

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1)224/18-19(02)

Ref. : CB1/PS/1/17

**Panel on Housing**

**Subcommittee to Follow Up the Issues  
Related to the Wang Chau Development Project**

**Updated background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat  
for the meeting on 30 November 2018**

**Purpose**

This paper provides background information on the issues related to the Wang Chau Development Project and the major views and concerns expressed by Members of the Legislative Council ("LegCo") on the subject.

**Background**

2. The Administration and the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation jointly entrusted the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") in July 2012 to commission a Planning and Engineering Study ("P&E Study") on the feasibility of the Wang Chau Housing Development and Yuen Long Industrial Estate Extension ("YLIEE") to study the technical feasibility of the development in the aspects of planning, construction and environment. The total planned development area is around 34 hectares<sup>1</sup>, and is situated North to Long Ping Estate in Yuen Long, between Kai Shan and Fuk Hi Street.

Development approach

3. According to the Administration, different parts of the P&E Study were completed in phases and the entire study was completed in September 2015. In

---

<sup>1</sup> LC Paper No. [CB\(1\)16/16-17\(01\)](#)

2013, whilst the P&E Study was yet to be completed and data and analyses gradually became available, the plan made public at that time was to proceed concurrently with all three phases of the public housing development to provide around 17 000 units, as well as YLIEE. In early 2014, the Administration decided to proceed first with Phase 1 development to provide 4 000 units, and develop Phases 2 and 3 and YLIEE at later periods ("phased development approach").<sup>2</sup>

4. According to the Administration, the Housing Department's proposal to proceed first with the Phase 1 development and leave the Phases 2 and 3 development to later periods was agreed by the Secretary for Transport and Housing in early 2014, who then reported to the 3C meeting chaired by the Chief Executive.

5. The reduction of public housing units from 17 000 to 4 000, as well as the rezoning of green belts for the development of these units instead of clearing the brownfield sites, have raised public concerns.<sup>3</sup> Some have called on the Administration to disclose the reports of the P&E Study to allow the public to have a clearer understanding of the project. On 18 October 2016, the Administration responded with the release of the 16 reports of the P&E Study to LegCo and the public, after processing the sensitive information such as land matters and financial information.<sup>4</sup>

#### Number of households affected by the Phase 1 development

6. In reply to a question at the Council meeting of 31 May 2017 about the number of households affected by the Phase 1 development, the Administration advised that the Lands Department ("LandsD") had conducted a pre-clearance freezing survey in the areas involved in the development plan concerned on 30 October 2015. A total of about 180 households, involving about 400 clearers,

---

<sup>2</sup> See Appendices I and II to LC Paper No. CB(1)126/16-17(01) for the demarcation of the site of Phases 1, 2 and 3 of the development and the YLIEE site and the land information of the sites respectively.

<sup>3</sup> The Chief Executive and other relevant officials held a press conference on 21 September 2016 and provided information regarding the Government's internal deliberation process for the decision to proceed with Phase 1 first, as well as the considerations supporting the decision. The relevant press statements and transcripts of the press conference have been provided in LC Paper No. [CB\(1\)126/16-17\(01\)](#).

<sup>4</sup> The reports can be accessed via [http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr1617/english/panels/hg/papers/wang\\_chau\\_report/wang\\_chau\\_report.htm](http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr1617/english/panels/hg/papers/wang_chau_report/wang_chau_report.htm)

were registered in the survey. It was tentatively established that among the registered households, about 100 households were residing in licensed domestic structures or surveyed domestic structures covered by the 1982 Squatter Control Survey ("SCS"); about 50 households were residing in licensed non-domestic structures or surveyed non-domestic structures covered by the 1982 SCS; and the remaining some 30 households were residing in unlicensed structures or structures that were not registered by the SCS.

7. As at the end of March 2018, LandsD had met with 156 households and 12 households were rehoused to HA's public rental housing ("PRH"). All of them were residents of 1982 SCS domestic structures. They had also satisfied the relevant eligibility criteria for PRH. Since some of the households had not provided documents or had provided insufficient documents, eligibility assessments had yet been completed. LandsD had been progressively establishing contacts with the registered households to explain to them the relevant ex-gratia allowances ("EGA") and rehousing arrangements.

