

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. PWSC193/18-19  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(15)B

**Public Works Subcommittee of the Finance Committee  
of the Legislative Council**

**Minutes of the 14<sup>th</sup> meeting  
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex  
on Monday, 18 March 2019, at 4:30 pm**

**Members present:**

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin

Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon HO Kai-ming  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai  
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS  
Hon CHAN Hoi-yan

**Member attending:**

Hon LAM Cheuk-ting

**Members absent:**

Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP  
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon AU Nok-hin

**Public officers attending:**

Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>3</sup>
Miss Joey LAM Kam-ping, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) <sup>1</sup>
Ms Bernadette LINN, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)

Mr Elvis AU Wai-kwong, JP	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Ms Margaret HSIA Mai-chi	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mr David LAM Chi-man	Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)5
Mr Ricky LAU Chun-kit, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr LAI Cheuk-ho	Project Manager (North) North Development Office Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Zorro YUEN Tat-yung	Chief Engineer (North)2 North Development Office Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr John CHUNG Wing-hong	Chief Engineer (North)3 North Development Office Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Kelvin LO Kwok-wah, JP	Director of Drainage Services
Mr Walter LEUNG Wing-yuen	Chief Engineer (Sewerage Projects) Drainage Services Department
Mr CHEN Che-kong	Assistant Director (Water Policy) Environmental Protection Department
Mr Anthony FOK	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Sewerage Infrastructure) Environmental Protection Department
Ms Lily CHIU Lee-lee	Chief Estate Surveyor (Acquisition Section) Lands Department

Mr Andy LAM Siu-hong	Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) <sup>3</sup>
Dr Kenny HO Chin-ho	Principal Veterinary Officer Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Mr Stephen LAI Yue-hong	Senior Agricultural Officer (Agri-Park & Land) Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

**Clerk in attendance:**

Ms Doris LO	Chief Council Secretary (1) <sup>2</sup>
-------------	--

**Staff in attendance:**

Mr Raymond CHOW	Senior Council Secretary (1) <sup>10</sup>
Ms Christina SHIU	Legislative Assistant (1) <sup>2</sup>
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1) <sup>8</sup>
Ms Clara LO	Legislative Assistant (1) <sup>9</sup>

---

Action

The Chairman advised that there were three funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting. All of them were items carried over from the previous meeting of the Subcommittee. These three funding proposals involved a total funding allocation of \$38,442.6 million. He reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council ("LegCo"), they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the funding proposals under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the proposals. He also drew members' attention to Rule 84 of RoP on voting in case of direct pecuniary interest.

**Head 707 — New Towns and Urban Area Development**

**PWSC(2018-19)41 747CL Advance site formation and engineering infrastructure works at Kwu Tung North new development area and Fanling North new development area**

**759CL First stage of site formation and engineering infrastructure at Kwu Tung North new development area and Fanling North new development area**

**828CL Remaining phase of site formation and engineering infrastructure works at Kwu Tung North new development area and Fanling North new development area**

**793CL Site formation and infrastructure works for Police facilities in Kong Nga Po**

**Head 704 — Drainage**

**388DS Shek Wu Hui Effluent Polishing Plant**

**Head 701 — Land Acquisition**

**37CA Special Ex-gratia Cash Allowance for the Kwu Tung North and Fanling North New Development Area**

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. [PWSC\(2018-19\)41](#), sought to upgrade 747CL, 759CL, part of 828CL, 793CL and 388DS to Category A at the estimated costs of \$17,320.1 million, \$896.4 million, \$764.5 million, \$1,913 million and \$11,972.8 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices respectively, and reserve funding for an estimated total cost of \$732.6 million for Subhead 37CA under Head 701 — Land Acquisition. The Subcommittee had commenced deliberation on the proposal at the meeting on 27 February 2019.

