

(Confirmed minutes)

(Translation)

**Sai Kung District Council**  
**Minutes of the First Special Meeting in 2023**

---

Date: 3 February 2023 (Friday)

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Venue: Conference Room of the Sai Kung District Council

| <b><u>Present</u></b>                         | <b><u>From</u></b>   | <b><u>To</u></b> |
|---|--|------------------|
| Mr CHAU Yin-ming, Francis, BBS, MH (Chairman) | 9:30 a.m.  | 11:31 a.m.       |
| Mr CHOI Ming-hei (Vice-Chairman)              | 9:30 a.m.  | 11:31 a.m.       |
| Mr CHAN Yiu-chor, Andrew                      | 9:30 a.m.  | 11:31 a.m.       |
| Mr CHEUNG Chin-pang, Edwin                    | 9:30 a.m.  | 11:31 a.m.       |
| Mr CHEUNG Mei-hung, Chris                     | 9:30 a.m.  | 11:31 a.m.       |
| Ms FONG Kwok-shan, Christine                  | 9:30 a.m.  | 11:31 a.m.       |
| Mr LAU Kai-hong                               | 9:30 a.m.  | 11:31 a.m.       |
| Mr WONG Shui-sang                             | 9:30 a.m.  | 11:31 a.m.       |
| Ms TSOI Leung-leung, Teresa (Secretary)       | Senior Executive Officer (District Council),<br>Sai Kung District Office |                  |

**In Attendance**

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| Mr TSANG Chun-man, Frank, JP | District Officer (Sai Kung), Sai Kung District Office                                      |
| Mr CHENG Chi-wing, Ken       | Senior Liaison Officer (1), Sai Kung District Office                                       |
| Ms LAM Yee-mang, Dawn        | Senior Liaison Officer (2), Sai Kung District Office                                       |
| Mr NG Wai-ming               | Senior Liaison Officer (3), Sai Kung District Office                                       |
| Miss WONG Chui-ying, Erin    | Executive Officer I (District Council), Sai Kung District Office                           |
| Ms YAN Mei-ling, Louisa      | Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning & Lands)2,<br>Development Bureau                   |
| Miss CHU Hiu-yin, Rebecca    | Assistant Secretary (Planning) Special Duties 1,<br>Development Bureau                     |
| Mr CHENG Kam-ming, Anson     | Assistant Secretary (Works Policies 3)4, Development<br>Bureau                             |
| Mr D. C. CHEUNG              | Principal Assistant Secretary (Sustainable Development),<br>Environment and Ecology Bureau |
| Mr LEUNG Tsz-hong, Billy     | Assistant Secretary (Sustainable Development)1,<br>Environment and Ecology Bureau          |
| Ms CHAU Yin-mai, Lisa        | Senior Town Planner (Sustainable Development) (Acting),<br>Environment and Ecology Bureau  |
| Mr OR Chun-ming, Kenny       | Assistant Secretary 7B, Transport and Logistics Bureau                                     |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Mr LEUNG Chung-lap, Michael, JP | Project Manager (East), Civil Engineering and Development Department                          |
| Mr CHUNG Ting-hao, Eric         | Senior Engineer/19(East), Civil Engineering and Development Department                        |
| Mr CHEUNG Wai-hung, Tony        | Assistant Director (Environmental Infrastructure), Environmental Protection Department        |
| Miss WONG Ho-ying, Connie       | Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional East)4, Environmental Protection Department |
| Mr CHAN Ka-ho, Benjamin         | Chief Engineer/Railway Development 2-1, Highways Department                                   |
| Mr CHO Chung-hon, John          | Senior Engineer/Railway Schemes(7), Highways Department                                       |
| Ms TAM Yin-ping, Donna          | Assistant Director of Planning/New Territories, Planning Department                           |
| Ms TANG Tsui-ye, Caroline       | District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands, Planning Department                             |
| Mr YEUNG Chi-kit, Kenneth       | Senior Town Planner/Special Duties, Planning Department                                       |

The Chairman said a quorum was present and the meeting commenced officially.

2. The Chairman welcomed all Members and attendees to the meeting, in particular Mr Frank TSANG, the new District Officer (Sai Kung).
3. The Chairman said the Secretariat had not received any Notification of Absence from Meeting submitted by Members before the meeting.

**I. Tseung Kwan O Area 137 and related near shore reclamations - Preliminary Outline Development Plan**

(SKDC(M) Paper No. 18/23)

4. The Chairman said Sai Kung District Council (SKDC) had always been concerned about the development of Tseung Kwan O (TKO) Area 137 and the neighbouring areas, and had urged the Government to announce the development plan as soon as possible. Since the Government had recently announced TKO Area 137 and related near shore reclamations - Preliminary Outline Development Plan (the Preliminary Outline Development Plan), Members hoped to convene a meeting as soon as possible to facilitate exchange of views with the Government, and conduct consultation and other follow-up actions afterwards. SKDC would continue to follow up the matter at the next full council meeting if necessary. As the departmental

representatives had to leave at 11 a.m., Members should speak as succinctly as possible to allow sufficient time for the departments to respond.

5. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives:

Development Bureau (DEVB)

- Ms Louisa YAN, Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning & Lands)<sup>2</sup>
- Miss Rebecca CHU, Assistant Secretary (Planning) Special Duties 1
- Mr Anson CHENG, Assistant Secretary (Works Policies 3)<sup>4</sup>

Environment and Ecology Bureau (EEB)

- Mr D. C. CHEUNG, Principal Assistant Secretary (Sustainable Development)
- Mr Billy LEUNG, Assistant Secretary (Sustainable Development )<sup>1</sup>
- Ms Lisa CHAU, Senior Town Planner (Sustainable Development) (Acting)

Transport and Logistics Bureau (TLB)

- Mr Kenny OR, Assistant Secretary 7B

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

- Mr Michael LEUNG, Project Manager (East)
- Mr Eric CHUNG, Senior Engineer/19(East)

Environmental Protection Department (EPD)

- Mr Tony CHEUNG, Assistant Director (Environmental Infrastructure)
- Miss Connie WONG, Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional East)<sup>4</sup>

Highways Department (HyD)

- Mr Benjamin CHAN, Chief Engineer/Railway Development 2-1
- Mr John CHO, Senior Engineer/Railway Schemes(7)

Planning Department (PlanD)

- Ms Donna TAM, Assistant Director of Planning/New Territories
- Ms Caroline TANG, District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands
- Mr Kenneth YEUNG, Senior Town Planner/Special Duties

6. Ms Louisa YAN, Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning & Lands)<sup>2</sup>, DEVB, said that as the proposed development at TKO Area 137 and the related near shore reclamations were highly relevant to the residents of TKO, the relevant policy bureaux and departments would like to solicit views from Members through the meeting. She gave an introduction of the development proposal as follows:

