

**RECOMMENDATIONS ON
STREAMLINING BUILDING WORKS AND
INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES**



September 2022

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“The Legislative Proposals to Streamline Development-related Statutory Processes” put forward by the Development Bureau to the Panel on Development of the Legislative Council on 22 March 2022 outlined the Government’s latest thinking to streamline and modernize the more critical statutory processes pertinent development projects.

The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (HKIE) provided our views in June 2022 in which we gave our support for this policy initiative to expedite the planning and development process so that the developable land for housing and other uses can be made available more efficiently and quickly. We however expressed explicitly in our views that the proposal addressed mainly the upstream statutory processes from green sites to mature land lots, whereas the actual building construction and other infrastructural development-related statutory processes, such as those stipulated in the Building Ordinance (Cap. 123) and Fire Services Ordinance (Cap. 95), etc. are left out of the discussions. These are however critical to the delivery of any development projects.

In view of this, HKIE has set up a Task Force to collect and review the feedback from the industry on their first-hand experience of the current building construction and infrastructural development process; and to make suggestions on the possible ways of streamlining and fast tracking the existing processes that would benefit the society.

Following Section 1 of the background description, the identified issues of the current practice and our recommendations are presented in three separate sections, namely, (a) Streamline the statutory regime, (b) Streamline the administrative arrangements, and (c) Expedite public housing projects using a new project delivery model.

Section 2 of the report highlights the important advantage of a new demeanor for the officers of government when dealing with statutory submissions. While discharging their statutory duties on the role of regulators to ensure minimum standards of safety and quality of works for the developments, for the benefit of the community at large, they should also shoulder a facilitator role to provide advice to project proponents on how they can achieve progress, all under the premises of not foregoing any safety, quality and statutory requirements and in fair and open manner. Bureaux and Heads of Department should clearly advise this to their officers to ease their worry on being complained later on offering privilege. In parallel, various government authorities, i.e., Buildings Department (BD), Geotechnical Engineering Office, Fire Services Department (FSD), Lands Department (LandsD), etc., should conduct appropriate reassessment and consider measures that we suggested in Section 2 of this report to streamline the submission, checking, supervision and approval processes with **an aim to advance building and infrastructural developments in a more expeditious manner.**

Section 3 of this report describes our proposals of adopting a ‘pre-application consultation step’ such that the project proponent may request workshops with the authorities for the

presentation of their design concept of the proposed development and for exchange of views on the major areas of concern. We also propose that the authorities will consider accepting draft statutory submission vetting so that early advice can be given to the project proponent and in turn, such **streamlined administrative arrangement** can expedite the statutory application and approval process. We also propose that tree felling application and approval shall be processed in parallel with the General Building Plans (GBP) vetting and approval mechanism.

Section 4 of this report illustrates our **idea of implementing a new project delivery model** for public housing projects so that the site formation/infrastructure works and the subsequent building construction would be managed and implemented by one single government department or entity in lieu of the current practice of splitting the works between Government and the Hong Kong Housing Authority. By doing this, we believe that the overall duration and cost of delivery of a public housing project could be substantially reduced.

The last section of this report summarizes our recommendations on streamlining building construction and infrastructure development processes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
1. BACKGROUND	5
2. STREAMLINE STATUTORY REGIME	7
3. STREAMLINE ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS	10
4. EXPEDITE PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS USING A NEW PROJECT DELIVERY MODEL	13
5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	16
6. REFERENCES	18

1. BACKGROUND

Prior to making recommendations for streamlining the development-related statutory processes, it is important to understand the existing procedures. Take large-scale new development area projects as an example. Suitable locations of urban development are firstly shortlisted based on geographical conditions and other environmental, financial and societal factors through planning studies. Funding approval on feasibility studies, preliminary investigating works and relevant environmental impact assessment, etc. would then be sought from the Legislative Council. Multiple rounds of public consultation with members of the public, Legislative Council, District Councils, local residents, professional groups and other stakeholders would then be conducted so that a revised Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP) would be prepared to indicate the land use along with development parameters. Afterward, the Government would undergo the statutory town planning process to reflect the RODP on statutory plans in the districts of concern. All these preliminary planning procedures alone normally take 5 to 8 years to finish.

