

**Country and Marine Parks Board (CMPB)**  
**Confirmed Minutes of the 46th Meeting**

---

*Date* : 28 January 2011 (Friday) File Ref.: AF CPA 01/1/0  
*Time* : 3:15p.m.  
*Venue* : Room 701, Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)  
Headquarters

---

**ATTENDANCE**

**Chairman**

Prof. Nora TAM Fung-ye, J.P.

**Members**

Dr. Gary ADES

Prof. CHU Lee-man

Ms. Betty HO Siu-fong

Prof. Paul LAM Kwan-sing, J.P.

Mrs. Tennessy LEE HUI Mei-sheung

Mr. LEUNG Wing-hang

Dr. Eric LI Shing-foon

Mr. LI Yiu-ban, B.B.S., J.P.

Mr. Young NG Chun-yeong

Mr. Alan WONG Chi-kong, J.P. Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation

Dr. LEUNG Siu-fai Deputy Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation

Mr. Wilson SO Ying-leung Assistant Director of Planning (New Territories)

Mr. Bobby NG Mang-tung, J.P. Assistant Director of Water Supplies (Development)

**Secretary**



Mr. James MOK Supervisor  
 Mr. Greg TSE Engineer  
 Mr. Ronald CHU Camp Operator

Ateliers VIII Architects Ltd.

Mr. KUNG Kai-yuen Architect/Managing Director  
 Ms. Stella LUK Architect  
 Mr. Dennis LEUNG Project Officer

Ecosystems Limited

Ms. YAU Mee-ling Senior Plant Ecologist/Director

Stephen Cheng Consulting Engineering Limited

Mr. Michael FUNG Structural and Geotechnical Engineering Consultant

GHD Ltd

Mr. Don CHOI Senior Engineer  
 Mr. Thomas WONG Senior Engineer  
 Mr. Eddie CHAN Senior Engineer

Kenneth Ng and Associate Ltd.

Mr. Albert CHUNG Landscape Consultant

LLA Ltd.

Mr. NG Siu-lung Director

**ABSENT WITH APOLOGIES**

Ms. Jasminia Kristine CHEUNG



*(End of the discussion under the closed-door session. The meeting was opened for public attendance.)*

### **VIII. Any Other Business**

#### **(a) South East New Territories (SENT) Landfill Extension**

06/11 The Chairman mentioned that the Board had followed up on the issues relating to the SENT Landfill Extension and the use of land in the Clear Water Bay Country Park (CWBCP) for the SENT Landfill Extension from 2008 to 2010. To update members on the latest development of the two issues, the Chairman informed members that Dr. Ellen CHAN Ying-lung, J.P., Assistant Director (Environmental Infrastructure) of EPD, had been invited to brief members under the Agenda Item VIII “Any Other Business”. She proposed that the item should be discussed right before Agenda Item II “Matters Arising”. Members agreed unanimously on the arrangement.

07/11 The Chairman welcomed Dr. Ellen CHAN Ying-lung, J.P. to attend the meeting. She said that a Legislative Council (LegCo) brief on 4 January 2011, which outlined the Administration’s waste management strategy and its updated action plan to tackle the imminent waste problem in Hong Kong, was also tabled for members’ reference.

08/11 Dr. Ellen CHAN Ying-lung, J.P. said that the issues of the SENT Landfill Extension and the use of 5 ha of land in the CWBCP to form part of the extension had been the subject of much controversy.

09/11 Dr. Ellen CHAN recapitulated the background of the issues. She said that the issues had been discussed in meetings of the Country Parks Committee and CMPB since the end of 2005. Site visits to the SENT Landfill had also been arranged for CMPB members. In the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) study, EPD had presented members with five options for the SENT Landfill Extension in which three of them did not involve the use of land in the CWBCP. EPD also explained to members the reasons of using 5 ha of land in the CWBCP for the SENT Landfill Extension.

10/11 Dr. CHAN took this opportunity to thank members for discussing the issues in great depth and giving valuable suggestions on the strategies of waste management in Hong Kong. She said that some suggestions had been incorporated into EPD’s action plans.

11/11 Dr. CHAN remarked that the Board unwillingly accepted the proposed excision of 5 ha of land in the CWBCP for the SENT Landfill Extension in the meeting on 11 September 2008.

12/11 Dr. CHAN continued to say that the Administration commenced the statutory process of excising the 5 ha of land from the approved map of the CWBCP by invoking the Country Parks Ordinance (CPO) and submitted the Country Parks (Designation) (Consolidation) (Amendment) Order 2010 to the Legislative Council (LegCo) in June 2010. The LegCo repealed the Order and rejected the excision of 5 ha of land in the CWBCP for the SENT Landfill Extension on 13 October 2010. The Chief Executive wrote to the LegCo President on 4 January 2011 to express the view clearly that the Administration and the LegCo held different views regarding the power and lawfulness of LegCo in repealing the Order.