- The Chief Executive had put forth a number of measures in the 2022 Policy Address to enhance the quantity of land and housing supply through a multi-pronged approach. Area 137, being a sizable piece of formed land in the metro area, would be one of the major sources of housing supply in Hong Kong in the short to medium term. The land concerned was currently being used as a temporary fill bank for storing public fill. In anticipation of future reclamation works that might progressively take up the public fill currently stored in that area and hence released the land concerned, the Government saw the opportunity to re-plan Area 137 for gainful uses. As set out in the 2022 Policy Address, Area 137 would be developed into a new community primarily for housing purpose, providing about 50 000 residential units for a total population of 135 000. First batch of around 34 000 residents could move in as early as 2030.
- TLB was conducting public consultation on the Strategic Studies on Railways and Major Roads beyond 2030 (RMR 2030+). The TKO Line Southern Extension recommended under the RMR 2030+ would connect LOHAS Park with Area 137, and provide convenient railway transport services for the future residents of Area 137.
- As the upcoming reclamation projects in Hong Kong would reduce significantly the need for stockpiling public fill, Area 137 would cease to serve as a temporary fill bank in the foreseeable future. That being said, as there was still a need to retain a smaller-scale facility for transferring public fill in Hong Kong, the Government proposed to make available land off TKO Area 132 through slope-cutting and reclamation. Around four hectares (ha) of the land created would be used for accommodating a public fill transfer facility (PFTF). Besides, since the concrete batching plant (CBP) in Area 137 was temporary in nature, it was necessary to re-provision the CBP in Area 132 in order to support the developments in East Kowloon and New Territories East. At the same time, electricity facilities (EFs) and three other public facilities for serving the territory east (including TKO) would also be accommodated in Area 132.
- The proposed EFs were not a nuclear power plant. Instead, the EFs would be used for receiving and handling zero-carbon energy. Hong Kong had all along been purchasing electricity from the Mainland. However, as the existing overland power transmission cables alone could unlikely be able to meet Hong Kong's future demand, it was necessary to identify suitable location for establishing power receiving points. Area 132 was considered an appropriate location for accommodating the EFs as it was located in the vicinity of the connection points of the existing power grids of the CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (CLP) and Hongkong Electric Company Limited (HEC), and the energy

to be sourced from the Mainland would be imported from the eastern side of Hong Kong.

- Apart from DEVB and its family departments, TLB, EEB, EPD and HyD had also sent representatives to attend the meeting to listen to Members' views and address any questions that Members might have.

7. Mr Kenneth YEUNG, Senior Town Planner/Special Duties, PlanD, briefed Members on the Preliminary Outline Development Plan with the presentation slides.

8. The views and enquiries of Mr Edwin CHEUNG were consolidated as follows:

- He asked whether the proposed six facilities in TKO Area 132 were solely for meeting the regional needs of TKO, and whether they were essential facilities for TKO. If not all of the facilities were for TKO's exclusive use, he suggested relocating some of them to different districts, so that each district could take up a share of social responsibility.
- As stated in a white paper previously published by DEVB, refuse transfer facilities would mainly be developed in caverns in the future. Since TKO had not received domestic waste for some years and only accepted waste that would not exude odour, residents worried about foul smell would emanate from the proposed refuse transfer station. Therefore, he asked why DEVB did not adopt the cavern option, and opined that DEVB's suggestions were contrary to its previous development approaches.
- He asked if the reason for not choosing the cavern development option was to save resources, time and procedures. He also requested the departments concerned to provide information such as the expenditure of and timeframe for the reclamation and cavern options.
- He said that Area 132 was only one kilometre away from the residential areas, which was actually not a long distance. Therefore, he asked why the Government did not consider setting up the facilities in the Lei Yue Mun Quarry instead, which was derelict and far away from residential areas. The site had a flat terrain and was situated at the waterfront, so he believed that the Government could avoid causing damage to the beautiful shoreline if the facilities were to be provided therein.
- He asked whether the Government's plan to put all six obnoxious facilities in TKO Area 132 at one stroke was based on the principle that "numbers do not matter anymore when it is going to be 'filthy' anyway".

9. The views of Ms Christine FONG were consolidated as follows:

- She remarked that DEVB, EEB and TLB should pay more visits to TKO and explain to residents the importance of development to the community and its advantages and influences.
- She was most concerned about the domestic refuse transfer station. After repeated requests, TKO Landfill no longer accepted domestic waste, allowing residents to live in an odour-free community. However, the Government suddenly decided to set up a refuse transfer station about one kilometre away from Ocean Shores, putting immense pressure on residents as they feared that the community would be plagued by foul smell again.
- She asked DEVB and EEB to explain whether the odour emanated from the facilities would be spread through prevailing winds to the vicinity of Tiu Keng Leng, TKO Town Centre and LOHAS Park.
- She was also concerned about the proposed construction waste handling facility, refuse transfer station and marine refuse collection point in TKO Area 132. Although the Government said that refuse would be handled in an enclosed space, residents still worried that the improper handling of refuse would emanate odour during transfer.
- In view of the potential problem of sand and dust produced during the operation of the construction waste handling facility, she asked the Government to explain whether it would completely close the construction waste landfill.
- SKDC had all along proposed the construction of a third road between Clear Water Bay and TKO. While she had no comments on the Area 137 residential development projects, the proposed 50 000 units was a huge number and therefore she proposed developing housing along the East Kowloon Line, such as the hilly areas on Po Lam Road North, and providing railway connections thereafter.
- SKDC had been requesting the Government to submit the development plan for TKO Area 137. While the Government was supporting the development of the new community, the existing residents of TKO suffered. The Government should consider relocating the proposed facilities in TKO Area 132 to different areas, or changing the layout of Area 137 to reduce the impacts of obnoxious facilities on the community.

10. The views of Mr Chris CHEUNG were consolidated as follows:

- He opined that although it gave no cause for criticism for the Government to develop housing in TKO Area 137, there was still the need to balance the needs of existing residents in the district.