For reclamation projects, construction works could be commenced when the aforesaid town planning procedures are completed. For new development areas (NDAs) at existing brownfield sites, it may usually take another four years for land clearance including compensation to landowners and relocation of occupants. Upon the completion of the reclamation works or land resumption and clearance in NDAs, site formation and infrastructure construction works could proceed to turn the land into spade-ready site suitable for superstructure works. These works include land decontamination, if any, road construction, water supply, drainage and sewerage, which would normally need another 5 years to complete. Finally, the land could be sold to developers for private residential development or handed over to the relevant government departments to construct public housing or other public facilities. This implies that it would take more than 10 to 13 years from planning to get a suitable development site ready for land supply.

With an aim of shortening such lengthy development process, the Government has proposed under their paper titled “Legislative Proposals to Streamline Development-related Statutory Processes” in March 2022 (the Proposal) for the Legislative Council’s consideration. The Proposal to simplify the repetitive procedures mainly revolves around those upstream statutory processes for developing spade-ready land lots, i.e., procedures under the Town Planning Ordinance, the Lands Resumption Ordinance, the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance, the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance, and the Railways Ordinance. The two leading local learned societies on town planning, namely, the Hong Kong Institute of Architects and the Hong Kong Institute of Planners, have already given their views on the Proposal in April 2022 and June 2022 respectively.

HKIE has also given our views on the Proposal under our letter dated 22 June 2022, in which we expressed our support for various policy initiatives to streamline the statutory processes contained in the Proposal. We, however, pointed out in our letter that the

Proposal had focused mainly on simplifying the upstream statutory processes of getting the land ready but had not mentioned other statutory processes critical to building construction and infrastructure development. Reviewing the latter processes altogether would obviously be vital and maximize the effect of the whole streamlining exercise because the downstream statutory processes after the spade-ready sites are ready for development are equally if not more critical for the timely delivery of any development projects.

For this reason, HKIE has committed a task force for (1) the study of potential areas of improvement in the downstream processes and statutory procedures related to building construction and infrastructure development, (2) the collection of views from the stakeholders in the industry and (3) making recommendations on the possible ways on streamlining the existing processes and statutory procedures.

2. STREAMLINE STATUTORY REGIME

2.1 Common Issues

Hong Kong has a very comprehensive and robust system in overseeing the planning, design and construction of buildings and associated works, all aiming to protect the public safety and property. Several government departments shoulder the legal authority (the Authority) under the jurisdiction of the relevant ordinances to carry out fundamental technical checks and to approve the design and monitoring the quality of and safe construction of all private and infrastructure development projects in Hong Kong.

Each government department normally has a clearly defined statutory timeframe in responding to any formal and inquiry submissions vested upon them under the respective Ordinance (the host department). However, scrutiny of the technical check would often involve various other enabling departments which are expertise in particular specific areas. Normally the host departments will circulate the submissions to those enabling departments for offering comments or advices under their specific areas and the host department will coordinate and respond to the project proponent with approval, rejection or comments with conditions. While statutory timeframe is imposed upon the host department, most other departments do not have the similar statutory obligation to shoulder the same legal commitment. A similar issue exists with the public utilities and transportation companies (i.e., CLP, HKT and MTR, etc.). If there is any delay in the aforesaid consultation process, the host department may cause prolongation in responding to the technical submissions.

Furthermore, new design concepts, technologies and products continue to emerge every day in our engineering industry. However, the submission process is commonly held up with technical difficulties and challenges due to the time-consuming process for the government departments to consider these new designs not covered under the Hong Kong Codes of Practices and recognized international practices. Similar to the issues mentioned in the previous paragraph, this would result in prolongation. Even when the plan submissions are approved with the new design concept, the frontline inspectorate staff might not be readily accepting such completed works on site during site tests and/or compliance inspections or require specific modifications or addition to suit their comprehension on the subjects rather than assessing the completed works based on the approved plans or principles. The projects sometime result in substantial modification cost and time delay.

Similarly, technological advancement in material science unfolds a lot of new building components and materials which might not be found in the Central Data Bank of the Buildings Department. These materials, if to be included in the submission, would require approval by various departments, which could take up to 6 to 12 months. This would greatly hinder the promotion of new and innovative materials for the advancement of the engineering industry.