13/11. After recapitulating the background, Dr. CHAN emphasized that the Environment Bureau would continue to adopt a multi-pronged approach to tackle the waste problem in Hong Kong in three aspects, namely, reduce and recycle, modern facilities for waste treatment and timely landfill extension. She remarked that the three aspects were interdependent, like three prongs of a tripod.

14/11 As regards the next steps for the SENT Landfill (commonly referred to as the Tseung Kwan O (TKO) Landfill), Dr. CHAN pointed out that the Administration would not consider using 5 ha of CWBCP land for landfill extension now. Besides, the Administration planned to scale down the extension into TKO Area 137 from 15.6 ha to 13 ha.

15/11 Dr. CHAN briefed members on the lifespan of the SENT Landfill and its extension options. She said that the capacity of the existing SENT Landfill would be exhausted by 2014. She informed members that the original option was to extend the lifespan of the SENT Landfill by 6 years (from 2014 to 2020) by, inter alia, extending 20.6 ha which comprised taking up 15.6 ha of the TKO Area 137 and encroaching into 5 ha of the CWBCP. As a result, the Administration would have sufficient time to develop new waste management facilities. The second option was to extend the lifespan by 4 years if the landfill extension took up 15.6 ha of the TKO Area 137 only. However, the time span was not long enough to develop new succession waste facilities. The third option was to extend the lifespan by about 2 years if the landfill extension took up 13 ha of the TKO Area 137 without waste diversion (i.e. 'Scaled-Down' Scheme without waste diversion). She highlighted that this option indicated that landfill extension without other waste management measures would be of no avail. The fourth option was to extend the lifespan by 6 years if the landfill extension took up 13 ha of the TKO Area 137 together with waste diversion (i.e. 'Scaled-Down' Scheme with waste diversion).

16/11 Dr. CHAN said that the current daily waste intake of the SENT Landfill was about 5,000 tonnes which consisted of municipal solid waste (MSW), construction waste, and sludge from sewage treatment works. She informed members that the key concern from local

residents, in particular from LOHAS Park, was the odour problem. She added that the Sai Kung District Council would not support the SENT Landfill Extension if the odour problem was not addressed. In response to Sai Kung District Council's concerns, the Administration decided that the SENT Landfill would not be used for disposal of odorous wastes such as MSW and sludge when the implementation of waste diversion would start from 2014. She explained that the SENT Landfill had to be used for disposal of sludge before 2014 because the sludge treatment facility would only be commissioned in late 2013. By implementing waste diversion in 2014, she highlighted that it was possible to scale down the SENT Landfill Extension to 13 ha which would allow the lifespan of the SENT Landfill to last until around 2020. Hence, the "Scale-Down" Scheme with waste diversion was adopted as the current proposal for the SENT Landfill Extension.

17/11 Dr. CHAN said that traffic and environmental problems would appear if private MSW collectors of the SENT Landfill were requested to dispose of MSW in the more remote North East New Territories (NENT) Landfill and West New Territories (WENT) Landfill in 2014. She summed up that although the "Scale-Down" Scheme with waste diversion was by no means a preferred option, the Administration did not really have any other choice as the abandonment of the extension in the strategic SENT Landfill location would critically affect Hong Kong's overall waste management strategy. Hence, the Administration proposed this option in order to minimize opposition to the SENT Landfill Extension.

18/11 Dr. CHAN informed members that more than seventy million dollars had been spent on extra measures to enhance the control of odour at the SENT Landfill. She said that EPD had arranged street washing service six times a day on Wan Po Road, in addition to two times per day by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department. EPD had also arranged free car washing service and free parking for refuse collection vehicles at the SENT Landfill. She emphasized that EPD would continue to enhance the odour control measures given the proximity of residential buildings to the SENT Landfill.

19/11 Dr. CHAN reiterated that it was not feasible to abandon the SENT Landfill Extension although 5 ha of land in the CWBCP could not be used now. In case the SENT Landfill Extension was abandoned, it would be very difficult to press ahead with the extension of the NENT Landfill and WENT Landfill. Moreover, these two landfills would have to receive more waste and there would be objections raised by relevant District Councils. She said that the Administration, being a responsible government, had to consider waste management in Hong Kong on an overall basis. Although 5 ha of CWBCP was now not required, she supplemented that EPD was willing to undertake enhancement works at the SENT Landfill and its extension, such as tree planting, that it had committed in previous Board's meetings.