#### Site formation and infrastructure works for Phase 1 development

8. According to the Administration's forecast, the public housing development Phase 1 at Wang Chau is to be completed in 2024-25, and will provide about 4 000 units for a population of about 12 300. To facilitate the timely completion of the Phase 1 development, the Administration consulted the Panel on Housing ("HG Panel") on 6 November 2017 on the funding proposal to take forward the Public Works Programme Item No. B780CL for the relevant site formation and infrastructure works ("the project B780CL"). Panel members urged the Administration to resolve the issues relating to the relocation, rehousing and compensation arrangements for all Wang Chau residents before commencing the project B780CL.

#### Proposed enhancements to compensation and rehousing arrangements

9. On 10 May 2018, the Administration announced the proposed enhancements to the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing ("C&R") arrangements for eligible domestic occupants in squatters and business undertakings affected by the Government's development clearance exercises. The Panel on Development ("DEV Panel") was briefed on the proposed enhancements on 29 May 2018.

10. Under the proposed enhancements, a unified and enhanced general ex-gratia C&R package, instead of "project specific" packages, would be applicable to all future Government's development clearance exercises irrespective of project scale. Apart from the existing means-tested rehousing

arrangement in PRH of HA for affected eligible households, non-means tested rehousing in dedicated rehousing estates to be developed and managed by the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HKHS") would be introduced.<sup>5</sup> The eligibility criteria of the cash EGA would be relaxed, and the amount of which would be increased. Further, LandsD would conduct a one-off voluntary registration exercise for domestic occupants in surveyed/licensed non-domestic structures, such that these affected occupants would be eligible for relevant C&R arrangements in future. The eligibility criteria of the EGA for business undertakings on brownfields and in squatters would also be relaxed from a minimum of 10-year continuous operation at the same land lot to a minimum of seven years.

11. To follow up the matter, HG Panel and DEV Panel held two joint meetings on 26 and 29 June 2018 to receive public views on the proposed enhancements as well as the project B780CL. HG Panel has raised no objection to the submission of the project B780CL to the Public Works Subcommittee for consideration.

12. In response to members' call for greater flexibility in the implementation of the new package with a view to addressing the concerns of those affected, the Administration has undertaken, in its financial proposal for the enhancements submitted to the Finance Committee ("FC") for approval, to exercise some flexibility in the implementation of the unified ex-gratia C&R package, without prejudice to the overall policy directions. For Wang Chau development Phase 1 for which Pre-clearance Survey ("PCS") had already been completed before the announcement of the enhanced ex-gratia C&R package on 10 May 2018, the Administration would exercise flexibility in assessing the continuous residence/occupation duration of clearers (e.g. households, business undertakings) for determining the eligibility for EGAs and/or rehousing arrangements by counting not only the length of continuous residence/occupation immediately preceding the date of PCS but also that after the date of PCS but before 10 May 2018 (i.e. the announcement date of the proposed enhanced ex-gratia C&R package). According to the Administration, this is an exceptional implementation arrangement confined to the Wang Chau development Phase 1 (and Kwu Tung North and Fanling North New Development Areas ("NDAs") and Hung Shui Kiu NDA as well), on the ground that the detailed assessment work which should have commenced soon after the

---

<sup>5</sup> Transitional arrangements would be offered by making use of vacant units of HKHS's rental and HA's PRH estates before the dedicated rehousing estates were completed and ready for population intake (estimated to be around 2023/2024 for the dedicated estates at Pak Wo Road, Fanling and Hung Shui Kiu New Development Areas).

PCS has been delayed for some time due to the review of the ex-gratia C&R package. The financial proposal was approved by FC on 18 July 2018.