Rehousing arrangement for affected households

3. Ms Claudia MO was concerned whether the Administration could provide a concrete response to the request for "rehousing before clearance" from households affected by the development of the new development areas ("NDAs") in Kwu Tung North ("KTN") and Fanling North ("FLN"). Mr Alvin YEUNG enquired whether all households affected by the First Phase development could be rehoused to Po Shek Wu ("PSW") Estate, the soon-to-be-completed public housing estate in Sheung Shui; if not, what the alternative rehousing arrangements were; and for those households which were affected by the Remaining Phase development and had submitted the voluntary applications for early departure from and surrendering of their squatter structures and the relevant documentary proof, whether the

Administration would let them know the application result as soon as possible and allow sufficient time for individual applicants to submit missing documents. Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr Andrew WAN requested the Administration to undertake that the affected households would be accorded the priority for rehousing to PSW Estate.

4. Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) ("PS(PL)/DEVB") said that "rehousing before clearance" was the Government's aim in providing local rehousing for eligible households affected by NDA development. Households who wanted to be considered for rehousing to PSW Estate should timely submit their applications, so that the eligibility vetting process could be completed before the completion and population intake of PSW Estate in mid-2019 for arranging priority rehousing for eligible applicants. As PSW Estate would provide about 1 000 housing units, there would, presumably, be enough units to accommodate the 445 households affected by the First Phase development by just looking at the number. However, in reality, some affected households might apply for splitting of households, and the respective numbers of units with different layouts in the housing estate might not match the demand of the applicants. Besides, the Administration was in the course of vetting the applicants' eligibility. As such, it could not undertake at this stage that all eligible affected households could be rehoused to PSW Estate. Nonetheless, eligible households that were not rehoused to PSW Estate might opt for other public housing estates in the North District which were soon to be completed.

5. Mr Jeremy TAM enquired whether the Administration would cater specifically for the needs of the elderly when rehousing the affected households, such as allocating the lower-floor units in public housing estates to the elderly. Mr Alvin YEUNG enquired whether the rehousing applications of ineligible affected households, such as those residing in the relevant structures continuously for less than seven years immediately preceding the date of the Government's Pre-clearance Survey ("PCS"), would be dealt with in a lenient manner.

6. PS(PL)/DEVB responded that the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HKHA") would accommodate such requests as appropriate in accordance with the existing policy if the elderly preferred lower-floor units of public housing estates. On the other hand, the rehousing arrangement did not apply to ineligible households, such as those residing in illegally erected non-surveyed/non-licensed structures or those who owned residential properties in Hong Kong. For eligible households residing in the surveyed/licensed structures continuously for at least two years but less than seven years immediately preceding the date of PCS would be offered Ex-gratia Allowance for Permitted Occupiers ("EGAPO") instead.

7. Mr Alvin YEUNG and Mr Andrew WAN suggested that the Administration should provide one-stop service in the affected areas to handle the rehousing applications of residents, who were mostly the elderly, so that the applicants would not have to undergo the formalities in person at the headquarters of HKHA or the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HKHS") in Ho Man Tin and in Tai Hang on the Hong Kong Island, respectively. Mr LAU Kwok-fan welcomed the arrangement to deploy staff to the affected areas to collect residents' rehousing applications on 8 and 9 March 2019, and enquired whether the service would be provided on an ongoing basis.

8. PS(PL)/DEVB replied that the Social Service Teams engaged by the Government would assist elderly applicants in making traffic arrangements to offices of HKHA/HKHS in the urban area. In response to the request of members and the local community, HKHA and HKHS would also consider setting up dedicated counters in the North District on specified dates for handling of rehousing applications. Chief Estate Surveyor (Acquisition Section), Lands Department ("CES(A)/LandsD"), supplemented that households might submit the voluntary applications and relevant documentary proof for early departure from and surrendering of their squatter structures by post, drop their applications in the drop-in boxes at the two local offices of the Social Service Teams, or contact the Lands Department ("LandsD") by phone to arrange collection of the applications at their squatter huts by LandsD staff. This would provide a more convenient solution to meet the needs of residents for submitting documents at different points of time.

9. Mr CHU Hoi-dick pointed out that as the affected households had been invited to submit the relevant documentary proof and/or rehousing applications by 8 March 2019, they mistook the date as the application deadline for rehousing and ex-gratia allowances. This probably reflected the constant communication gap between the Administration and the affected households. He enquired the respective numbers of households affected by the First Phase and the Remaining Phase of the NDA development who had submitted applications for rehousing to PSW Estate as at the aforesaid date.