20/11 Dr. Ellen CHAN addressed a member's concerns that EPD did not have other proposals, apart from proposed using the 5 ha of the CWBCP, when it consulted the Board two years ago. She said that the "Scaled-Down" Scheme with waste diversion was not a preferred option since more than 1,000 waste collection trucks were required to carry waste to the more remote NENT Landfill and WENT Landfill and other transfer facilities instead of to the SENT Landfill. This option would likely result in secondary pollution. She pointed out that the SENT Landfill, which was nearest to urban areas, received more than 70% of the total construction waste disposed of each day in Hong Kong. Hence, EPD would need to pursue the SENT Landfill extension; otherwise the waste would have to be carried to the other two landfills. She added that the transport sector and waste collection industry might resist disposal of waste at the two more remote landfills and EPD would consult them in advance. She advised that if EPD had other better proposals two years ago, they simply would not put forward the controversial proposal of using 5 ha in the CWBCP to the Board at that time.

21/11 Dr. Ellen CHAN went on to say that EPD would continue to minimize environmental nuisance of the SENT Landfill with their best endeavours, given its proximity to the Tseung Kwan O Industrial Estate. She said that waste management facilities were indispensable infrastructures in the development of new districts and sites should be reserved for these facilities when a new district was being developed. In addition, the public and the local community should be educated that waste management facilities were not offensive facilities. She pointed out that environmental nuisance of these facilities must be eliminated in order to persuade the local community to accept them. She cited that the sludge treatment facility being constructed at the ash lagoon in Tsang Tsui, Tuen Mun, which would be commissioned in late 2013, would incorporate recreational facilities such as spa and the design of the facility would be attractive and modern.

22/11 The member appreciated the efforts of Environment Bureau and Environmental Protection Department on waste management. He advised that EPD should try not to let the public have the impression that their efforts were piecemeal ones. The Chairman remarked that the member's views were cogent.

23/11 A member was delighted to know that the 5 ha of the CWBCP would not be used for the SENT Landfill Extension. However, she was worried that reclamation might be done outside Victoria Harbour, which was protected by Protection of the Harbour Ordinance, for disposal of construction waste as the 5 ha of the CWBCP would not have been used for the SENT Landfill Extension. She pointed out that a comprehensive waste management strategy should be considered. Waste charging scheme should be introduced as soon as possible as it was currently easier to rally support of the public who saw the need of waste reduction. The Administration should make the public know that it had an implementable action plan with

various measures, not only landfill extension.

24/11 Mr. Joseph SHAM replied a member's enquiry that the land of the CWBCP was designated as a country park in 1979 and the approved map (1979 map) was then deposited in the Land Registry. Upon proposed excision of the 5 ha of land of the CWBCP, the Administration prepared another map in 2009 (2009 map). As the LegCo had repealed the Country Parks (Designation) (Consolidation) (Amendment) Order 2010 on 13 October 2010, the 2009 map was legally void and so the approved map would remain to be the 1979 map. He emphasized that the 5 ha of land was still part of the CWBCP and was under effective management of AFCD. As regards the site at the upper slope above the Tai Au Mun Road, he said that the site was by and large not a very desirable one to be designated as part of the CWBCP because few recreational facilities could be provided thereat. Hence, AFCD did not intend to designate the site as part of the CWBCP at the time being. He informed members that AFCD had pursued to identify suitable sites for designation as part of the CWBCP.

25/11 Mr. Joseph SHAM thanked members for their contribution on the issue of using the 5 ha of the CWBCP for the SENT Landfill Extension now that the issue had come to an end in respect of the CWBCP.

26/11 Dr. Ellen CHAN answered a member's enquiry that currently EPD did not have a new design for the boundary between the CWBCP and the SENT Landfill Extension since the Administration's decision on 4 January 2011. She said that EPD understood the Board's concerns on the previously proposed retaining wall along the boundary in one of the original options. EPD and its consultants would work out the new profile of the scaled-down SENT Landfill Extension, including the design.

27/11 In response to the member's concerns, Mr. Alan WONG Chi-kong, J.P. remarked that beautification works could be done to the retaining wall if the wall was required. He cited that Association for Geoconservation, Hong Kong had advised Housing Department on landscape design of a wall in a housing estate in the quarry in Kowloon.

28/11 The Chairman thanked Dr. Ellen CHAN Ying-lung, J.P. for attending the meeting.

(Dr. Ellen CHAN Ying-lung, J.P. left the meeting at this juncture.)

## **II. Matters Arising**

(a) Progress Report on the Phase III Redevelopment of HKFYG Jockey Club Sai Kung Outdoor Training Camp (Para. 190/10)

29/11 Mr. LEUNG Chi-hong reported that HKFYG and its consultants would brief

members on the progress of their project in Agenda Item III.