### **Major views and concerns expressed by Members**

13. In view of the public concern over the Wang Chau development project, HG Panel and DEV Panel have discussed the project with the Administration at five joint Panel meetings held on 15 and 29 November 2016, 6 December 2016, 26 and 29 June 2018, and have received public views on the subject at three of the joint meetings. The Subcommittee to Follow Up the Issues Related to the Wang Chau Development Project ("the Subcommittee") met on 25 April 2018 to receive an update on the project by the Administration. The major views and concerns expressed by Members are summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

#### Phased development approach

14. While some Members appreciated that taking forward the Wang Chau Housing Development in phases could enable early production of 4 000 housing units, some Members opined that the Administration should develop all three phases concurrently to provide the about 17 000 units to meet the society's imminent public housing demand and provide sufficient ancillary facilities to the community there.

15. The Administration explained that the phased development approach was a pragmatic and progressive one having regard to the brownfield operations in the sites required for Phases 1 to 3 of the development, local sentiment, technical and environmental considerations including infrastructure works required to underpin the development. The Administration also advised that the overall target of developing a total of 17 000 units remained unchanged. A technical feasibility study on the development of Phases 2 and 3 (i.e. Engineering Feasibility Study for Site Formation and Infrastructural Works for Remaining Phases of Public Housing Developments at Wang Chau, Yuen Long) was being conducted since July 2017, the result of the study was expected to be available in early 2019 and the Administration would make reference to the results to determine the implementation plan and timetable.

#### Consultations with relevant parties

16. Some Members opined that the Administration's decision to scale down the development was made after conducting informal consultations/lobbying sessions (including with rural representatives, District Council members and brownfield operators who had vested interests in the land sites concerned)

without the knowledge or participation of the residents affected by the development. They questioned whether the decision to defer the Phases 2 and 3 development was made because of the pressure exerted by a handful of persons.

17. The Administration explained that it had taken into account views collected during the informal consultations and government departments had also conducted their own analyses before deciding to take forward the development in phases.

18. Some Members pointed out that the plan to build housing units on green belts in Phase 1 for implementing the development project would force the existing villagers who had not been properly consulted on the development to move out. They held the view that public consultation should not be replaced by informal consultations/lobbying sessions in planning public housing projects, and urged the Administration to shelve or postpone the development project, launch a public consultation, meet the affected villagers and listen to their concerns.

19. The Administration explained that rezoning involving green belts would be required at Wang Chau for land lots designated for development. The Administration had conducted public consultations and undergone necessary statutory procedures for the Phase 1 development, and the public had opportunities to express their opinions during the process. In October 2014, the Town Planning Board ("TPB") exhibited the draft Ping Shan Outline Zoning Plan ("draft OZP") with the inclusion of the rezoning proposal of the Phase 1 development at Wang Chau for public inspection. Having considered the relevant representations and comments in respect of the draft OZP, TPB decided not to propose corresponding amendments to the draft OZP. Informal consultation for proposed project which affected the area concerned was a long-standing practice in the Government's consultation system, but could not and would not replace the public consultations conducted in accordance with the statutory requirements and established procedures.

#### Environmental impact assessment

20. On the question why the Administration did not carry out an environmental impact assessment ("EIA") for the development projects at Wang Chau, the Administration explained that YLIEE was a designated project under Schedule 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance ("EIAO"), and an EIA was only required if the Administration developed Phases 1, 2 and 3 development and YLIEE together. As the Administration had decided to proceed with Phase 1 development first and the scale was far below the thresholds for EIA set out in EIAO, an EIA was not required.

### Compensation and rehousing arrangements for affected residents

21. Some Members opined that the Administration should review and improve the C&R arrangements in order to take better care of the needs of the people affected, including the immediate accommodation needs of those who were not eligible for public housing. Some Members enquired whether the Administration would consider compensating the affected residents more favourably, such as by according priority to their applications for PRH and introducing non-means tested rehousing option to PRH for households affected by the Wang Chau development. Some Members opined that the works should not proceed until C&R arrangements were properly handled.

22. On 6 November 2017, HG Panel passed two motions urging the Administration to (a) revise the compensation mechanism, so that residents living in non-domestic structures at sites affected by land clearance can also be compensated and rehoused; and (b) review the existing compensation and rehousing mechanism so that those usual residents who have been living there before the announcement of the project should be eligible for ex-gratia removal compensation and should be rehoused in PRH units.