2.2 Recommendations

To address the above-mentioned common issues identified, we recommend the following streamlining and improvement measures:-

- a. Consider the feasibility to request all relevant authorities and supporting/ enabling departments, including public utilities and transportation companies (i.e., CLP, HKT and MTR, etc.), to **commit to certain time pledges and take a more proactive role to discuss with AP/RSE/RGE with a view for early approval**, thereby enhancing processing efficiency;
- b. Government departments shall deploy more resources or streamline process with a view to support the first submission shall be approved within the statutory period of 60 calendar days. **Upon the first approval where the fundamental design principles and construction methodologies have been thoroughly reviewed and accepted** by the technical departments in ensuring public safety and built quality are fully complied with the relevant regulations and codes of practice, **AP/RSE/RGE shall be allowed to make minor amendments for construction without prior approval and consent**¹. BD has implemented this similar practice by their PNAP ADM 19 on a few selected items of works with restrictive conditions since 2002. However, the imposed conditions or restrictions so far have often constrained the effectiveness of this time and cost enhancement measure. We suggest the government to extend the Minor Amendment Approach promulgated in para. 22 to 25 of PNAP ADM 19 to all types of building works and remove all unnecessary imposed conditions². In this regard, prior approval and consent to the amendments of all buildings works including all foundations, site formation, structures, drainage works etc. (for which the design principles and construction methods has been approved and first approval been given) would not be required. For check and balance, **AP/RSE/RGE are required to ensure that the original approved design assumptions are all time complied with, and final approval and consent for all these amendments shall be obtained prior to certifying completion of the building works**. For avoidance of doubt, this streamline measure does not apply to those amendments which involve change in design principles and construction methodologies.
- c. Adopt a **collaborative approach** through conducting workshops (relevant authorities in downstream end involving the issuance of various licenses or certificates before OP granted, such as FSD, FEHD, etc., could be invited), if found necessary, particularly for those large-scale or complicated developments, between the project proponent

¹ Similar time frame for government's own infrastructures or development projects shall be worked out and promulgated.

² For instance, foundation works can only be relocated not more than 5 m, not more than 5% increase of piles within site, etc.

and the Authority to expedite the approval as well as acceptance inspection process with a view to minimize or avoid resubmissions with possible means;

- d. Promote the concept of relevant Authority also **undertaking a facilitating role for buildings or development projects while discharging the statutory regulatory or checking duties without compromising any safety and quality requirements, all in fair and open manner.** Officers and inspectorate staff of relevant government departments should be encouraged to adopt this new demeanor so that those project-related problems could be resolved proactively and preferably in the upfront. Bureaux and Heads of Department should clearly advise these to their officers to ease their worry on being complained later on offering privilege; and
- e. **Assign a government bureau as lead coordinator** (modelling on the previous Infrastructure Coordination Office) to handle inter-departmental issues within the Government to avoid undesirable delay due to interface issues. Unresolved issues shall be escalated to the Secretary for a decision. Similar model had been implemented by the Government's previous Housing Bureau in achieving the 85,000 flats per year target.
- f. Set up a Housing Development Unit in BD to support fast track approval of housing sites with more than 200 units. Priority status may be granted by BD upon application.

2.3 Other Suggestions

In order to facilitate the adoption of new construction material and components which continue to surface worldwide while withholding the interest of public health and safety, we recommend to provide a clear definition on the pre-approval of products with CE marking or UL certification. Specific load factor or material factor allowance can be imposed to enhance the overall performance reliability while at the same time supporting the advancement of technology. The Central Data Bank should be regularly updated with the use of these new products once approved and successful adopted in different projects. With the continual endorsement for adopting advanced and cutting-edge products, the engineering industry can be kept abreast of the international arena.

To focus the government's efforts in achieving fast track and cost effective housing and infrastructure developments, the Government is suggested to set aside introducing new regulations, code of practices and administrative measures which will incur extra design efforts and construction cost and programme, unless it is for remedy the risks affecting public safety and built quality or global commitment.

While the engineering professional practitioners is recommended to shoulder more responsibilities in the above suggested streamlined approval process, HKIE stands ready to work with the Engineer Registration Board to work out a revised regulatory framework for Registered Professional Engineers in discharging their duties.