- (b) Proposed Double Haven Special Area, High Island Special Area, Sharp Island Special Area, Ung Kong Group Special Area and Ninepin Group Special Area (Para. 192/10)

30/11 Mr. LEUNG Chi-hong reported that the Administration gazetted Double Haven and Others (Special Areas) Order 2010 in accordance with section (24) of the CPO on 22 October 2010. The Order came into operation on 1 January 2011. As a result, the total area of country parks increased from 44,004 ha to 44,239 ha and there were now 24 country parks and 22 special areas.

- (c) Annual Field Visit (Para.241/10)

31/11 Mr. Joseph SHAM reported that the Annual Field Visit took place on 7 December 2010 and seven Board members participated in the Visit. Members first visited Sai Wan enclave and were briefed on the protection measures on the site. They then set off to Wan Tsai Peninsula and were briefed on the implementation of Country Park Plantation Enrichment Project as well as campsite facilities thereat. Before ending the Visit, members proceeded to Hoi Ha enclave and Marine Park at Hoi Ha Wan. They were briefed on the statutory planning control to Hoi Ha enclave and the ecological features as well as management control within Hoi Ha Wan Marine Park. Meanwhile photographs taken during the Visit were circulated at the meeting.

32/11 The Chairman thanked AFCD staff for arranging the Visit which was a very successful one. She remarked that the Visit let members have personal experience on the issue of country park enclaves and enhanced the Board's work on country park enclaves in the future.

### **III. Progress Report on the Phase III Redevelopment of HKFYG Jockey Club Sai Kung Outdoor Training Camp (Working Paper: WP/CMPB/1/2011)**

33/11 Mr. LEUNG Chi-hong briefed members on Working Paper WP/CMPB/1/2011. He said that the Board supported the Project in principle at the meeting on 15 January 2010; however, it was of the view that the project proponent should (1) submit to the Board a detailed and comprehensive EIA study report, (2) carry out Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) on Tai Mong Tsai Road, (3) carry out compensatory planting, (4) inform the Board whether there would be further expansion of the Camp in the future, and (5) adopt vertical greening for both Phase II and III developments. HKFYG would present a progress report to address the Board's comments at the meeting. He remarked that if the Project was acceptable to the Board, the Authority would work out detailed conditions governing the Project.

34/11 Dr. Eric LI Shing-foon declared that LLA Ltd. had been working for his company and Mr. NG Siu-lung was responsible for his project. But he neither knew Mr. NG nor dealt with him in his project. Ms. Betty HO Siu-fong also declared that LLA Ltd. had worked for her company. Members considered that the above persons could continue to attend the meeting.

35/11 Mr. LEUNG Chi-hong replied a member's enquiry that HKFYG presented an ecological assessment report at the meeting on 15 January 2010. Nevertheless the Authority was of the view that the report was not able to adequately address the Board's concerns and HKFYG was required to provide a detailed and comprehensive EIA study report instead. He advised that an ecological impact assessment report was included in the full EIA study report in accordance with Technical Memorandum of Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO). The Chairman supplemented that findings of ecological impact study were included in the EIA Executive Summary (Annex D of the Paper).

36/11 The Chairman welcomed the following persons to attend the meeting:

The Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups (HKFYG)

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Mr. WAN Man-ye, B.B.S., J.P. | HKFYG Honorary Secretary and Chairman of the HKFYG Jockey Club Sai Kung Outdoor Training Camp Phase III Redevelopment Committee |
|------------------------------|---|

|               |            |
|---------------|------------|
| Mr. James MOK | Supervisor |
|---------------|------------|

|              |          |
|--------------|----------|
| Mr. Greg TSE | Engineer |
|--------------|----------|

|                |               |
|----------------|---------------|
| Mr. Ronald CHU | Camp Operator |
|----------------|---------------|

Ateliers VIII Architects Ltd.

|                   |                             |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Mr. KUNG Kai-yuen | Architect/Managing Director |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|

|                |           |
|----------------|-----------|
| Ms. Stella LUK | Architect |
|----------------|-----------|

|                  |                 |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Dennis LEUNG | Project Officer |
|------------------|-----------------|

Ecosystems Limited

|                  |                                 |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Ms. YAU Mee-ling | Senior Plant Ecologist/Director |
|------------------|---------------------------------|

Stephen Cheng Consulting Engineering Limited



audits, HKFYG would report the progress of the project in its website in accordance with EPD's requirements. Overall the EIA study had concluded that the Project was environmentally acceptable and in compliance with environmental laws and standards.

42/11 Mr. WAN remarked that the Phase III project would not induce adverse traffic impact onto the adjacent road network based on TIA findings. He added that operational arrangements for better utilization of coach capacity would be considered in the future. He highlighted that no future extension of the Camp was planned currently.