10. PS(PL)/DEVB responded that the Administration had made use of various channels such as issuance of press release and distribution of letters to individual households by the Social Service Teams to clarify that 8 March 2019 was not the application deadline for rehousing/ex-gratia allowances. CES(A)/LandsD supplemented that among the 445 households affected by the First Phase development of the NDAs, so far about 140 had indicated their wish to be considered for rehousing to PSW Estate. The information of about 80 of those households had been forwarded to HKHA

for follow up. Among the 1 062 households affected by the Remaining Phase development, so far about 366 had indicated their wish for early departure from and surrendering of their squatter structures in order to be considered for rehousing to PSW Estate. The eligibility of those households was under vetting.

11. Mr Andrew WAN and Mr LAM Cheuk-ting noted that the affected households were offered a non-means tested rehousing option in the dedicated rehousing estate of HKHS at Pak Wo Road, Fanling, for which they were required to pay higher rents chargeable at HKHS's prevailing Group B standard. They suggested that HKHS should allow the households which had passed the means test to be rehoused to the dedicated rehousing estate at lower rents chargeable at HKHS's prevailing Group A standard.

12. PS(PL)/DEVB said that dedicated rehousing estates were built to rehouse eligible households opting for non-means tested rehousing. HKHS would charge rents at the level of its Group B rental units. Nonetheless, needy households might apply for rent reduction under HKHS's Rent Assistance Scheme.

13. Mr CHU Hoi-dick was concerned that many squatter structures in the New Territories but outside NDAs had their squatter survey numbers cancelled due to such reasons as addition of structures or alteration with materials that did not conform with the squatter survey record, rendering the relevant residents ineligible for compensation and rehousing. Mr CHU urged the Administration to deal with the squatter issues in NDAs and other areas in the New Territories in the same way.

14. PS(PL)/DEVB explained that it was the Government's established policy to prioritize enforcement actions against irregularities in squatter structures. The Administration would handle the demolition of non-compliant structures in a humane manner. She reiterated that residents residing in illegal structures without a squatter survey number would not be eligible for EGAPO when their structures were demolished by the Administration.

#### Agricultural rehabilitation arrangements

15. Mr Alvin YEUNG enquired whether it was possible for the Administration to issue registration licences for squatter structures to affected farmers on a discretionary basis, allowing them to erect residential structures near their rehabilitated farmland and continue their pursuit of a living-cum-farming lifestyle.



16. PS(PL)/DEVB responded that allowing farmers to pursue a living-cum-farming lifestyle on government land was not an existing policy. For those farmers who had resided in surveyed squatter structures/licensed structures on private agricultural land affected by development clearance exercises, they would be allowed to erect domestic structures on other private agricultural land on a discretionary basis. However, in the case of government land used for agricultural practices, farmers were not allowed to do so, lest it would encourage people to use farming as a pretext in the hope of obtaining government land for building domestic cottages. She added that in order to assist farmers in agricultural rehabilitation, the Administration specially introduced the Special Agricultural Land Rehabilitation Scheme ("SALRS") to identify government land for farmers affected by NDA development to practice agricultural rehabilitation. As for housing arrangement, affected farmers might opt for either means-tested or non-means tested rehousing arrangement. The Administration would endeavour to rehouse them to housing estates in close proximity to their rehabilitated farmland as far as possible.

17. Mr WU Chi-wai was concerned about the scattered locations of the farmland identified under SALRS, and the possibility that they might be used for other development purposes in future. He enquired whether the land surrounding those plots of land was government or private land; the maximum number of years for which farmers might use the land to resume farming; and whether the farmland was provided with power and water supply and sewerage facilities.

18. PS(PL)/DEVB and Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)<sup>5</sup> said that the Administration had sought to bring adjoining plots of government land under SALRS as far as practicable in the land identification process. These plots of land were surrounded mainly by private agricultural land, village houses or rural areas. With a combined area of about four hectares, they were mostly located within land zoned "Agriculture", while a small portion was located in land zoned "Green Belt" with "Agriculture" listed as an always permitted use. The Administration currently did not have any plans to convert the land to other development uses. It would visit the sites concerned with farmers who would re-establish their farming practices and provide power and water supply and sewerage facilities, etc., according to their needs.