23. On rehousing the affected residents, the Administration advised that according to the prevailing policy, in order to be rehoused in PRH, all households affected by clearances and registered in the pre-clearance freezing survey must be occupying a structure covered by a license for domestic use (i.e. a licensed domestic structure), or a structure covered by the SCS and registered for domestic use (i.e. a surveyed domestic structure) (regardless of whether the structure was located on government land or private agricultural land), and must also satisfy the relevant eligibility criteria of HA for PRH. Meanwhile, if the household was occupying a structure covered by a license for non-domestic use (i.e. a licensed non-domestic structure) or a structure covered by the SCS and registered for non-domestic use (i.e. a surveyed non-domestic structure), and if the household had continuously been occupying these structures for at least two years before the date of the pre-clearance freezing survey for domestic use, they would be eligible for Domestic Removal Allowance ("DRA"), the amount of which would depend on the household size.

24. When considering the proposal on enhancements to the C&R arrangements in May 2018, DEV Panel passed four motions appealing the Administration to, among others, (a) review also the compensation mechanism for the agricultural sector; (b) extend the option of village relocation to non-indigenous villages affected by the Government's clearance exercises; (c) as for the NDA projects, conduct land resumption in one go to avoid protracting the

impact on the villagers, and ensure those occupants registered in the freezing survey but evicted by the landowners subsequently could still be eligible for compensation; and (d) arrange interim rehousing for the affected residents before the dedicated rehousing estates were ready for population intake.

### Eligible households

25. Some Members expressed concern about the percentage of villagers affected by the Wang Chau development who would only be eligible for DRA but not ex-gratia C&R arrangements under the proposed enhancement, and the reasons of their ineligibility. The Administration advised that as a preliminary estimate, after the implementation of the relevant proposed enhancements, households eligible for rehousing to public housing would be 45% of the households registered in 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.

26. The Administration supplemented that in general, squatter occupants who would only be entitled to DRA under the proposed enhancement included (a) occupants in non-surveyed/non-licensed squatter structures which were totally unauthorized and were not tolerated under the prevailing Squatter Control Policy, and (b) households residing in surveyed/licensed structures who were not eligible for any form of rehousing or EGA for Permitted Occupiers of Licensed Structures and Surveyed Squatters affected by Clearance ("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.

### Village resite

27. Some Members suggested that a village resite should be provided for reprovisioning of village houses to affected villagers as they might have difficulty in adapting to the living environment in public housing blocks. The Administration advised that while acknowledging 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 individual aspirations on C&R arrangements.



### Ex-gratia compensation

28. In response to some Members' enquiries about the amount of EGA for occupants in squatters in the proposed enhancement would be lower than the amount offered in the prevailing ex-gratia compensation regime, the Administration advised that to introduce a unified general ex-gratia compensation package for all development clearance projects, it was 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.

### Non-domestic structures

29. Some Members enquired whether the Administration would also register the non-domestic structures in the voluntary registration exercise as lot owners might force the existing occupants in surveyed/licensed non-domestic structures to move out so that their relatives or friends could register as new occupants of the structures in the voluntary registration exercise. The Administration advised that 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 at the time of registration. 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.

### Flexibility in implementation

30. In response to some Members' concerns about the entitlement to DRA of households opted for subsidized sale flats ("SSFs") and households which resided in squatter structures for decades but were subsequently evicted by lot owners before PCS, the Administration advised that all squatter occupants registered in the relevant PCS, including those who opted for rehousing to rental units or SSFs at Dedicated Rehousing Estates ("DREs"), would be entitled to DRA. 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 C&R arrangements on compassionate grounds. The Administration believed that it was not practicable to introduce a discretionary mechanism for households evicted before PCS. To demonstrate

that the household concerned had been residing in the structures, they might provide relevant documentary proof, such as utility bills and bank statements for LandsD's consideration.

### Rehousing arrangement

31. Some Members enquired whether HA had estimated the number of PRH units that would be allocated to squatter occupants affected by the Government's development clearances, and whether non-means tested rehousing arrangements under the proposed arrangement would affect the supply of PRH for applicants on the PRH waiting list.