43/11 Mr. WAN briefed members on the programme schedule for the project. HKFYG planned to start construction works in early April 2011 and complete them in October 2012. 180 and 120 minipiles would be built under canteen block and dormitory buildings respectively in April 2010. Construction works for two new platform decks, which were supported by a total of 60 minipiles, would not be started until the works was gazetted under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance. The ACE EIA Sub-committee had also been advised that construction works of the two decks would be done in dry seasons (i.e., from November to coming April) only. If construction works of the decks could not be commenced in November 2011, they would be delayed to November 2012. He remarked that HKFYG was willing to accept the outcome of such delay to minimize environmental impacts, even though slippage to the project would occur.

44/11 Mr. WAN concluded that all the Board's comments had been addressed. He said that HKFYG would appreciate it if the Authority granted its consent to the Project before District Land Conference on 17 February 2011. He added that HKFYG's application for short-term tenancy agreement of the extended portion of the Camp and application for tree felling proposal of the Project would be considered in the Conference. Subject to approval on the two applications, construction works, except works for the decks, would commence in early April 2011.

45/11 A member opined that the EIA was essential because modifications had been made to the Project.

46/10 Ms. YAU Mee-ling replied the member's enquiries that the contractor's contract stipulated that the works contractor should carry out tree protection upon handover of the site and identify retained and transplanted trees on site. Landscape contractor would implement root-cutting work and preparatory work for transplantation afterwards. She pointed out that entire work process would be monitored by Environmental Team and Independent Environmental Checker. HKFYG staff, being site representatives and engineers, would oversee tree retaining works and entire monitoring process. Landscape consultants, being members of Project Team, would liaise closely with the landscape contractor. This should

ensure that tree retaining and transplantation work would be performed to the best. She said that suitable locations had been identified on site for transplanted trees. Detailed tree transplantation plan would be submitted for AFCD's consideration during Environmental Monitoring and Audit stage. With AFCD's agreement on the plan and locations of transplantation, transplantation work would be implemented.

47/10 Ms. YAU advised the member that most of the 232 felled trees were *Acacia confusa* (台灣相思) and other common species. The trees proposed for compensatory planting within the project area and Lui Ta Shek would mainly consist of native species with higher ecological value. A total of 275 trees, comprising 150 standard size trees and 125 tree whips, would be planted within the project area. The standard size trees would be planted around the project site which would give an immediate greening effect. She highlighted that both total number and total diameter at breast height (DBH) of compensated trees would offer a compensation ratio greater than 1:1 on site.

48/11 Ms. YAU Mee-ling answered a member's enquiries that compensatory tree planting in a ratio of greater than 1:1 comprised trees only. Green roof, vertical greening and screening plantings, including climber plants, herbs and shrubs, were extra ones in compensatory planting. Mr. Albert CHUNG supplemented that climber plants and drooping plants would be included in vertical greening while open lawn in green roof.

49/11 In response to a member's enquiries on details of felled trees and compensatory trees, Ms. YAU Mee-ling said that the main EIA report contained a table showing native tree species recommended for compensatory planting, including species like *Schefflera heptaphylla* (鴨腳木) and *Machilus chekiangensis* (楠樹).

50/11 Mr. Alan WONG Chi-kong, J.P. said that AFCD had studied the EIA report and compensatory tree planting plan of the Project. He advised that the report and the plan were acceptable to AFCD in principle; hence AFCD recommended the Board to accept the EIA report and compensatory planting plan. The Chairman highlighted that HKFYG would consult AFCD on detailed requirements of compensatory planting plan upon the Board's approval on the Project. HKFYG would follow AFCD's requirements until the completion of the Project. Mr. Alan WONG added that AFCD would monitor HKFYG on implementation of the compensatory planting plan, including the plan for mangrove.

51/11 Ms. YAU Mee-ling briefed members on table 6.14 "Native Tree and Shrub Species Recommended for Compensatory Woodland Planting" of EIA main report. She said that recommended tree species were pioneer species, including *Schefflera heptaphylla* (鴨腳木), *Machilus chekiangensis* (楠樹), *Alangium chinense* (八角楓), and *Aquilaria sinensis* (土沉香), which could enhance ecological value. Recommended shrubs were mainly of berry species

which could provide birds with food. Flowering plants were also recommended for provision of nectar to butterflies and other insects.