19. Mr CHU Hoi-dick pointed out that many affected farmers were reluctant to visit the sites for agricultural rehabilitation together with government officials due to their dissatisfaction with the Administration's failure to respond to their demand for the living-cum-farming lifestyle. Moreover, Mr CHU was dissatisfied that farmers were required to pay rent

for using the lodging and storage units at the proposed Agricultural Park ("Agri-Park"). He also enquired about the respective rental levels of the lodging facilities at the proposed Agri-Park and Long Valley Nature Park ("LVNP") and those to be built on the government land under SALRS, and whether the Administration would consider abolishing the rental requirement.

20. Senior Agricultural Officer (Agri-Park & Land), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, replied that the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department ("AFCD") was examining the rental levels of the lodging and storage units at the Agri-Park, as well as evaluating the future operation mode of LVNP, including appointing non-government organizations to manage the park or collect rents from tenants. Since the lodging facilities were meant to facilitate the farming activities of farmers, the rents concerned would be set at a reasonable level. Regarding the lodging facilities to be built under SALRS, PS(PL)/DEVB said that the rental level would be set with reference to that of similar facilities at the Agri-Park and LVNP. As most farmers affected by the First Phase development would only start moving out from late 2020, there was still time to discuss the details of leasing the above facilities.

#### Rehousing arrangement for the affected business operators

21. Ms Tanya CHAN noted that the Administration had to resume the site of a lard boiling factory, the only one of its kind in Hong Kong, near the Shek Wu Hui Sewage Treatment Works ("SWHSTW"). She was concerned whether the pork fat collected by the factory would be landfilled after the factory ceased operation, and whether another site would be identified for reprovisioning the factory. Ms Claudia MO also expressed concern about the issue. Meanwhile, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting pointed out that villagers of Tai Tong Wu Village near the lard boiling factory had requested LandsD to resume the site due to the pollution it caused to the neighbourhood.

22. Ms Tanya CHAN further enquired how the Administration would handle/rehouse the 141 business and industrial undertakings, 18 graves and two urns that were affected by the First Phase development of the NDAs. Mr CHU Hoi-dick was concerned about the rehousing arrangement for a sawmill in Kwu Tung that was affected by the development.

23. PS(PL)/DEVB and CES(A)/LandsD replied that the aforesaid lard boiling factory fell outside the scope of SWHSTW and NDAs. Since the factory had breached the tenancy terms, LandsD had terminated its tenancy and was in discussion with the Drainage Services Department ("DSD") on whether the site could be handed over to DSD for use as a site office. PS(PL)/DEVB further said that according to the funding proposal of the

unified and enhanced general ex-gratia compensation arrangements approved by the Finance Committee ("FC") in July 2018, affected business operators that were eligible open-air/outdoor business undertakings or operating from surveyed/licensed squatter structures could be considered for ex-gratia allowance. These business operators might re-provision their business at another location with the ex-gratia allowance. If necessary, government departments responsible for land and planning matters would provide the relevant assistance.

#### Relocation of elderly homes at Dills Corner Garden

24. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that according to the Administration's undertaking, the residential care homes for the elderly ("RCHEs") at the Dills Corner Garden ("DCG") would not be demolished until the seamless relocation of residents of those RCHEs to the new Multi-welfare Services Complex ("the new complex") in Area 29 of KTN NDA could be arranged. However, the RCHEs concerned would be demolished in two phases under the current plan. About 160 residents affected by the first phase demolition would have to move to other homes at DCG which were not subject to the impact of the first phase demolition before they could be relocated to the new complex upon its completion. Dr CHEUNG urged the Administration to honour its undertaking by arranging the relocation of residents to the new complex in one go so that residents would not have to move twice.

25. PS(PL)/DEVB explained that the site of RCHEs at DCG affected by the first phase demolition was used for the construction of a transport interchange which had to be completed before 2025 to meet the additional traffic demand expected to arise from the commissioning/resident intake of the new complex and the First Phase development of KTN NDA in 2023 and 2025 respectively. The Social Welfare Department ("SWD") was discussing with operators of RCHEs at DCG for arranging comparable accommodation for affected residents in other homes in the area at the same rent during the transitional period.