3. STREAMLINE ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

3.1 Current Practice

At present, the current administrative arrangements for a building and infrastructure development project involve the submission of different types of prescribed plans, such as general building plans (GBP), foundation plans, superstructure plans, site formation plans, drainage plans, demolition plans, and excavation and lateral support plans, etc. The Authority is committed to adopting a totally positive attitude towards building and infrastructure development. Its mission is to facilitate building and construction professionals in the approval process whilst ensuring public safety and health. With a view to enhancing efficiency, the Authority has already adopted a **curtailed and fundamental checking system** in the plan approval process, in which non-fundamental issues will not be checked and will not be raised as disapproval items. The AP/RSE/RGE would thus ensure that all non-fundamental issues have fully complied with the relevant regulations and codes of practice before the commencement of the works.

A centralized processing system (CPS) is also adopted for building plans to ensure that all interested government departments are consulted and their comments on private development proposals are collated by the Authority within the time limits allowed for processing building plans. The system also serves the purpose of making the Authority a focal point where issues arising from private building or infrastructure development can be suitably scrutinized.

Notwithstanding the above streamlined measures and the timelines specified under the relevant regulations, GBP submission often had to be withdrawn and re-submitted a few times before obtaining the Authority's approval. The submission process has to be reiterated for several months, thereby taking up much precious delivery time to the development³. GBP approval would normally go through the following procedures:-

- (a) The Authorized Person (AP) making a submission to the Authority;
- (b) The Authority's internal checking and arranging inter-departmental review through the CPS;
- (c) Arrange meetings as needed to discuss the submission;
- (d) The Authority approve the GBP or reject the submission with reasons; and
- (e) The AP would make a re-submission to the Authority for further consideration and/or approval.

³ It must however be recognized that these iteration processes are unavoidable in order to uphold the objective of protecting public safety and health requirements under the relevant regulations.

The approval process would usually take around 6 to 8 months and more time would be needed for large-scale or complicated projects.

Furthermore, according to PNAP ADM 19, AP/RSE/RGE may submit a written pre-submission enquiry to facilitate early clearance of basic design principles before formal submission of prescribed plans, and BD may hold pre-submission conferences to discuss and examine the issues and principles involved. It is acknowledged that such services offered by BD would facilitate building professionals to prepare their design submissions thereby avoiding abortive work. However, it is noticed that such service has not been quite widely utilized nor extended to other relevant departments.

At the early stage of a project, it is not uncommon that site-specific ground investigation (GI) information is not yet available due to the time required to arrange GI; which may also be delayed due to land availability. Nonetheless, ground conditions can sometimes or fairly often be inferred from previous GI conducted on the same site or in the vicinity of the concerned site. However, these previous GI information were often not accepted for submission purpose.

Furthermore, under the current regime, some other departments such as Lands LandsD would withhold processing some development related submissions such as Tree Felling application until GBP approval by the Building Authority (BA) has been obtained possibly for reasons that changes in GBP will correspondingly affect the other submissions. Though there could be rationale behind such withholding, the sites may be left in an idle situation even if the foundation, site formation and ELS plans were approved since the trees cannot be felled yet. Such sequential processing arrangements would unavoidably prolong the critical path of actual construction commencement after GBP approvals, which in turn would cause undesirable delay to the development. This effect is more significant for sites in the rural areas.

When the construction of a new private building or part of it is completed, the AP will submit a form BA13 together with the requisite certificates, record plans and schedules to the BA for the request of inspections for the issuance of an Occupation Permit (OP), certifying that the new building is structurally safe and has been erected in accordance with the approved GBP. On the other hand, a Certificate of Compliance (CC) is issued by LandsD if it is satisfied that all the obligations imposed in the conditions of the land grant for a lot have been complied with. Before obtaining the OP, various certificates or licenses (such as, Water Connection Advice from WSD before FSD inspection, EMSD Lift Inspection before FSD inspection, the fire certificates issued by FSD, etc.) would also be required. As such, any review on streamlining the submission and approval process must also cover these relevant authorities.

Nevertheless, under the current practice, the project AP would submit CC application after the relevant OP was issued by BD, as LandsD has administratively included securing OP as a pre-requisite for processing of CC application. Such sequential application arrangements unnecessarily lengthen the lead time for the issuance of CC.