- He hoped that all obnoxious facilities would be moved away from TKO, because TKO had taken up social responsibilities and shouldered the burden of obnoxious facilities for more than 30 years since the provisioning of the landfill and fill bank. The Government had already planned to set up other obnoxious facilities in TKO before the above-mentioned two ceased operation. Speaking from his experience during the inspection at the surrounding areas of Island West Transfer Station, he believed that the refuse transfer station would definitely emit odour. Therefore, he agreed that the proposed obnoxious facilities should be relocated to the former site of Lei Yue Mun Quarry, or that other cavern development proposals should be adopted so as to reduce the impacts of the facilities on TKO residents. He hoped that DEVB would factor in residents' needs and relocate the proposed facilities into caverns.
- He expressed concerns about the reclamation extent of TKO Line Southern Extension. He stated that the Secretary for Development, Ms LINN Hon-ho, Bernadette, had put forward a large-scale reclamation proposal off InnoPark in October last year. After learning of the news, he and the residents had immediately taken actions to express their objection to the proposal, if not, the reclamation extent of Area 137 might have been even larger than that of Area 132.
- He asked DEVB to directly respond to enquiries concerning the reclamation extent of TKO Line Southern Extension, including the exact reclamation locations, tracks to be connected, etc.
- He found the one-kilometre sea wall unacceptable. An excessively long sea wall could lead to stagnation of water in the bay off the industrial estate and thus affect the environment. He therefore asked whether the track could be built at a greater depth to reduce the reclamation extent, and why light rails could not be used.
- He pointed out that DEVB had said establishing railway connections to Area 137 could improve transport accessibility. However, the signalling system upgrade project of the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL), originally scheduled for 2021, had been pushed to 2029. Moreover, the planned population of Area 137 was 135 000. He opined that DEVB and TLB should be responsible for providing a concrete timetable for the enhancement of service frequency of TKO Line, expediting the construction of the North Island Line, and studying the provision of direct railway connection from LOHAS Park Station to North Point Station, or the construction of new railway lines to Siu Sai Wan, so as to convince residents that the development would be beneficial to the community. Otherwise, it would only affect passengers at other stations.

- He asked whether the cycle tracks in Area 137 would be connected to the existing cycle track loop.

11. The views of Mr Andrew CHAN were consolidated as follows:

- It was stipulated in the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance that reclamation works must fulfil three criteria, including “compelling, overriding and present need”, “no viable alternative”, and “minimum impairment to the Harbour”. Although TKO Area 132 was beyond the official boundary of the Victoria Harbour, TKO was not a remote area. The combined population of Area 132 and Area 137 would amount to nearly 600 000, which would be one of the most densely populated areas in Hong Kong. Therefore, to convince SKDC and the public, the Government should evaluate the reclamation project in the district in accordance with relevant standards applicable to the Victoria Harbour.
- The residents of TKO had been tolerating the presence of facilities such as landfill, fill bank, explosives depot, etc. for many years. It was proposed in the Preliminary Outline Development Plan that permanent facilities, including a public fill transfer facility, a concrete batching plant, electricity facilities, a construction waste treatment facility, a refuse transfer station, a marine refuse collection point, etc., would be provided in TKO Area 132, with all obnoxious facilities forming a cluster in TKO. He pointed out that no similar planning approach had been adopted in other districts of Hong Kong. The key concern was not about whether these facilities should be placed in the “backyard of your home”, instead the focus was that these obnoxious facilities should never be clustered in one single area.
- It was stipulated in the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance that reclamation could only be carried out when there was no viable alternative. However, the Government gave the impression that it had not carefully considered the other viable options, and planned to place all obnoxious facilities at an open area only for the sake of convenience.
- He remarked that the Government should reconsider whether it was necessary to cluster all facilities in the same area, the area of reclamation, and ways to minimise the impact of reclamation on the environment.
- The reclamation project would damage the last remaining natural shoreline in Hong Kong, and therefore some organisations had expressed their views by writing to government departments, the Legislative Council and SKDC. He opined that it was necessary for the Government to take their views into account.
- He had phoned a representative of the residents of On Luen Tsuen, and was told that On Luen Tsuen was on the periphery of the reclamation area. However, the

Government had not informed the residents about the project. The residents worried that the reclamation project would affect their homes, or even result in removal of the village. On Luen Tsuen was only a village with 20 to 30 licensed structures and squatter structures and not an indigenous village. Therefore, it might not be what the Government was most concerned about. He hoped that the impacts arising from the project on the villagers could be avoided, and if the villagers were to be affected, they should be informed and consulted as soon as possible. He hoped that the Government would make reasonable ex-gratia compensation arrangements and compassionate rehousing arrangements with a caring spirit.

- In his opinion, although there were various plans for infrastructure development in Hong Kong, including the High Speed Rail, Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, the Three-Runway System, Lantau Tomorrow, Northern Metropolis, etc., there was a lack of clear population policies and planning. “Competing for talents” was not included as one of the planning objectives. It would be difficult to make sustainable population planning in the absence of clear population policies. The city would end up having a “reactive approach” for urban planning, meaning endless housing construction and reclamation with the sole purpose to catch up with the housing supply target that it had failed to achieve. This would in turn arouse public opposition and such situation would affect the development of Hong Kong in the coming decades. He hoped that the Hong Kong Government, or even the Central Government, would think it over and turn Hong Kong into a livable city.

12. Mr LAU Kai-hong disagreed with Mr Andrew CHAN that matters relating to indigenous villages should be mentioned during the discussion of this agenda item. He cited the example of Shui Bin Village, which had received assistance from the Government in the course of relocation even though it was not an indigenous village. He also stated that Tin Ha Wan Village was formerly situated in TKO Area 137 and adjacent to Fu Tau Chau Village. He hoped that the Government would consider connecting the roads of Area 137 to the inner sections of Clear Water Bay Road, such as areas other than Po Toi O, Clear Water Bay Second Beach (Tai Ching Shui), Lung Ha Wan, etc., with a view to alleviating issues concerning traffic congestion and poor access to public transport at the inner sections of Clear Water Bay. This could support low-density residential development in the future to tie in with the Government’s housing policies. Furthermore, he was of the view that the location for reclamation in TKO Area 132 was not ideal, and suggested relocating some of the facilities into caverns and the remaining ones to areas far away from residential areas, and adopting more appropriate designs.

13. The Vice-Chairman agreed with Mr Andrew CHAN's views, and pointed out that the current issue was not about whether the facilities should be provided in one's "backyard". The proposed six facilities in TKO Area 132 were obnoxious facilities, and although the paper stated that the location of which was not in proximity to residential areas, it was not far away from them either and would inevitably arouse opposition from the residents. He hoped that the Government would consider more the views of citizens during consultation. TKO had been bearing the burden of having facilities serving different purposes in the district all along. While residents had the rare opportunity to enjoy the benefits brought by the commissioning of new facilities in the district, such as the Cross Bay Link (CBL) and TKO-Lam Tin Tunnel (TKO-LT Tunnel), the Government announced the planning proposal for TKO Area 132. He remarked that as the society was gradually resuming normalcy, the Government should endeavour to enhance people's livelihood and listen to the public more often.