26. Mr CHAN Han-pan and Mr LAM Cheuk-ting urged the Administration to allow the existing operators of RCHEs at DCG to continue with their RCHE operation in the new complex. Mr CHAN also enquired whether the ex-gratia allowance for the business and industrial undertakings affected by the First Phase development of the NDAs was also applicable to the existing RCHE operators, as well as whether the Administration had deployed manpower to ascertain the operators' eligibility for the ex-gratia allowance and their intention to continue with their RCHE operation in the new complex or at other locations. Mr LAM suggested that the Administration should consider granting five-year contracts to existing

RCHE operators for operating RCHEs in the new complex and review later the contract arrangements, so that the residents who were under their care could adapt to the environment of the new complex as soon as possible.

27. PS(PL)/DEVB replied that the ex-gratia allowance arrangement was applicable to the existing operators of RCHEs at DCG. The amount of ex-gratia allowance payable to an operator would depend on the size of its business venue and whether the operator had a continuous operational period of at least seven years as the lessee of the short term tenancy. Moreover, the Administration had discussed with the existing RCHE operators with focus on the relocation arrangement for residents during the transitional period. As the next step, the Administration would discuss with them the matters on ex-gratia allowance. Regarding the RCHE service to be provided in the new complex, SWD would consider in tender assessment whether the potential operators had plans to properly handle and accommodate the RCHE residents and staff affected by the demolition of DCG. In other words, the existing service operators with a proper take-over plan would have an advantage in bidding for the service contract.

28. Mr CHAN Hak-kan urged SWD not to establish an unduly burdensome mechanism (e.g. requiring the tenderers to fill out numerous forms) for the tender exercise of the service contracts for the RCHEs in the new complex. Instead, it should evaluate the tenders under a mechanism which was fair, while according priority to the existing RCHE operators for operating the service continuously. Concurring with the views of Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Han-pan suggested that SWD officials should attend the next meeting of the Subcommittee (if the discussion on this item could not be finished at this meeting) to explain the specific arrangement for relocating the RCHEs at DCG.

29. The Chairman suggested that members might follow up on the specific arrangement for relocating the RCHEs at DCG on other occasions. Mr Tony TSE opined that in order to make the best use of the meeting time, members should focus their questions on issues relating to the proposed projects. Other questions involving the Government's policy might be put forward in writing.

30. PS(PL)/DEVB undertook to relay members' views to SWD so as to establish an assessment mechanism which was simple yet conducive to ensuring the service quality of the RCHEs.

Handling of animals affected by development

31. Ms Claudia MO criticized the Administration for not paying attention to the problem of the large number of animals to be displaced by the NDA development. She enquired about the number of dogs in the KTN and FLN areas; how the Administration would handle those dogs (including those without a valid licence); and whether it had discussed with affected households the arrangement for the dogs they kept. Dr KWOK Ka-ki also enquired about the arrangement of the Administration for resettling the affected animals.

32. Principal Veterinary Officer, AFCD ("PVO/AFCD"), said that according to the records of the dog licensing system maintained by AFCD, there were more than 500 dogs with a valid licence in the KTN and FLN areas. PS(PL)/DEVB pointed out that HKHA and HKHS would follow the existing policy by granting discretionary approval for affected households to bring along the service dogs or companion dogs they had been keeping for years when moving to rehousing estates, and effort would be made to expedite the vetting and approval process. In addition, the Administration had earmarked funding to support the use of vacant government sites by non-government organizations. AFCD would encourage non-profit-making organizations to apply for the government funding support concerned to set up animal adoption centres providing shelter for animals that were not allowed to be rehoused in public housing estates with their owners.

33. Mr Jeremy TAM said that there were many dogs in the KTN and FLN areas that were kept by people but did not have a valid licence. He enquired how HKHA and HKHS would handle the requests from the affected households which would be rehoused for moving to their public housing estate units with those animals.

34. PS(PL)/DEVB and PVO/AFCD responded that AFCD advised the public against keeping dogs without a valid licence. AFCD would send its staff to KTN and FLN to assist local residents in licence application for their dogs, so that they could apply for bringing along these animals when being rehoused to public housing estates in future.