3.2 Recommendations

HKIE has observed the below-listed areas of improvement to further streamline the submission and approval processes:-

- a. Adopt parallel processing arrangements instead of sequential ones, so as to shorten the critical path for project implementation;
- b. Review critically and trim any unnecessary, redundant or duplicative procedural steps with little added values;
- c. Use **the framework of “Pre-application Consultation’ and “Draft Statutory Submission Vetting’ steps of GBP approval** so that the project proponent may request workshops with the authorities for the presentation of their design concept of the proposed development and for exchange of views on the major areas of concerns. The latter step could also allow the authorities to give early advice to the project proponent before the formal submission to supplement the collaborative approach as proposed in Section 2.2(c) above. Again this approach should only be limited to those large-scale and complicated developments.
- d. Promote the wider use of the pre-submission conferences. Also, invite other relevant Government departments to take part in the conferences in order to take full benefit of the pre-submission engagement process. Once the major principles are established, building professionals can develop the design scheme for formal submission. In the design development process, workshops or presentations with the Authority and relevant government departments will be useful for project proponents to explain the design concepts and constraints in more detail. These workshops will facilitate government officers to expedite the checking of the submissions, in particular for large-scale complicated developments.
- e. Consider granting conditional approval when ground conditions can be inferred from previous GI information conducted on the same site or in the vicinity of the concerned site. In fact, fairly often, design principles and fundamental issues can be discussed and agreed based on some preliminary ground models developed from available information, allowing the Authority to grant conditional approval. Certainly, the respective AP or RGE shall exercise professional judgement to determine those previous GI information are reliable or not; for instance too old data may be less reliable in view of the techniques in old days. The assumed ground conditions can later be verified by confirmatory GI when actual construction starts and such information is available.
- f. Process tree felling proposal in parallel with the vetting and approval of GBPs. Approval of tree felling proposal will be allowed without the pre-requisite of GBPs’ approval. The benefit of this measure would be more significant in rural development where no scarce tree species exist within sites.

4. EXPEDITE THE PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS USING NEW PROJECT DELIVERY MODEL

4.1 Current Practice

Under the current practice or regime of delivering public housing projects, Government provided formed land with infrastructures for Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) to carry out the building works. In most cases, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) is responsible for carrying out site formation and associated infrastructure works, and subsequently hands over the site to the (HKHA⁴) for building works and associated civil and geotechnical works within the site boundary. Site development projects of CEDD typically go through the phases of Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS), Investigation, Design and Construction. In the EFS Phase, a preliminary design would be developed and assessments of various impacts of the development, e.g. traffic, environmental, drainage and sewerage, would be prepared for vetting by the corresponding authorities. In the Investigation Phase, CEDD will fine tune the preliminary design and carry out the various gazettal preparation work where necessary. In parallel with the Investigation Phase, the Planning Department will carry out public consultation and the various statutory planning procedures, including submission to Town Planning Board, OZP amendment, etc. The Design and Construction Phases for site formation and infrastructure works will take typically 5 years⁵. Upon handover of the site to HKHA, it takes another 5 years to complete works for the housing development. Hence, with this sequential delivery model, it takes at least 10 years from site formation design to population intake.

It is, however, not uncommon that HKHA would modify a site formed by CEDD to suit its subsequent building design development needs. Some examples: (i) CEDD fills up a platform whilst Housing Department (HD) would need to dig down for foundation works or basement construction; (ii) CEDD carries out substantial permanent geotechnical works for a hillside site, such as bored pile walls for retaining the uphill while the necessary support can structurally be taken up by screen walls of the future housing development by HKHA; (iii) The site platform layout of a hillside site formed by CEDD would need to be modified to suit the latest revised building blocks layout by HKHA. Furthermore, it is recognized that HKHA's construction activities could not commence until CEDD completes its works and handover the site to HKHA on contractual liability reasons (though phased handover can be and had been arranged for large sites already). If such contractual liability issues can be removed, much building works activities (e.g. foundation works of buildings) can be carried out in tandem with remaining site formation works with suitable site planning and management.

⁴ Housing Department (HD) is the executive arm of HKHA.

⁵ About 2 years design with about 3 years construction.

4.2 Recommendations

The above examples demonstrate that there are rooms to streamline the housing development process from site formation to building construction to save time and cost. For sites where the site formation can be easily demarcated from the associated infrastructure works or the infrastructure works are not significant, we **recommend that upon completion of the Investigation Phase, the sites can be handed over to a single party to handle the housing development from site formation design and construction to completion of the development.**

With a view to shortening the critical path for project implementation and reducing the overall construction cost, the current practice of splitting the works to different departments⁶ could be reviewed and streamlined. We **recommend that a new public housing project delivery model, which aims at adopting parallel planning, design and construction arrangements thus enhancing coordination of inter-departmental issues**, should be explored and adopted to expedite the development as well as achieving overall cost saving.