14. Mr WONG Shui-sang quoted Mr Andrew CHAN as saying that indigenous villages could receive compensation from the Government. He explained that the land in indigenous villages was privately owned, and the so-called compensation was only a very low price paid by the Government to acquire the land and the interim housing built for the affected villagers. After a few years, the Government would then sell the land to developers at a high price. Therefore, it was untrue that being an indigenous villager would give one the leverage to negotiate with the Government for compensation. He said that Hong Kong had little land with a huge population, so reclamation development was an inevitable choice. He cited Sai Kung as an example that some villages therein were resumed by the Government to provide land for the construction of the High Island Reservoir for the supply of fresh water in Hong Kong. The Government subsequently provided housing for the affected residents by carrying out reclamation in Sai Kung. He believed that the Government would devise a comprehensive plan for the development of TKO Area 137. However, from the perspectives of local DC Members, they must raise objections. In fact, the construction of obnoxious facilities would arouse opposition wherever they locate, but it was still necessary to find a place to accommodate these facilities. Nevertheless, he hoped that the Government would avoid grouping all obnoxious facilities in the same area as far as practicable, and consider accommodating them in caverns so as not to affect people's livelihood. He suggested that reclamation must be carried out in Hong Kong to allow the city to accommodate a vast population. The Government had to make optimal use of land resources for development in a bid to seek land for housing construction. However, Members would definitely oppose the reclamation proposal to safeguard the interests of residents in the district. Therefore, he asked the Government to strike a good balance, provide sufficient ancillary transport facilities and carry out greening work so as to avoid affecting residents. Lastly, he also suggested that reclamation could be carried out in Sai Kung for the construction of railways.

15. The views of the Chairman were as follows:

- SKDC had been urging the Government to submit the planning proposal for TKO Area 137. In comparison with the previous large-scale reclamation proposal, the current reclamation extent off LOHAS Park had been reduced to two hectares. Nonetheless, Members and the public were still concerned about the details of the reclamation extent, including the dredging depth, its impact on currents, etc. He asked DEVB to respond to the issues concerned later.
- Area 137 accommodated facilities such as South East New Territories Landfill Extension, a desalination plant, etc., involving reclamation works of about 20 hectares. However, Members did not offer their views on the planning and layout involved, and he wondered if that meant they had accepted the Government's planning proposal, including 54 hectares of residential sites 12 hectares of "Government, Institution or Community" sites, 20 hectares of land for local sitting-out facilities, as well as 15 hectares of land for road construction, totalling 101 hectares. After government departments had given responses, Members could comment on the detailed design of Area 137, including public transport arrangements, ratio of parking spaces, etc.
- The development of Area 132 proposed by DEVB this time was equivalent to the scrapped development plan of Area 131. Area 131 was originally designated for use as a cargo working area and for the construction of the Western Coast Road. When the Government conducted the Feasibility Study for Further Development of TKO, it was found that there were quite a lot of corals in the waters of Area 131. On top of that, there were other environmental factors to be considered, and the public also wished to retain the shoreline and landscape, so the proposal was eventually rejected. He opined that the six facilities in Area 132 currently proposed by the Government were definitely not far away from residential areas. Although the ones closest to residential areas were the electricity facilities, where clean power was received, next to it was the odour-producing refuse transfer station, followed by the marine refuse collection point and the construction waste handling facility. Whilst it was indicated in the Government's paper that the construction waste treatment facility was one of the other location-specific public facilities, there was in fact already a facility of the same kind in Area 137.
- The fill bank currently in Area 137 was of temporary nature, but it would become a permanent facility after being relocated to Area 132. However, the Government once mentioned that upon completion of reclamation works in the TKO area, the fill bank would be relocated to areas which could support other

large-scale infrastructure developments. Therefore, SKDC was astonished by the Government's plan to build a public fill transfer facility in Area 132.

- The concrete batching plant was the facility furthest from the residential areas in Area 132. SKDC had been opposing the relocation of the concrete batching plants from Yau Tong to Tseung Kwan O. However, some years after the relocation of the concrete batching plant to Area 137, the Government planned to relocate it again to Area 132. He was sceptical about the effectiveness of such practice.
- The Government planned to construct a one-kilometre breakwater to protect the facilities therewithin, reflecting that the Government was aware that there would be big waves at the reclamation site, and therefore it might not be a suitable location. He asked the departmental representatives to elaborate on this matter.
- Although Tin Ha Wan Village and Fat Tau Chau Village had been relocated to Hang Hau, the former sites were still the burial grounds of indigenous villagers. Since the Government's proposed railway alignment was a straight line, he wondered whether such situation would be catered for.
- He suggested that the Government consider the problem of prevailing winds in the course of planning. During the discussion of the government joint-user building in TKO Area 86 at the previous SKDC meeting, the Government Laboratory (Govt Lab) had submitted to SKDC figures for the simulation of prevailing wind directions, and explained the situation of wind directions in different months and seasons of the year. After studying Govt Lab's figures, he expected that in the future, especially during summertime, the frequency of winds blowing from Area 132 to TKO would be quite high, leading to concerns about the problem of odour. Therefore, DEVB should submit relevant information about prevailing wind directions, if any, for SKDC's reference.

16. Ms Louisa YAN of DEVB responded as follows:

- The six public facilities currently proposed to be accommodated in TKO Area 132 would all require marine frontage for daily operation, including transporting the necessary raw materials and the finished products, etc. through marine transport.
- As accommodating the EFs in the eastern part of Hong Kong could facilitate electricity transmission, the Government considered that Area 132, which was in close proximity to the existing power grids of CLP and HEC, would be an optimal location for accommodating the EFs. The facilities to be accommodated in the proposed EFs would be used for receiving zero-carbon energy which was in fact odourless, and no noise and hazard would be resulted during the process.

- Two out of the six proposed public facilities would be relocated from TKO Area 137 to the land off Area 132. The area of the existing temporary fill bank in Area 137 was about 80 ha. It was anticipated that as future reclamation works would progressively took up the public fill currently stored in Area 137, the land concerned could be released for other uses. Nonetheless, there was still a need to retain a smaller-scale facility of about 4 ha for receiving and transferring public fill to appropriate projects for reuse. Of note was that the functions of the PFTF differed from that of the temporary fill bank in Area 137. The former would be set up for transferring public fill, while the latter was used for stockpiling.
- There were currently more than 20 CBPs in Hong Kong for supplying concrete to various development projects across the territory. The Government was aware of the concerns of the local community over the operations of the two CBPs in Yau Tong. In fact, EPD had already rejected the licence renewal applications of the operators of the two CBPs in light of their unsatisfactory performance. The operators subsequently lodged appeals and an application for judicial review against the decision. The proceeding of appeal by one of the CBPs was still underway, while the application for leave to apply for a judicial review for the other CBP had already been refused by the court. The Government would like to emphasise that the behaviour of individual CBPs could not represent the entire industry. In fact, CBPs, located in various districts across the territory, were mostly well-managed causing minimal environmental nuisance to nearby residents. The Government had for instance added the relevant conditions in the tender documents of the temporary CBP in Area 137 (e.g. the tenderer should have sufficient experience in operating CBP, its licence/licence renewal applications had never been rejected by EPD in the past three years, and the operator was required to put in place a series of pollution control and environmental management measures in the future). The Government would also step up efforts in performing its gatekeeping duty to ease public concerns about the operation of the CBP.
- At present, the waste generated in the territory east area (including TKO) would be transferred to the RTSs in Sha Tin, West Kowloon and Island East for handling. However, such cross-district waste handling arrangement would lead to a large number of refuse collection vehicles travelling on the roads, creating nuisance to various districts. Coupled with the fact that these RTSs had reached their capacity limits, there was a need to set up a RTS in TKO.
- The MRCP was set up for unloading the marine refuse collected for subsequent transferral to the nearby RTS for handling.

