

URBAN PLANNING AND  
**ENVIRONMENTAL LAW**  
**QUARTERLY**

商 家 雙 律 師 行 · 城 規 環 保 簡 訊

**The Mai Po wetlands** are of indisputable importance to the regional and world environment. In particular, various species of migratory birds, including endangered species, depend on Mai Po as a nesting (and resting) place. On behalf of the world, Hong Kong is the trustee of the ecological health and ultimate survival of Mai Po.

In the feature article of this quarter's Report we raise the question of the adequacy of "buffer zones" for the protection of the fragile ecological system of Mai Po. We offer a brief comparison with the approach of another developed country - the United States - to the critical need for strict control of human activity on land surrounding wild-life reserves. We also question the ability and resolve of planning authorities (and their appellate bodies) to conduct effective environmental assessments of development proposals in this ecologically damaged and sensitive region.

**The Editors**

· CONTENTS ·

**Page**

FEATURE: Mai Po Marshes - Creating Effective 'Buffer Zones' .....	1
LEGISLATION DIGEST .....	4
HONG KONG BRIEFING .....	5
Environment and Public Health .....	5
Planning and Land Use .....	5
PADS UPDATE .....	5
CASE LAW UPDATE .....	6
PROSECUTION	
STATISTICS .....	8
ABBREVIATIONS .....	8

**"Mai Po Marshes - Creating  
 Effective 'Buffer Zones'"**

On the 6th March, 1995 the Government, after two years of formal consideration, agreed to nominate a 1500 hectare area of the Mai Po Marshes as a Reserve under the Ramsar Convention. (The Convention (1971), is aimed at international co-operation for the protection of the world's critical wetlands. It was extended to Hong Kong in 1979. China adopted the Convention in 1992).

The entire Mai Po wetlands (which are a vital part of the larger wetlands system of Inner Deep Bay), are of critical importance to the survival of many species of northern hemisphere migratory birds, as well as numerous other indigenous wildlife species. Regrettably, the Ramsar nomination will not necessarily

ensure the long-term survival of Mai Po's wetlands ecology. The area to be designated is not large; it is not a self-contained wilderness, the integrity of which is dependent only upon what happens within its own boundaries. Therefore the ecological health of Mai Po is likely to be determined to a significant extent by the effectiveness of the "buffer zones" between the designated reserve and human activities on surrounding land.

The Government has created two Buffer Zones around Deep Bay. Buffer Zone 1, of 948 ha, permits (by consent) new development only if it is considered necessary to maintain the conservation of the area's environment. Buffer Zone 2, of 1027 ha, contemplates (subject to consent) development which is compatible with the aims of the

Deep Bay Environmental Management Area (including Mai Po) as designated by the Deep Bay Integrated Environmental Study Group - 1988), that is, development which will have no significant impact on the Deep Bay environment. Any development is also subject to the more detailed Outline Zoning Plans (1994).

However, in environmental terms there is no real distinction between the buffer zones and other contiguous areas. What is allowed to take place in the formal Buffer Zone 2 and other surrounding land which is sufficiently close to Mai Po potentially to affect the Reserve (in the ecological sense) will be just as important to Mai Po's survival as the management of the Reserve itself. Early indications give cause for concern in that regard, particularly after the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Henderson Land Development Ltd. v Town Planning Board* (April 1995).

That decision allows Henderson Land to proceed with a H.K.\$2 billion residential and golf course development at Nam Sang Wei, which is within Buffer Zone 2. [The Town Planning Board had rejected Henderson Land's earlier proposals, and the current proposal. The Town Planning Appeal Board overturned that decision. Its decision was upheld by the Court of Appeal]. Henderson Land have offered to provide nature reserves and to restore certain degraded fish ponds within the designated Mai Po Buffer Zone as a trade off for any environmental ill effects resulting from their development.

Leaving aside consideration of the grounds for the Court's decision (and resisting analytical comment on the court's views and understanding of the vital importance of maintaining the ecological integrity of the Marshes) there is no doubt the decision is critically important to the preservation of the Mai Po Marshes.

The Henderson Land project alone will mean many more people living in an area immediately adjacent to Mai Po, plus the loss of habitat (actual or fringe) to make way for buildings and the proposed golf course. However, it would be misleading to consider only the anticipated *direct* environmental effects of the subject development. An objective, realistic assessment of environmental impacts must take into account the anticipated *cumulative* effects of the subject development together with existing, and likely future developments, within the regional environment in question.

