● The Administration should make clear the timetable to develop Wang Chau Phases 2 and 3 development.</li> <li>● The Administration should resume the site where the Fanling Golf Course was located for providing public housing.</li> </ul>
44.	Mr MAK Cheuk-wang Member 關注洪水橋新發展區 聯盟	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should carry out a freezing survey for farmers affected by the Hung Shui Kiu ("HSK") NDA project.</li> <li>● The Administration should put in place measures to protect the interests of farmers affected by HSK NDA project, provide agricultural land for them to continue their farming practices and announce the arrangements regarding ex-gratia allowance for crops.</li> <li>● The Administration should allow villagers to keep their dogs/animals in Dedicated Rehousing Estates.</li> </ul>
45.	Mr HO Hoi-fat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should provide a site in HSK NDA for re-provisioning of the village houses affected by the NDA project.</li> <li>● The arrangement to rehouse affected households to public housing could not address the villagers' aspirations for maintaining their rural living style and was not in line with the people-oriented principle.</li> </ul>

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
46.	簡健龍先生 成員 一群正受困於水深火熱之中的農民	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should carry out a freezing survey for farmers affected by its development clearances and announce the arrangement regarding ex-gratia allowance for crops.</li> <li>● The Administration should provide decent housing for rehousing squatter occupants affected by its development projects.</li> <li>● The Administration should explain why non-means tested rehousing would not be offered to squatter households which owned domestic properties.</li> </ul>
47.	Mr LAI Chang 成員 一群正受洪水橋發展計劃影響的農民	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should carry out a freezing survey for farmers affected by the HSK NDA project.</li> <li>● Farmers were concerned about the arrangement regarding ex-gratia allowance for crops.</li> </ul>
48.	簡家強先生 成員 守護農園	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should provide a site for reprovisioning of his village which would be affected by the HSK NDA project.</li> <li>● Residents in his village had moved to the village before 1982, and the Administration should provide subsidized sale flats or rental units at concessionary flat prices or rents to the villagers who wished to move to these housing units.</li> </ul>
49.	杜桂根先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should provide a site for reprovisioning of his village.</li> <li>● The Administration should undertake reclamation projects between Ap Lei Chau and Po Toi Island to increase land supply in order to save the need for resuming the land from villagers.</li> </ul>
<b><u>Session Three</u></b>		
50.	梁德明先生 成員 不是地產舖	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should allow farmers affected by its development projects to continue their agricultural practices in-situ, as arranging them to farm in the Agricultural Park might not address their aspirations.</li> <li>● The Proposal was inadequate as it did not include any improvements to the existing compensation and other</li> </ul>

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<p>relevant arrangements for farmers affected by the Government's land clearances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration had not consulted affected villagers on the Proposal, and had not addressed the request that a site should be provided for reprovisioning of their villages.</li> </ul>
51.	羅崇傑先生	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Villagers in Tan Kwai Tsuen of HSK were not clear about the rehousing and compensation arrangements that the Administration would offer to them.</li> </ul>
52.	陳偉琛先生 成員 丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Presentation of views as set out in LC Paper No. CB(1)1165/17-18(03) (Chinese version only)</li> </ul>

#### Submissions from parties not attending the meeting

No.	LC Paper No	Submission
1.	LC Paper No. CB(1)1200/17-18(06)	Submission from 土瓜灣重建項目 KC09-KC13 非住宅租戶關注組 (Chinese version only)
2.	LC Paper No. CB(1)1200/17-18(07)	Submission from 粉嶺北新發展區寮屋居民關注組 (Chinese version only)

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
 6 November 2018