- Co-locating various public facilities in the same area would not only result in operational synergy, but also allow the facilities to share berthing spaces. In view of public's concerns over reclamation, the Government had already reduced the scale of land creation by around a quarter, and moved the facilities further away from large-scale residential development. On the premise that the works programme would not be affected, the Government would seek to carry out slope-cutting as far as practicable, and optimise the land in-take and layout design, in a bid to reduce the scale of reclamation.
- The feasibility of relocating some of the suitable facilities into cavern would also be examined. It was however worthwhile to note that at present, the diameters of the largest cavern in Hong Kong and other parts of the world were around 30 metres and 60 metres respectively. Given the components of the EFs were relatively bulky and required a space of at least 80 metres in diameter, it would not be possible to move the EFs into cavern. Besides, apart from the considerations of technology, time and cost-effectiveness, given the facilities would require marine frontage for daily operation, even if some parts of the facilities were separated and moved into cavern, reclamation was still inevitable for setting up docks for mooring of vessels, providing waterfront site for operation, and constructing roads between the piers and cavern. In the end, the losses might outweigh the gains.
- The former quarry site at Lei Yue Mun of around 1 ha was located at the southernmost tip of the western coast of TKO, and was in close proximity to the Tathong Channel which was currently under fairway restriction. To avoid creating any disturbances to the fairways when the vessels serving the public facilities were commuting to and from the area, the Government considered it not suitable to accommodate the public facilities at the former quarry site at Lei Yue Mun from the marine safety perspective. CEDD would later on further supplement on the details.
- DEVB was currently collecting views from different stakeholders in respect of the development proposal. Views from members of the public, including the local community and the residents of the On Luen Tsuen, were welcomed. The Government would take the views collected into consideration when optimising the proposals in the future. Relevant departments would also meet with various stakeholders of the local community in due course to listen to their views directly.
- TLB would later on supplement on the planning of transport infrastructure.

17. Mr Michael LEUNG, Project Manager (East), CEDD, responded as follows:

- The Tathong Channel, located to the south of TKO Area 132, was currently adopting traffic separation scheme as recognised by the international treaties. Around 300 vessels would pass through the Tathong Channel every day. The waters beyond the Tathong Channel were inshore traffic zones intended for small vessels. Having consulted the relevant departments, in order to ensure safe navigation, a 250-metre wide inshore traffic zone off the proposed breakwater had to be maintained.
- There were two known coral communities in the vicinity of Area 132, located near the ventilation building of TKO-LT Tunnel and in the area near the former Lei Yue Mun Quarry respectively. The current proposed location for reclamation had already avoided the coral communities concerned as far as practicable.
- Noting the concerns over the marine ecology, the Government had already analysed whether there were any special or endangered species such as horseshoe crabs in the vicinity of the proposed location for reclamation. If such species were found, they would be protected. Nonetheless, according to past environmental impact assessments conducted for CBL, TKO-LT Tunnel and other projects in the district, no such species which required protection were found in Area 132 and its vicinity. It was hence proposed to carry out reclamation off Area 132 to make optimal use of land.

18. The Chairman estimated that in the light of the development of TKO Area 132, the Government would need to build approach roads connecting CBL and TKO-LT Tunnel. He asked whether CEDD had built bridge piers in advance to facilitate future construction of approach roads.

19. Mr Michael LEUNG of CEDD responded that the Government planned to make available land for accommodating six public facilities in TKO Area 132 through reclamation and slope-cutting. Since the traffic induced could travel directly to CBL and TKO-LT Tunnel via the new approach roads, Kowloon-bound traffic would be able to access TKO-LT Tunnel without routing through the existing road network in TKO. Although CEDD had yet to construct bridge piers for the approach roads, the study suggested that there was sufficient space for constructing the approach roads.

20. The Chairman asked DEVB to provide the respective occupying areas of the facilities.

21. Ms Louisa YAN of DEVB stated that under the current proposal, about 25 ha of land would be made available off Area 132 through reclamation and slope-cutting, of which 5.9 ha were designated for the EFs, 3 ha for the RTS, 4 ha for the PFTF, 4.5 ha for the CWHF, 0.18 ha

for the MRCP and 0.6 ha for the CBP, making a total of 18 ha. Separately, roads and breakwater would take up 6 ha and 1 ha of land respectively.

22. Ms Donna TAM, Assistant Director of Planning/New Territories, PlanD, responded as follows:

- The Government had conducted a traffic impact assessment for the development of TKO Area 137, and would further examine in detail the external road connections at the next stage.
- The Government would carry out proper planning for the cycle tracks in Area 137 and would connect the said section in Area 137 with the existing cycle tracks.
- The feasibility of linking Area 137 with the country park in the vicinity would be further studied at the next stage.
- Area 137 would be designated primarily for residential development, taking up land of more than 50 per cent of the total development area. Ancillary facilities would also be provided in accordance with the requirements set out in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. In addition, under the prevailing policy, the Government would reserve premises equivalent to five per cent of the total domestic gross floor area of a public housing project for welfare use, so there would not be the problem of insufficient community facilities. Furthermore, the Government would provide schools and open spaces in Area 137 in accordance with the latest requirements. Taking into account the objective of improving living space, the Government would increase the flat sizes of public and private housing units by ten per cent, which meant the average flat sizes of public and private housing units would increase to 55 and 82.5 square metres respectively. As for open space, the Government would also adopt the latest recommendations and set the provision standard to 3.5 square metres per person, which would be higher than the current standard of 2 square metres per person. The Government was consolidating the scale of development of Area 137, with a view to developing it into a self-contained community with comprehensive ancillary facilities.