52/11 In response to Mr. Wilson SO Ying-leung's enquiries on two new decks, Mr. WAN Man-yee said that the area of small deck was 210m<sup>2</sup> while that of large one was 370m<sup>2</sup>. Both were located beyond high water mark and so outside country park area. He said that ecological impact, construction method and construction timetable of the two decks were discussed in ACE meeting. He emphasized that the two decks were vital to the Camp because they would provide ground level open areas for outdoor water sports activities, such as canoeing and wind-surfing, if utilization rate of the Camp would be doubled. As HKFYG should handle the issues of fishing, navigation and underwater cable as well, he suggested that HKFYG should request Lands Department to gazette the works of two decks under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance at District Lands Conference meeting in February 2011. If objections were raised during the gazette period, the Executive Council (the ExCo) would consider whether to grant the site of the decks to HKFYG. HKFYG should submit application for short-term tenancy of the two decks only upon the approval from the ExCo.

53/11 Mr. Wilson SO Ying-leung remarked that if the area of 580m<sup>2</sup> would involve reclamation, Planning Department (PlanD) would look into issues in relation to current Outline Zoning Plan. He advised that PlanD would convey their views to HKFYG after the meeting. The Chairman pointed out that the matter was concerns of PlanD and LandsD as the decks were outside country park area.

54/11 Mr. WAN Man-yee replied Mr. Bobby NG Mang-tung, J.P. that waste water would be reused for irrigation and flushing purpose while rain collection was not planned in the Project.

55/11 Mr. WAN Man-yee advised a member that the L-shaped road on the left part of Master Layout Plan was an existing one. He said that it was very difficult for coach to turn around at this road currently. Hence, two loading/unloading spaces on the roof deck of the new canteen block were proposed if traffic flow would be increased by 50%.

56/11 Mr. WAN Man-yee replied a member that the L-shaped road was in fact a flyover linking Tai Mong Tsai Road and the second floor of a building. The existing sewage treatment plant was located under the second floor. He said that the road was required on operational grounds as the Camp was an elongated site and it was inconvenient to load/unload goods in the proposed loading/unloading spaces. He highlighted that the road and proposed pick-up/drop-off point were required on operation and safety grounds.

57/11 Ms. YAU Mee-ling answered a member's enquiries that frequency of night survey was increased during ecological survey. Based on the findings of the survey and previous

literature review, Brown Fish Owl was known to use large rocks in coastal area as roosting sites. Though more than 200 trees would be felled, more than 300 trees would be retained in the site and there were still quite a lot of mature trees in the surrounding area. Hence, impacts on Brown Fish Owl would be insignificant. She said that precautionary measures would be taken during operational phase. For example, the lighting of the building would not be pointed to the areas where Brown Fish Owl frequently used and there would not be a lot of noisy activities at night. It was expected that Brown Fish Owl would continue to use the site.

58/11 The Chairman thanked representatives of HKFYG and project consultants for attending the meeting. She said that the Board would make its decision in the meeting.

59/10 Mr. WAN Man-ye thanked the Board. He said that LandsD would not consider the Project if they did not receive the Board's decision. He proposed that if feasible, the Board would inform LandsD of its decision before 14 February 2011 so that Lands Department could consider HKFYG's application for short-term tenancy of the site in District Lands Conference on 17 February 2011. The Chairman responded that the Board would try to accommodate his request.

(Representatives of HKFYG and project consultants left the meeting at this juncture.)

60/11 After the Chairman had recapitulated the consultation history of the project, members agreed to support the project. The Chairman concluded that the Board accepted the project in principle.

61/11 The Chairman summed up that AFCD had undertaken to follow up the issues of protection of existing trees, tree transplantation, species of compensatory tree to be planted and their subsequent conditions, as well as the effects of compensatory planting on animals. Besides, AFCD should inform LandsD and HKFYG of the Board's acceptance to the project.

[Post-meeting note: AFCD informed HKFYG and LandsD that the Country and Marine Parks Authority had no objection to the project on 7 February 2011.]

#### **IV. Summary Report of Country Parks Committee (CPC) (Working Paper: WP/CMPB/2/2011)**

62/11 Ms. Betty HO Siu-fong, Chairman of the Country Parks Committee, presented Working Paper WP/CMPB/2/2011. The Report summarized issues discussed at the CPC meeting held on 2 December 2010, including planning and development of mountain bike facilities in country parks, summary of development proposals within country parks from 1 April 2010 to 30 September 2010 and the Country and Marine Parks Authority Progress Report on Country Parks. Members noted the Report.

**V. Summary Report of Marine Parks Committee (MPC)  
(Working Paper WP/CMPB/3/2011)**

63/11 Prof. Paul LAM Kwan-sing, J.P., Chairman of the Marine Parks Committee, presented the Working Paper WP/CMPB/3/2011. The Report summarized issues discussed at the MPC meeting held on 18 November 2010, including Sha Chau Facility arrangement after operation of Permanent Aviation Fuel Facility in Tuen Mun, Pilot Scheme to help fishermen pursue fisheries related ecotourism activities and the Country and Marine Parks Authority Progress Report on Marine Parks and Marine Reserve.