32. The Administration advised that before the DREs were ready for population intake, HA and HKHS would make use of its vacant units in its rental estates in different districts as far as practicable to provide transitional arrangements to eligible households opting for non-means tested rehousing. In 2018, HA had reserved about 350 PRH units under Clearance Rehousing for eligible clearerees affected by government actions on land clearance, and about 2 000 PRH units for eligible applicants under Compassionate Rehousing.

33. Some Members enquired about the factors to be taken into account by the Administration when determining the rehousing eligibility of squatter occupants with special circumstances. The Administration advised that it would, where appropriate, exercise discretion in respect of the eligibility for the proposed non-means tested rehousing taking into account the special circumstances of the applicants. Relevant government departments would assess each case on individual merits.

34. Some Members enquired whether the proposed arrangements were applicable to all eligible households affected by the Government's development clearance exercises over the territory, including those carried out in urban districts, and about the estimated number of households affected by the Government's development clearances. The Administration advised that the proposed arrangements would be applicable to all eligible households affected by Government's development clearance exercises across the territory, and that according to the Government's preliminary rough estimate at the present stage, about 8 000 squatter households were estimated to be affected by the Government's development clearance exercises in the short-to-medium term.

### Ex-gratia compensation arrangement for open-air/outdoor business undertakings

35. In response to some Members' enquiries about the reason why open-air/outdoor business undertakings had to meet the minimum operational period of seven years instead of two years immediately preceding the date of PCS in order to be eligible for EGA under the proposed arrangements, the Administration advised that it considered that the minimum operational period requirement of open-air/outdoor business undertakings should be longer than the minimum residence requirement for EGAs of households residing in surveyed/licensed domestic structures to avoid such business undertakings starting up their operations on agricultural land for a short period in the hope of getting EGAs. The proposed seven-year operation requirement was in line with the minimum residence requirement for non-means tested rehousing, and was an appropriate threshold to prevent abuse and ensure prudent use of public money. The Administration also confirmed that brownfield operators would meet the eligibility threshold if they had operated continuously for seven years immediately preceding the date of PCS within the boundary of the area to be cleared for development, albeit not on the same land lot.

### Compensation for farming households

36. Some Members were concerned that PCS had not been conducted for farmers and that farming households in various NDAs would not be entitled to any compensation package nor offered any arrangements that helped them to continue farming practices if they had been evicted by lot owners before clearances. 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 without taking into account other relevant factors such as farm productivity, business losses suffered by farmers due to land clearances, etc.

37. The Administration 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.

### Handling of brownfield issues

38. Some Members highlighted the significant contribution of the industries supported by the operations on the brownfield sites to the local economy, and stressed that any relocation of these operations to make way for the development at Wang Chau must be handled appropriately. They opined that the Administration should take into account the impact of its future measures to relocate the brownfield operations on the cost and financial sustainability of these operations, and work out appropriate compensation options and feasible reprovisioning arrangements for them. Some Members enquired whether the Administration would consider relocating the brownfield operations which did not require the use of heavy machinery, such as motor maintenance, container storage space, to multi-storey buildings.

39. The Administration advised that an inter-bureau/department task force on brownfield operations had been established in 2014 to consider how best to tackle brownfield sites on a more holistic basis. Feasibility studies on multi-storey buildings for accommodating some brownfield operations were also underway. The Administration 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. 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. Regarding Members' concern whether the Administration was according priority to rezoning green belts over developing brownfields in Wang Chau, the Administration advised that the total size of green belts in Phases 2 and 3 of the Wang Chau development project 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.

### Freezing survey on brownfields

40. Some Members enquired whether the Administration would conduct a registration exercise/a territory-wide freezing survey on brownfields, so as to prevent land owners from turning their land into brownfield sites in the hope of receiving higher compensation in future.

41. The Administration advised that if the brownfields fell within the development boundary of individual public development projects requiring land resumption and clearance, the Government would continue to act according to the established procedures by carrying out freezing surveys for the purpose of

assessing eligibility for compensation and ex-gratia allowances. The Government had no intention to condone unauthorized brownfield developments, for which enforcement actions would continue to be taken under the relevant regulatory regimes. On the contrary, where the so-called brownfield operations did not involve unauthorized developments, the Government did not think it appropriate to halt such operations across the board. In this regard, the Government had not considered the idea of conducting a freezing survey of brownfield sites for purposes other than those mentioned above.