One possible scenario is Government can consider selecting some suitable sites and split them to be **wholly taken up by either CEDD or HD** (HKHA's executive arm) **from Design phase (or even Investigation phase) onward**. With this arrangement, the site formation and building works can be implemented by one single department (hence consultant and contractor) such that certain activities can be carried out in tandem. Secondment of suitable architectural and engineering professionals and inspectorate staff can be arranged to suit needs.

Another possible scenario is by making reference to the former New Airport Projects Coordination Office or Territory Development Department (which is now merged with CEDD) and the Hongkong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Project Management Office, where a high-level project office is formed and to act as a lead agent to oversee a multi-disciplinary team to perform all the housing development related activities, from investigation phase till buildings completion. The completed buildings are then handed over to HKHA for population intake. The project team members can be drawn by secondment from various government departments, as and when necessary including CEDD, HD, etc. with support from the appointed consultants and contractor to sort out numerous technical and interfacing issues (between site formation and superstructure works) during implementation.

By doing this, we believe that the overall duration and cost of delivery of a public housing project could be substantially reduced. It is expected that the total construction time under this single entity scenario could be grossly less than 8 years. It must however be

⁶ It is recognized there are distinct functions vested and restriction bounded on the HKHA under the Housing Ordinance.

emphasized that not all sites are suitable for adopting this model, for example most sites in NDA or those requiring reclamation which requires substantial infrastructure works.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For any large-scale housing and infrastructure projects, the current statutory and administrative processes require a lengthy period from concept to project delivery. Many studies have focused on the upstream statutory processes including town planning, public consultation, land grant, etc. This Paper has put its focus on the downstream processes for both private and public housing and infrastructure development.

For private development projects, all plan submissions shall be approved by the Authority prior to the commencement of works. Yet, such submission processes can be hindered by a combination of issues including time commitment on comments from other government departments, difficulty in the application of new design and innovative concepts and the use of new materials not listed on the Central Data Bank. In order to provide a clear timeframe for the approval process, the proposed recommendation is to consider assigning **an entity to act as the overall centralised processing department for the submissions** while imposing a **common timeframe for all other government departments and public utilities** in responding to the plan submissions.

In order to smoothen the statutory process, a **“Draft Statutory Submission Vetting” step** through conducting a series of workshops is recommended for early consultation with the Authority before formal submission to identify all technical issues and to agree on principles of resolution such that the submissions can be approved with other department consultation being running in parallel to minimize the chance of prolongation of the process. A **collaborative approach** is also proposed throughout the formal submission process, particularly for those large-scale or complicated developments, between the project proponent and the Authority to expedite the approval as well as acceptance inspection process with a view to minimize or avoid resubmissions with possible means.

It is also recommended that upon obtaining first approval, project proponents shall be allowed to **make minor amendments for construction without need of prior approval and consent** provided that the original approved design principles and construction methodologies are complied with. For check and balance, project proponents are required to obtain final approval for all these amendments before certifying completion of the building works. **Tree felling application and approval** shall also be processed before GBP approval.

The concept of encouraging the officers of relevant Authority for **undertaking a facilitating role for buildings or development projects** in fair and open manner while discharging the statutory regulatory or checking duties without compromising any safety and quality requirements should be promoted. Bureaux and Heads of Department should clearly advise this to their officers to ease their worry on being complained later on offering privilege.

With respect to public housing development, the current practice of having development sites first formed by CEDD prior to handing over to HKHA for housing development can be streamlined to reduce the time and cost of the development. **Suitable development**

sites can be selected and handed over to one entity after the Investigation Phase such that it handles the housing development from site formation design and construction to completion of the development. **A new public housing project delivery model,** involving setting up a high-level project office to act as a lead agent to oversee a multi-disciplinary team and coordinate inter-departmental issues with sufficient authority and efficiency, is proposed to expedite development with overall cost savings.

END

6. REFERENCES

- i. Legislative Council Panel on Development (LC Paper No. CB(1)78/2022(02)), Legislative Proposals to Streamline Development-related Statutory Processes, 22 March 2022
- ii. HKIE, Views from the HKIE on the Legislative Proposals to Streamline Development-related Statutory Processes, 15 June 2022