23. The Chairman said that SKDC would still have to follow up the land uses of Area 137 in the future. It was because five school sites and some scattered “Government, Institution or Community” sites were included in the planning for LOHAS Park more than a decade ago. However, the sites had neither been earmarked for any development projects so far, nor designated for uses other than the original ones. Although the Government intended to develop Area 137 into a livable community, it did not, in fact, make proper planning for the development of LOHAS Park. He considered it necessary to discuss the planning for

Area 137 in detail, in the hope that it would complement the development of LOHAS Park and TKO Areas 85 and 86. He asked relevant government departments to co-ordinate with MTRCL in optimising the land at LOHAS Park, and opined that the Government did not conduct proper planning for LOHAS Park, making it difficult to believe that the Government could develop Area 137 into a self-contained community.

24. Ms Donna TAM of PlanD responded that PlanD would continue to follow up the planning of TKO Area 137. The plan available at the current stage was just the Preliminary Outline Development Plan, and the detailed technical assessments, review and refinement of the land use layout would be carried out at the next stage. PlanD would co-ordinate with different policy bureaux and departments at the construction stage with a view to tying in the commissioning of local community and infrastructure facilities with population intake.

25. Mr Tony CHEUNG, Assistant Director (Environmental Infrastructure), EPD, responded that currently there were a total of seven RTSs in Hong Kong, and no RTSs were developed for Sai Kung district. Therefore, refuse collection vehicles, after collecting waste in the district, would have to deliver waste to the RTSs at West Kowloon, Island East and Sha Tin for treatment. Such practice had resulted in long journeys and overloading of the RTSs of other districts. Upon the commissioning of the RTS in TKO Area 132, refuse collection vehicles in Sai Kung district could deliver waste to the nearby Area 132, where waste would be compacted in an enclosed space inside the facility. During the process, air would be deodorised and extracted under negative pressure, and the compacted waste would subsequently be stored in sealed containers and transported by sea. Since refuse collection vehicles could transport waste directly to the nearby RTS, and the compacted waste would not be transported by land, there would be improvements to the environmental hygiene and traffic condition for the urban areas of Sai Kung. Among the RTSs in urban areas, the one proposed in Area 132 was the farthest away from residential development, situated at about 1.2 kilometres from urban areas. The adjacent EFs would be taller than the RTS. The Government would continue to make improvements based on the experience of operating the current seven RTSs. Although a few complaints against individual RTSs were received, the problems had been resolved immediately. Under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance, the provision of RTSs was subject to the statutory environmental impact assessment process. The operation of RTSs, including wastewater treatment, was also regulated by relevant ordinances.

26. The Chairman pointed out that part of the foul smell from the RTSs came from drainage pipe works, and asked whether the RTS in TKO would take sludge cake produced in the sewage treatment process.

27. Mr Tony CHEUNG of EPD responded that the RTS in TKO would only receive municipal solid waste.

28. Mr Kenny OR, Assistant Secretary 7B, TLB, expressed gratitude to SKDC for its support for the consultation exercise on RMR 2030+ and its valuable feedback on the works proposals at the consultation meeting on 14 January. TLB was reviewing the feasibility of the relevant proposals. His response was as follows:

- The proposed TKO Line Southern Extension would be extended from the at-grade LOHAS Park MTR Station to the underground station at TKO Area 137, so the construction of relevant structures was required to protect railway facilities from adverse weather. The Government would listen to public views and review the feasibility of reducing the reclamation extent.
- The Government would factor in the development needs and land uses of Hong Kong beyond 2046 when conducting RMR 2030+, including the transport and logistics demand arising from the population intake at Po Lam and Area 137, as well as the commissioning of infrastructure and railway operation in due course. The Government anticipated that MTRCL would have upgraded the signalling system and purchased trains by then, and therefore TKO Line would be capable of accommodating the transport demand arising from the development of Area 137 and TKO in the long run. Furthermore, Route 6, which comprises the commissioned TKO-LT Tunnel, and the Central Kowloon Route and Trunk Road T2 anticipated to be commissioned in 2026, would be open to vehicular traffic. As a result, the journey time during peak hours between TKO Town Centre and Yau Ma Tei Interchange would be substantially reduced. Apart from Eastern Harbour Crossing, the public could also travel to Hong Kong Island conveniently via Western Harbour Crossing, and enjoy more commuting options.
- According to the preliminary analysis of RMR 2030+, the provision of roads leading to Hong Kong Island at the easternmost part of TKO might not effectively shorten the journey and commuting time of TKO residents to the urban areas. In addition, for any new cross-harbour transport infrastructure, factors such as the ancillary infrastructure at Hong Kong Island, engineering feasibility, impacts on the community, etc., had to be taken into consideration. The construction of transport infrastructure linking Area 137 with areas such as Chai Wan and Heng Fa Tsuen would involve a number of technical difficulties, including the need to pass through many coastal properties and public facilities for connection with the existing Island Line and Island Eastern Corridor. It would also require significant public resources and therefore, the Government would have to prudently study the overall transport benefits and cost-effectiveness of relevant

proposals, taking into account the implications on existing properties, buildings and public facilities.

29. Mr Benjamin CHAN, Chief Engineer/Railway Development 2-1, HyD, responded as follows:

- The original proposed alignment for the East Kowloon Line ran along a hilly topography. After re-examination, the Government anticipated that, considering the limited climbing capability of the heavy rail system, alignment, gradient, location of stations, construction constraints, etc., the project would face significant technical challenges, including the need to construct deep underground stations, railway tunnels and relatively long adits on higher grounds. Moreover, as the stations would be located deep underground, the public would need to take longer time to travel between the station platforms and the ground level, thus increasing the journey time. In view of this, the Government considered the original scheme for the East Kowloon Line not an effective option.
- The Government had paid close attention to the transport demand in East Kowloon, especially the commuting needs of residents living in the uphill areas of Kwun Tong. In this connection, it was exploring an elevated trackless rapid transit system as an alternative, which would connect Po Tat with the existing Choi Hung MTR Station via Sau Mau Ping, Shun On, Shun Lee and Choi Wan. The relevant feasibility study was expected to be completed around mid-2023. The way forward of the project, including the preliminary timetable, implementation arrangement, etc., would be promulgated by then.
- As stated in a paper recently submitted by the Government to the Legislative Council, the planning of the proposed North Island Line involved complicated technical issues. This included the need for the railway alignment to support the planning of the new Harbourfront on the northern shore of Hong Kong Island and to connect with existing railways, the construction of the railway tunnels passing underneath the busy town centre and being in close proximity to existing buildings and infrastructures (e.g. the Central-Wan Chai Bypass and existing railway tunnels), the diversion of underground public utilities along the railway alignment during the construction, etc. Furthermore, the operations and services of existing underground railway lines, infrastructures and public utilities would need to be maintained. Therefore, it was expected that the construction works would face significant technical difficulties. MTRCL was exploring feasible options to improve the design of the project.