### Impact of land clearances on animals

42. In response to some Members' enquiries 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 DREs and the measures to keep the dogs/animals given up by squatter occupants in future, the Administration replied that the transitional units used for rehousing eligible squatter occupants were housing units in HKHS's rental or HA's PRH estates, keeping of unauthorized dogs/animals in these units was not allowed under the relevant policies. During the land resumption process, some pet animals might be abandoned by owners and the Agriculture and Fisheries Conservation Department ("AFCD") would collect these animals to prevent animal cruelty and nuisance issues. These animals would be sent to AFCD's animal management centres for examination by veterinary officers, and AFCD had formed partnerships with various animal welfare organizations for pet rehoming services.

### **Council questions**

43. Members including Hon CHU Hoi-dick, Hon Paul TSE, Hon Steven HO, Hon Kenneth LAU, Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung, Hon LAU Kwok-fan and Hon Andrew WAN raised questions on various issues related to land development projects and their impacts at the Council meetings on 2 and 9 November 2016, 12 April 2017, 31 May 2017, 28 June 2017, 28 March 2018 and 13 June 2018 respectively. The Council questions and the Administration's replies are hyperlinked in the **Appendix**.

### **Latest development**

44. The Administration will give an update on the Wang Chau development project at the Subcommittee meeting on 30 November 2018.

**Relevant papers**

45. A list of relevant papers is in the **Appendix**.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
28 November 2018

## Public housing development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long

## List of relevant papers

Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Panel on Development	23 February 2016	<p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)931/15-16</a>)</p> <p>Administration's paper on actions against illegal occupation of government land and the latest plan for public housing development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)707/15-16(01)</a>)</p>
Panel on Development	29 May 2018	<p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)55/18-19</a>)</p> <p>Administration's paper on proposed enhancements to the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for Government's development clearance exercises (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)951/17-18(01)</a>)</p> <p>Administration's response to the issues raised by members at the meeting (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)1262/17-18(01)</a>)</p>
Panel on Housing and Panel on Development	15 and 29 November and 6 December 2016	<p>Administration's paper on public housing development plan at Wang Chau, Yuen Long (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)16/16-17(01)</a>)</p> <p>Press releases on public housing development plan at Wang Chau issued by the Administration from 21 September 2016 to 13 November 2016 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)126/16-17(01)</a>)</p> <p>Information note on public housing development plan at Wang Chau prepared by the Information Services Division of the Legislative Council Secretariat (LC Paper No. <a href="#">IN01/16-17</a>)</p>

Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
		<p>Minutes of joint meetings on 15 November 2016 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)1097/16-17</a>), 29 November 2016 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)1098/16-17</a>) and 6 December 2016 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)1441/16-17</a>)</p> <p>Administration's follow-up papers for the joint meetings on 15 November 2016 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)201/16-17(01)</a>), 29 November 2016 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)254/16-17(01)</a>) and 6 December 2016 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)387/16-17(02)</a>)</p> <p>Administration's response (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)260/16-17(01)</a>) to questions raised in two letters dated 28 and 29 November 2016 (LC Papers No. <a href="#">CB(1)213/16-17(01)</a> and <a href="#">CB(1)254/16-17(02)</a>)</p>
<p>Panel on Housing and Panel on Development</p>	<p>26 and 29 June 2018</p>	<p>Minutes of joint meetings on 26 June 2018 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)139/18-19</a>) and 29 June 2018 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)140/18-19</a>)</p> <p>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. <a href="#">CB(1)1165/17-18(01)</a>)</p> <p>Administration's response to the issues raised by members at the joint meetings (LC Paper Nos. <a href="#">CB(1)1221/17-18(01)</a> and <a href="#">CB(1)1246/17-18(01)</a>)</p>
<p>Public Works Subcommittee</p>	<p>25 January, 3, 15, 18 and 22 February 2017</p>	<p>Administration's paper on block allocations under the Capital Works Reserve Fund (LC Paper No. <a href="#">PWSC(2016-17)37</a>)</p> <p>Minutes of meetings on 25 January 2017 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">PWSC78/16-17</a>), 3 February 2017 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">PWSC91/16-17</a>), 15 February 2017 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">PWSC100/16-17</a>), 18 February 2017 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">PWSC112/16-17</a>) and</p>



Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
		<p>22 February 2017 (LC Paper No. <a href="#">PWSC101/16-17</a>)</p> <p>Administration's responses (LC Paper No. <a href="#">PWSC20/16-17(02)</a>; <a href="#">PWSC31/16-17(02)</a>; <a href="#">PWSC31/16-17(03)</a>; <a href="#">PWSC61/16-17(02)</a>(Chinese version only); <a href="#">PWSC74/16-17(02)</a>; <a href="#">PWSC88/16-17(01)</a>; <a href="#">PWSC93/16-17(01)</a>; <a href="#">PWSC95/16-17(01)</a>(Chinese version only) and <a href="#">PWSC98/16-17(01)</a>) to issues raised by members in the meetings/letters)</p>
Finance Committee	24 February, 17 and 18 March 2017	<p>Administration's responses (LC Paper No. <a href="#">FC62/16-17</a>; <a href="#">FC76/16-17(01)</a> (Chinese version only); <a href="#">FC153/16-17(01)</a> (Chinese version only); <a href="#">FC56/16-17(02)</a>; <a href="#">FC61/16-17(01)</a> (Chinese version only)) to issues raised by members in the meetings/letters regarding <a href="#">FCR(2016-17)86</a></p>
Finance Committee	18 July 2018	<p>Administration's paper on Capital Works Reserve Fund Head 701 : land acquisition, enhancements of the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements to be offered to eligible domestic occupants in squatters and to business undertakings affected by government development clearance exercises (LC Paper No. <a href="#">FCR(2018-19)48</a>)</p> <p>Administration's responses to issues raised by members at the meeting (LC Paper No. <a href="#">FC334/17-18(01)</a>)</p>
Panel on Housing	6 November 2017	<p>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. <a href="#">CB(1)155/17-18(04)</a>)</p> <p>Minutes of the meeting (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)416/17-18</a>)</p>

Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
		<p>Administration's response (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)308/17-18(01)</a>) to issues raised by members and the two motions carried at the meeting</p> <p>Administration's response to the issues raised in the letter dated 30 November 2017 from Hon CHU Hoi-dick regarding "Head 711 project no. B780CL - Site formation and infrastructure works for public housing development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long" as set out in LC Paper No. CB(1)310/17-18(01) (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)435/17-18(01)</a>)</p>
Subcommittee to Follow Up the Issues Related to the Wang Chau Development Project	28 February 2018	Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)866/17-18</a> )
Subcommittee to Follow Up the Issues Related to the Wang Chau Development Project	25 April 2018	<p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)1347/17-18</a>)</p> <p>Administration's paper on the Public Housing Development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)849/17-18(01)</a>)</p> <p>Administration's response to the issues raised at the meeting (LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(1)1003/17-18(02)</a>)</p>

Hyperlink to relevant Council Questions:

Date	Council Question
2 November 2016	<a href="#">Council question</a> on development projects in the New Territories
9 November 2016	<a href="#">Council question</a> on impact of mainland-funded consortia buying commercial and residential sites and properties in Hong Kong

<b>Date</b>	<b>Council Question</b>
16 November 2016	<a href="#">Council question</a> on interdepartmental task forces on land development led by the Chief Executive
12 April 2017	<a href="#">Council question</a> on farmers affected by development plans
31 May 2017	<a href="#">Council question</a> on rehousing of residents affected by land resumption and squatter clearance programmes
28 June 2017	<a href="#">Council question</a> on statistics on agricultural lands and development plans
28 March 2018	<a href="#">Council question</a> on compensations and rehousing for residents affected by the North East New Territories New Development Areas Planning
13 June 2018	<a href="#">Council question</a> on the land supply option of tapping into developers' private agricultural land reserve in the New Territories