64/11 Mr. Alan WONG Chi-kong, J.P. pointed out that Sha Chau and Lung Kwu Chau Marine Park would face challenges in next few years, including commencement of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge project and proposed construction of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Runway of Hong Kong International Airport. As the waters in the west of Hong Kong were the habitat of Chinese white dolphins, AFCD had expressed concerns to Airport Authority Hong Kong (AAHK) that the impacts of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Runway project should be minimized and there should be compensation package. AFCD would also liaise closely with AAHK and reflect their concerns to AAHK in the future. He informed members that AFCD would report the effects of individual works project on marine parks to the Board at appropriate time.

65/11 A member appreciated the Pilot Scheme.

66/11 Mr. Joseph SHAM answered the member's enquiries on technical difficulties that one of main terms of the Pilot Scheme required the contractors to deploy vessels with valid licences for carrying passengers and specified life-saving appliances. The service contract also required the contractor to engage two tourist guides for each tour, one should have fishermen background and was responsible for fisheries while the other was responsible for geology and ecology. He said that target groups of the tours were secondary school students and teachers. The tours aimed to provide students with geo-conservation knowledge and Other Learning Experience under New Senior School Curriculum so that demand may support the tours as a sustainable business in the future. He remarked that the Scheme was on a trial basis in Sai Kung and Tai Po Districts currently. The Scheme would be extended to the South District later. The implementation of the Scheme in other districts would also be considered. By participating in the Scheme, fishermen were encouraged to gain experience and skills required to run the business.

67/11 Mr. Joseph SHAM addressed the member's further enquiries on quality of tour guides that tour guides had to attend a short-term course on eco-tourism as well as basic requirements of being qualified guides before they could engage in tours.

68/11 A member appreciated the Pilot Scheme and efforts of AFCD staff. He pointed out that the Scheme proved that local community and geological features in Hong Kong could be integrated well which would be a very good selling point for the upgrading of Hong Kong National Geopark to a global geopark. The Scheme could score high marks for the upgrading. As regards the quality of tour guides, he proposed that Recommended Geopark Guides (R2G) could be engaged for eco-tours in geopark areas.

69/11 Mr. Joseph SHAM thanked the member for his proposal. He said that AFCD had already been mindful of the quality of geo-tour guides. So tour guides were required to meet AFCD's standards, such as to be R2Gs. He remarked that one of the purposes of the Scheme would be to show the experts of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization that integration of local community could be achieved during the upgrading of Hong Kong National Geopark to a global geopark.

70/11 Mr. Alan WONG Chi-kong, J.P. informed members that AFCD would undertake to allocate resources to train fishermen to be engaged in fisheries related ecotourism in next few years. Apart from upgrading of Hong Kong National Geopark to a global geopark, the Scheme was essential to assist fishermen in switching to other business in the long term. He highlighted that AFCD would accord priority to provide such training to trawler fishermen whose livelihood would be affected by the banning of trawling in Hong Kong waters to be implemented within the coming two years.

71/11 Mr. Alan WONG Chi-kong, J.P. went on to say that subject to the feedback from consultation with fishermen and availability of funding, AFCD would continue to implement the Scheme with a view to assisting fishermen affected by the trawl ban to switch to alternative business. He believed that both Environment Bureau and Food and Health Bureau would give policy support to this plan.

72/11 A member appreciated AFCD's efforts to assist fishermen in switching business after participating in one of the tours under the Scheme on 25 January 2011. He proposed that surrendered trawlers might be used for eco-tours as participants of eco-tours could have a first-hand experience on fishermen's way of life. As fishermen were not good at presentation, he proposed that training should be provided to improve their presentation skills.

73/11 Mr. Joseph SHAM answered a member's enquiries that the number of fishermen interested in the Scheme could not be ascertained yet because the Scheme had been implemented for a few months only. He said that the service contracts would end in March 2011 and AFCD would consider extending the contracts if necessary. Tentatively AFCD aimed to train 50 – 100 fishermen so that as many fishermen as possible could have a preliminary

introduction on the Scheme. Whether fishermen would participate in the Scheme will depend on many factors. AFCD would follow up the participation of fishermen in the Scheme.

74/11 Dr. LEUNG Siu-fai supplemented that the presentation skills of fishermen as tourist guides had been taken into account when designing the Scheme. He pointed out that under the Scheme a fisherman, being responsible for fishermen culture and local fishing methods, worked together with another professional guide, being responsible for geology and ecology, in each tour. Fishermen interested in running this kind of tour business in future might consider adopting similar arrangements. Alternatively, if a fisherman had acquired adequate the necessary skills and knowledge, he could run the tour by himself without partnership with another guide. He concluded that the mode of operation for such tour business could be multifarious subject to future development.