- The capacity of the existing Island Line would be increased due to the upgrading of the signalling system. In addition, large-scale planned development projects such as the strategic transport infrastructure of the Kau Yi Chau Artificial Islands might affect the ridership of the Island Line in the future. The Government would review the patronage of the Island Line and the design of the North Island Line in due course.

30. Mr Edwin CHEUNG opined that although government departments had reiterated that the reclamation proposal for TKO Area 132 was well thought out, he had no idea how the Government conducted the analysis and drew the conclusion that Area 132 was the best location. He requested relevant departments to give an account to the public of the locations that had been considered and to explain the pros and cons of each location. He pointed out that the representatives of the departments had stated earlier they would listen to Members' comments and proactively consider the cavern development proposal. He questioned the decision of DEVB and CEDD to release a badly-thought-out reclamation proposal at the beginning instead of exploring options that were generally supported by the public and considering the cavern development proposal in the first place. He remarked that the Government's way of handling the matter was only for the sake of convenience, and it was reckless with its search of land for housing development. He hoped that the Government would elaborate on why Area 132 is considered to be the best option. Moreover, SKDC was more concerned about pollution issues such as odour and dust, whereas electricity facilities were not an issue of focus for SKDC. Given that the Government planned to place all six facilities in Area 132 at the same time, he asked if that meant Area 132 was the most suitable location for those six facilities. He cited the example of the electricity centre. The Government said electricity would be imported from the eastern part of the Mainland. Assuming that electricity was imported via Daya Bay Nuclear Power Station (DBNPS), the location nearest to DBNPS would be Plover Cove Reservoir or Sai Kung East Country Park, and there was no need to take a route that bypassed the above locations to reach Area 132. He hoped representatives of the departments would respond to his questions directly.

31. Ms Christine FONG found it appropriate for the Government to purchase electricity in order to reduce tariff. However, various Members had commented that the Government should not place all obnoxious facilities or infrastructures in TKO. Thus she suggested decentralising the handling of electricity to be transmitted to HEC and CLP so that the burden would be shared by different districts, or placing the electricity facilities in the open sea. As for the concrete batching plant, it would only take a 10-minute drive to reach Yau Tong after the commissioning of TKO-LT Tunnel, and therefore the demand for concrete in TKO could still be met even if the concrete patching plant was located in Kowloon. In fact, there was already a concrete patching plant in Sai Kung town centre, which showed that the district was

not free of responsibilities. She enquired about the capacity of the concrete batching plant and the number of barges and heavy vehicles involved in those six facilities.

32. Mr Chris CHEUNG said while the Government's plan to build a buffer zone for the TKO Line Southern Extension was understandable, he believed the proposed one-kilometre sea wall would significantly affect the currents in nearby waters. Hence, he suggested that the Government reduce both the length of the sea wall and reclamation extent as far as possible. According to the reply from TLB earlier, the option of carrying out deeper excavation was not infeasible. In that way, LOHAS Park MTR Station could be expanded to increase carrying capacity while the reclamation extent could also be minimised.

33. Mr LAU Kai-hong asked representatives from different departments to attend SKDC meetings more often to exchange views with Members. Since there was not enough information at present, departments should submit the detailed design to SKDC as soon as possible. This could facilitate members' understanding about the details of the facilities such as the stations, sea walls and piers, etc.

34. Ms Louisa YAN of DEVB responded as follows:

- The Government did not rule out the option of cavern and would review the feasibility of relocating some of the suitable facilities into cavern. However, as mentioned earlier, reclamation would still be inevitable as all of the facilities to be accommodated in TKO Area 132 would require marine frontage for daily operation.
- In the course of formulating the development proposal, the Government had reviewed the depth of water, fairways and ecology of different locations. From a planning perspective, co-locating the six facilities could achieve operational synergy. CEDD and PlanD would further supplement from technical and planning perspectives respectively.

35. Mr Michael LEUNG of CEDD responded that the further expansion of the extent of reclamation in TKO Area 137 for providing the six facilities entailed technical difficulties. The abovementioned inshore traffic zone would be affected if the reclamation extent was expanded westward. The findings of the study also suggested that if the reclamation extent was further expanded southward, it might cause changes in the water flow directions, thereby affect the water quality and fisheries at Joss House Bay and the operation of the desalination plant in the long run.

36. Ms Donna TAM of PlanD replied that the proposed facilities in TKO Area 132 mainly served the territory east area (including TKO). Apart from taking into consideration factors such as geography and marine access, the Government had also considered placing some or all of the facilities in TKO Area 137 during the course of the study. However, this proposal was found infeasible from technical and planning perspectives. In particular, as set out in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, if the facilities in question were accommodated in Area 137, a buffer zone of 100 to 200 metres had to be provided between the residential areas and the facilities. This would in turn further reduce the developable area of the site, resulting in a substantial reduction in housing supply and the size of population which it could support. Moreover, the daily operation of the six facilities in Area 132 would rely on marine transport, and hence had to be accommodated at a location with marine frontage for constructing a breakwater for vessels to berth. If the facilities were to be provided in Area 137, part of the waterfront promenade would need to be used for the construction of facilities such as breakwaters and berthing spaces, upsetting the original plan of providing a sound waterfront promenade for public enjoyment. In view of the above, the Government considered that it would be more appropriate to co-locate those facilities in Area 132.

37. Mr D. C. CHEUNG of EEB responded that as stated by President Xi Jinping in his speech in the 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, China would proactively and progressively achieve carbon peaking and carbon neutrality. The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region would actively collaborate with the Greater Bay Area to contribute to the country. One of the decarbonisation strategies set out by the Government in Hong Kong's Climate Action Plan 2050 announced in 2021 was "net-zero electricity generation". This would entail identifying and developing sources of zero-carbon energy in neighbouring regions with a view to progressively relying less on fossil fuels in electricity generation and reducing emissions from power plants. The Government did not rule out the possibility of importing any kind of zero-carbon energy, including nuclear energy and renewable energy (such as wind energy, solar energy and hydro energy). It had been 30 years since Hong Kong started importing nuclear power from DBNPS in 1994. At present, DBNPS could not further increase their electricity supply to Hong Kong. Most clean energy projects of Guangdong Province currently took place in areas near the shore. With the majority of the sources of electricity coming from the east side, receiving electricity from TKO could tie in with the interconnection between CLP and HEC. He added that the interconnection between HEC and CLP, commenced in the 1980s, was primarily used for providing emergency power backup, and the system had been in use for more than 40 years with limited capacity. With the increased import of zero-carbon energy in Hong Kong, there was a need for the two power companies to enhance their interconnections by improving the capacity for receiving electricity from and transmitting electricity to each other for a reliable power supply. In addition to the EFs in Area 132, ancillary facilities were also required on Hong Kong Island.