Tender, scopes and costs of the projects

35. Mr CHU Hoi-dick pointed out that the projects set out under the funding submission (e.g. 747CL and 388DS) incurred substantial construction costs. Regarding project tendering, he enquired whether the Administration would engage a major contractor to deliver the projects under one single contract, or it would split the projects into several contracts, so that

more small and medium contractors could participate in the tender exercise. Director of Civil Engineering and Development ("DCED") said that the Administration planned to split the proposed projects into several contracts with values ranging from between \$200 million and \$300 million to several billion dollars.

36. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted that both 747CL and 388DS involved works items related to the expansion of SWHSTW. He enquired why the relevant works were proposed to be funded under 747CL and carried out together by DSD under the works contracts of 388DS; and about the respective scopes of works under the two projects. Moreover, Mr CHAN enquired about the respective scopes of two works items under 747CL, namely the construction of roads and associated junction/road improvements (others) at a cost around \$447 million, and the reprovisioning works at a cost around \$350 million. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was concerned whether cost control measures would be taken for 388DS, which incurred a construction cost as high as \$11.9 billion.

37. DCED and Director of Drainage Services ("DDS") pointed out that there was no overlap in the scopes of works of the part expansion and upgrading of SWHSTW under 747CL and 388DS (Shek Wu Hui Effluent Polishing Plant). The former sought to cope with the additional sewage load expected to arise from the First Phase development of the NDAs, and the latter sought to cope with the additional sewage load from the continuous development of Sheung Shui and Fanling (including the Remaining Phase development of the NDAs). In addition, DCED advised that the construction of roads and associated junction/road improvements (others) included the construction of three footbridges at Lung Yeuk Tau Interchange, Ng Tung River and Ho Ka Yuen respectively, while the reprovisioning works included reprovisioning the existing facilities such as On Lok Mun Street Playground, North District Temporary Wholesale Market for Agricultural Products and refuse collection points.

38. Mr Tony TSE requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the price adjustment factors adopted in working out the cost estimates in MOD prices (including the consultants' fees) of the projects set out under the funding submission (i.e. 747CL, 759CL, 828CL, 793CL and 388DS). The Administration undertook to provide the supplementary information requested by Mr TSE after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. [PWSC179/18-19\(01\)](#) (Chinese version) on 25 April 2019.)*

Transport infrastructure projects to support new development in Kwu Tung North and Fanling North

39. Referring to the Administration's response to members' questions raised at the meeting on 27 February 2019 ([LC Paper No. PWSC150/18-19\(01\)](#) (Chinese version)), Mr CHAN Hak-kan pointed out that the target commissioning of MTR Kwu Tung Station was to tie in with the first population intake of the public housing development in KTN NDA expected in 2027. Mr CHAN requested the Administration to clarify whether only Kwu Tung Station would be opened by then, or the whole Northern Link (i.e. the railway line between Kwu Tung Station and Kam Sheung Road Station of the West Rail Line) would also be ready for commissioning; in the case of the latter, whether MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL") had sufficient time to build the Northern Link.

40. PS(PL)/DEVB responded that while MTR Kwu Tung Station was targeted for commissioning in 2027, the target commissioning of the entire Northern Link would hinge on the completion and population intake of the whole NDA development, i.e. around 2032/2033.

41. Mr Gary FAN pointed out that MTRCL had built platform structures at Kwu Tung when constructing the Lok Ma Chau Spur Line ("LMCSL") of the East Rail Line many years ago. He enquired when the Administration's most recent site visit to Kwu Tung Station took place; whether the Administration had assessed if the original design of the platform structures could meet the current needs; and about the works and cost required for developing Kwu Tung Station on the existing platform structures.

42. Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)<sup>3</sup> replied that Kwu Tung Station, after completion, would become an intermediate station on LMCSL, for which platform structures had already been built by Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation during the construction of LMCSL. As such, the construction works of Kwu Tung Station, though involving numerous works items, would not be met with too many engineering challenges. On the other hand, for the Northern Link which connected Kwu Tung Station and Kam Sheung Road Station of the West Rail Line, MTRCL would need to build another platform (not the platform on LMCSL) at Kwu Tung Station for use by the proposed Northern Link. The relevant government department(s) were studying MTRCL's proposal for the Northern Link development. It was not necessary to send any staff there to conduct site visit at this stage.