75/11 Members had noted the Report.

**VI. Summary Report of Public Relations Committee (PRC)  
Working Paper WP/CMPB/4/2011)**

76/1 As Dr. LO Wing-lok, J.P., Chairman of the Public Relations Committee, did not attend the meeting, Mr. Joseph SHAM presented the Summary Report on his behalf. The Report summarized issues discussed at the PRC meeting held on 26 October 2010, including Publicity and Media Coverage, “Geopark Festival” Programme, “Great Outdoors Hong Kong 2010” Programme and the Country and Marine Parks Authority Progress Report. Members noted the Report.

**VII. Country and Marine Parks Authority Progress Report  
(Working Paper WP/CMPB/5/2011)**

77/11 Mr. Joseph SHAM presented Working Paper WP/CMPB/5/2011 on Country and Marine Parks Authority Progress Report for the period from 1 September to 30 November 2010. He highlighted that the number of fires was four during the period and a bigger one occurred in Shing Mun Reservoir in November. There was a drop in visitor number in country parks in November compared with the corresponding period of last year, probably due to the opening of Hong Kong National Geopark last November. He said that up to 30 November 2010, 16 fisheries related ecotours under the Pilot Scheme were completed and 447 students and teachers participated. During the report period, two teachers workshop were organized and 37 teachers participated.

78/11 Members noted the Report.

## **VIII. Any Other Business**

### **(b) Report of the Country and Marine Parks Board**

79/11 Mr. Joseph SHAM presented the Report which summarized the work of the Country and Marine Parks Board during the period from 1 September 2007 to 31 August 2009. Subject to Members' endorsement, the Report would be uploaded onto AFCD's website.

80/11 Members noted the Report and had no objection to uploading the Report onto AFCD's website.

[Post-meeting note: The Report was uploaded onto AFCD's website on 1 February 2011.]

### **(c) Failure of receiving local telecommunications signals in country parks**

81/11 A member raised the issue of failure of receiving local telecommunications signals in country parks. He cited an incident that a child drowned in Ping Chau recently because it was very difficult to telephone the Police thereat. He said that local telecommunications signals could not be received in Ping Chau and signals of roaming service from Ping Chau would be transmitted to Mainland China instead of Hong Kong. He said that the problem of electricity supply prevented the establishment of telecommunications relay stations in country parks. To address this problem, he suggested that renewable energy should be considered as a source of electricity supply for these stations. As a result local telecommunications signals could be received in country parks and recues could be speeded up.

82/11 In response to the member's concerns, Mr. LEUNG Chi-hong said that AFCD had been following up with Office of the Telecommunications Authority and Marine Police to explore feasible means to improve reporting mechanism of accidents in Ping Chau after the incident. To report an incident to the Police, Marine Police was thinking to erect notice boards in Ping Chau to advise people to dial telephone number 112 to transmit the message to the Police of Mainland China first. Meanwhile Marine Police was discussing with the Police of Mainland China how to relay the message of incident to them.

### **(d) Illegal delivery of heavy machinery in Country Parks**

83/11 A member said that Sai Wan incident reflected the problem of illegal delivery of heavy machinery and excavators in country parks. Referring to statistics of fines in a survey of South China Morning Post, he remarked that the laws were lenient because offenders had not been fined to maximum penalty under relevant sections of CPO and of Lands Ordinance respectively. He worried that country parks would face big problem if the situation continued. He enquired whether AFCD would consider revising CPO in order to deter the situation.

84/11 Mr. Alan WONG Chi-kong, J.P. replied that an increase in maximum penalty might not be an effective way to address the issue because actual penalty of each case could be subject to the judge's deliberation. He pointed out that high media coverage on Sai Wan incident had given warnings to those developers who intended to carry out unauthorized developments in country park enclaves. Moreover, since Sai Wan incident last year PlanD had worked together with AFCD to apply statutory planning control to enclaves which faced imminent development threat, such as Hoi Ha and Pak Lap Wan, by including the areas into Development Permitted Area (DPA) plans. Besides, green groups and the media remained very vigilant to any development in enclaves. Such efforts should prevent occurrence of similar incidents in the near future. He opined that it was not necessary to accord priority to revise CPO for the time being and the problem could be solved by effective law enforcement of AFCD, PlanD and LandsD.

#### **IX. Date of Next Meeting**

85/11 The Chairman informed members that the date of next meeting was tentatively scheduled for 24 May 2011.

86/11 The meeting was adjourned at 17:40 p.m.

– End –