38. The Chairman hoped that SKDC could continue to exchange views with relevant policy bureaux and departments in the future and if necessary, the matters concerned could be discussed at the next full council meeting or at another special meeting. The schedule would be extremely tight if the Government aimed to arrange population intake in Area 137 in 2030 and to commence the reclamation project in Area 132 in 2025. He hoped the Government would not make hasty decisions and overlook the overall planning needs and the residents' views, which would lead to a loss of confidence by the public in the Government. He also hoped that SKDC could continue to discuss the matters with the Government on behalf of residents, and that the Government would consult residents of the districts concerned. SKDC had received letters earlier from the Ocean Shores Owners' Committee, On Luen Tsuen Area 132 Concern Group (literal translation) and Association for Geoconservation, Hong Kong respectively. He would arrange for the letters to be uploaded onto the website of SKDC if it is feasible.

39. Mr Edwin CHEUNG quoted the words of President Xi Jinping in his important speech: "to be responsive to the people's needs". He himself wished government departments, including DEVB, CEDD and PlanD, would re-examine the plan to develop Area 132 for the construction of six permanent obnoxious facilities and listen to the views from nearly 10 000 citizens collected by HK Round Table On People's Livelihood. He hoped that the Government would not focus on instant results and convenience only, and shorten the period for public consultation to lower the cost. He moved an extempore motion, which read "Strongly request the Development Bureau to ensure all obnoxious facilities are situated far away from densely populated residential areas and carry out cavern development instead of reclamation to accommodate such facilities".

40. Ms Christine FONG stated that the residents were deeply concerned about the plans proposed by the Government to carry out reclamation near residential areas and place the obnoxious facilities near the shore of TKO. Hence, she would also like to move an extempore motion and said Members were welcome to comment on the motion while giving priority consideration to the best interests of TKO residents. The extempore motion moved by her read "Urge the Development Bureau to seek alternative locations (including caverns) suitable for the construction of obnoxious facilities, shelve the reclamation project near the residential area of Tseung Kwan O Area 132 to avoid odour and dust from being carried by prevailing winds to the high-density residential community in the inland area of Tseung Kwan O".

41. Mr Edwin CHEUNG amended the extempore motion moved by him to "Strongly request the Government to ensure all obnoxious facilities are situated far away from densely populated residential areas and carry out cavern development instead of reclamation to accommodate such

facilities”.

42. The Chairman said that the extempore motion proposed by Mr Edwin CHEUNG was seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Mr Andrew CHAN, the Chairman, Messrs Chris CHEUNG, LAU Kai-hong and WONG Shui-sang, and the extempore motion proposed by Ms Christine FONG was seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Messrs WONG Shui-sang, LAU Kai-hong, Andrew CHAN and Edwin CHEUNG. As over half of the Members had agreed to the above two extempore motions, the Chairman declared that the motions were added to the agenda of this meeting.

43. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above two extempore motions were passed. The Chairman said although the motions might not bind the Government, he still hoped that government departments would respect Members’ opinions and stated that SKDC had noted the Government’s reply on the cavern development proposal. He pointed out that while SKDC agreed to the development of Area 137 in principle, the detailed design of the project should be discussed at another time. According to the information provided by the Government, 54 hectares of land in Area 137 would be earmarked for residential development and relevant public facilities would be provided to accommodate the needs of the community in LOHAS Park. Moreover, he remarked that while Members completely understood the purposes of the proposed facilities in Area 132, they still hoped the Government would reduce the number of facilities as much as possible and would consider other alternatives or placing the facilities in other locations. The Government should also take note of the concerns of the residents in On Luen Tsuen about the development of Area 132 as well as the suggestion from the public for the retention of the original shoreline. He opined that detailed discussion on Area 132 was necessary, and suggested that relevant government bureaux and departments arrange for SKDC to conduct a site visit to existing facilities of the same types in order for Members to know whether the environment of Area 132 was suitable for those six facilities. He would discuss with Members later if there was a need to follow up the matter at the next full council meeting or at another special meeting.

44. Ms Christine FONG referred to SKDC’s earlier discussion of the introduction of linkage of Clear Water Bay Road with Area 137 and pointed out that she had also suggested the construction of a third road between Clear Water Bay and TKO in the past. Since TLB representative was present at the meeting, she would like to propose an extempore motion, which read “Propose to construct a third road between Clear Water Bay and Tseung Kwan O connecting Wan Po Road, Area 137, the Cross Bay Bridge and Tseung Kwan O - Lam Tin Tunnel to tackle traffic congestion in rural Sai Kung and Clear Water Bay and shorten the journey time from rural areas to West Kowloon”.

45. The Chairman said that the motion was seconded by Messrs LAU Kai-hong and WONG Shui-sang.

46. As seven Members had agreed to the motion, the Chairman declared that the extempore motion moved by Ms Christine FONG was added to the agenda of this meeting.

47. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above extempore motion was passed.

48. Mr Andrew CHAN clarified that earlier in the meeting when he said On Luen Tsuen was not an indigenous village, he did not mean to compare indigenous villages with non-indigenous villages, nor did he mean to deny the contribution and sacrifices made by indigenous villages for the development of Hong Kong. The Government did not make appropriate arrangements for indigenous villagers even though they had sacrificed a lot, which was why he was worried that villagers of On Luen Tsuen might feel helpless when seeking compensation. He hoped the Government would pay more attention to this matter.

49. Mr LAU Kai-hong thanked Mr Andrew CHAN for his words and pointed out that villagers along Sai Kung and Hang Hau had sacrificed their homes, “Tso Tong” lands, ancestral halls and clan graves for the development of Hong Kong. Hong Kong would not have what it had today without them. He hoped that Members would be careful when referring to the situation of indigenous villages so as to avoid giving people the impression that indigenous villagers had the power to influence the arrangements for compensation made by the Government. He believed that the Government would adopt a fair arrangement.

50. Mr WONG Shui-sang said that in addition to Sai Kung, the public housing in districts such as Tsuen Wan, Sha Tin, Yuen Long, Tai Po, Fanling, Tsing Yi, etc., were also built on land of villagers. At that time, the Government purchased the land, whether from indigenous villagers or not, at low prices. In fact, the majority of land in Hong Kong was acquired from reclamation and purchased from indigenous villagers. The government-owned land was mostly in remote areas, which made it difficult for development, whereas the land that was suitable for development was owned by indigenous villagers. The Government was able to build homes for the public only because it bought the land from indigenous villagers at low prices.

## **II. Any Other Business**

51. There was no further business raised by Members.

### **III. Date of Next Meeting**

52. The next meeting was scheduled to be held on 7 March 2023 (Tuesday) at 9:30 a.m. The meeting ended at 11:31 a.m.

Sai Kung District Council Secretariat  
March 2023