Proposed Long Valley Nature Park

43. Mr CHU Hoi-dick noted that 759CL included the development of a nature park covering an area of about 37 hectares at Long Valley. Mr CHU enquired whether the Administration would submit a separate proposal on LVNP (including the layout, design and operation of the park) for consultation with the relevant LegCo Panel(s).

44. PS(PL)/DEVB said that the Administration had consulted the Panel on Development on funding proposals relating to NDAs, which included the LVNP project, on 22 January 2019. The Administration was also more than willing to respond to members' questions on LVNP before the funding proposal concerned was considered by FC.

Protecting the important trees affected by development

45. Ms Tanya CHAN noted that according to paragraph 37 of Enclosure 1 to the discussion paper and its Annex 9, 1 838 trees within the project boundary of 747CL would be preserved, whereas 6 809 trees would be removed, including 6 644 to be felled and 165 to be transplanted. The trees to be removed included 10 important trees, among which three *Aquilaria sinensis* trees would be transplanted and the remaining seven would be felled. Ms CHAN queried whether it was necessary to fell so many trees within the project boundary of 747CL for the purpose of site formation, given that most of the land concerned would only be used for open space development, and 15 important trees at DCG (also located within the scope of NDAs) could be preserved in-situ. Furthermore, even if trees, whips and shrubs would be planted in future under the compensatory planting plan, they might not be able to take over the role of the original trees in air purification, etc..

46. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen was concerned whether the Administration had underestimated the number of important trees among the affected trees as only 10 were identified among the total of 6 809 trees. Mr CHAN also noted that being 100 years old or above was one of the criteria of an important tree. He enquired how the Administration verified the age of the trees to be felled to confirm that the tree age was younger than 100 years.

47. DCED and Project Manager (North), North Development Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department, advised that the Administration would preserve trees as far as practicable when implementing public works projects, and would remove trees only when necessary (e.g. when excavation and refilling works were involved). As the ground levels required only minor adjustments in the site formation process of the DCG area, the Administration had modified the project design to enable the in-situ



preservation of 15 important trees at DCG. In contrast, trees had to be removed from the project site of 747CL because the ground levels at some parts of the project site required major adjustments, and part of the open space would be used for developing ball game venues. Annex 9 to Enclosure 1 to the discussion paper only set out the 10 important trees affected by 747CL that could not be preserved in-situ but left out the information on the 15 important trees proposed to be preserved at DCG.

48. Chief Engineer (North)3, North Development Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department, supplemented that tree specialists had examined the trees within the project boundary of 747CL following the Administration's guidelines, and had submitted the findings to the relevant government department(s) for formulating a suitable proposal for handling trees. The 6 644 trees proposed to be felled were in relatively poor health and were not important trees.

49. Ms Tanya CHAN asked the Administration to explain why the location map and pictures of the 10 important trees that were affected by 747CL and proposed to be transplanted/felled as set out in Annex 9 to Enclosure 1 to the discussion paper were made available only upon media enquiries. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen requested the Administration to provide members with the location map and pictures of these trees.

50. Mr Gary FAN was also concerned that only a handful of important trees could be preserved in-situ (e.g. the 15 important trees at DCG) while a large number of trees were to be felled, and asked why the Administration did not timely furnish members with information on the trees affected by the proposed projects. He also requested the Administration to provide the tree survey report prepared by the consultant for 747CL and 759CL.

51. DCED explained that the information on the 10 important trees (including their species, health conditions, etc.) affected by 747CL was detailed in Annex 9 to Enclosure 1 to the discussion paper. The Administration undertook to provide the information requested by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Mr Gary FAN after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. [PWSC179/18-19\(01\)](#) (Chinese version) on 25 April 2019.)*

52. At 6:08 pm, the Chairman invited members who intended to propose motions under paragraph 32A of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure ("32A motions") to put forward their proposed motions as soon as possible.

At 6:25 pm, the Chairman said that he had received one 32A motion proposed by Mr CHU Hoi-dick.

53. The Chairman said that as the meeting was about to end, the Subcommittee would continue to discuss this item and deal with 32A motion(s) at the next meeting. The meeting ended at 6:27 pm.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
2 May 2019