On this point, it is important to bear in mind that the Inner Deep Bay wetlands include man-made fishponds. Traditionally, these have been considered to have no real ecological value (and were referred to as having "no intrinsic value" by one of the judges in *Henderson Land*). However, the most recent studies indicate that the ponds system is so well established that it now forms an "integral part of the Inner Deep Bay wetland system", supporting numerous species of fauna (see: Wing Hing Chu, "Fish Ponds in the Ecology of the Inner Deep Bay Wetlands of Hong Kong": (1995) 3 *Asian Journal of Environmental Management* 13).

In recent years, huge areas of these ponds have been lost to the cause of development. For example, 450 ha were reclaimed for Tin Shui Wai New Town. As well, extensive illegal reclamation for container storage has occurred - (Wing Hing Chu, p.13). It is the *cumulative* effects of these habitat losses, and actual and proposed developments which must be taken into account when assessing any development proposal sited in the Inner Deep Bay wetlands system (but, particularly, any proposal for Buffer Zone 2).

*The Court of Appeal's green light for Henderson Land is likely to encourage other companies to proceed with their own development plans for the Mai Po Buffer Zone 2 (and/or immediately adjacent areas).*

The Court of Appeal's green light for Henderson Land is likely to encourage other companies to proceed with their own development plans for the Mai Po Buffer Zone 2 (and/or immediately adjacent areas). There are currently at least five such proposals before the Town Planning Appeal Board. The Henderson Land decision, whilst based on the individual facts and merits of that particular proposal, is likely to

strengthen the position of those appellants. Therefore, there is little doubt that considerable further development (presumably residential) will occur within Buffer Zone 2. So what? - might well be the historical response from the majority of Hong Kong's community.

The Mai Po Marshes represent the very last sizeable example of the region's wetlands. In other areas of adjoining Guangdong Province, wetlands have been virtually obliterated by frenetic development over the last fifteen years or so; e.g. Shenzhen municipality was once a wetlands area, rich in wild life diversity. Of all the categories of wild-life habitat, wetlands are probably the most ravaged (and threatened) throughout the world. After all, until recently it was universally considered good sense to fill in "useless" swamps in order to build supermarkets, housing estates and factories.

Unquestionably, Mai Po is of international, not merely regional, ecological importance. Thousands

of migratory birds each year rely on the marshes as a critical feeding and rest area. At any one time in the migration season more than 60,000 birds, of numerous species, rest at Mai Po. And that is just one of the important ecological functions of the Marshes.

The Government's eventual recognition of the importance of Mai Po Marshes to the world's environment, by way of the Ramsar nomination, underscores their unique position in Hong Kong's environment.

Whilst that designation should at least help to protect the nucleus of the Marshes (as long as Hong Kong accepts the Convention), there remains the question of the effects of activity on surrounding lands, including the official Buffer Zone 2. It is submitted that to allow development of any significant scale - certainly of the scale and kind contemplated by Henderson Land and others - is, environmental folly. Interspersing small nature reserves, or sanctuaries, with relatively high density human occupation will do little to preserve the ecological integrity of the Marshes and the surrounding areas of wild-life habitat.

By way of comparison, it is recognized in the United States (and other Western countries) that effective buffer zones are critically important for protection of national parks. The concentration of human activity in the United States is less than in Hong Kong, and their parks and other national reserve areas are, of course, massive in comparison to Mai Po: (the U.S. National Parks System - which does not include public lands under the care of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management - includes about 360 parks comprising more than 80 million

acres). Yet, they specifically legislate for protective buffer zones, where large scale developments, like Henderson Land's proposal, or a combination of small developments with like effect, are prohibited.

For example, the legislation which created the *Jean Laffitte National Historic Park* [16 USC ss.230 et seq.] established a "park protection zone" surrounding the Park, in respect of which strict development criteria apply. Another example is the *Chaco Culture National Historic Park Act* [16 USC ss.410 et seq.] which requires the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with surrounding landowners for the purpose of preserving the historical and archeological integrity of the entire ecological region - not just the area within the park boundaries.

Additionally, there are various general statutes, such as the *National Environmental Policy Act*, the *Federal Land Policy and Management Act* and the *Multiple-use Sustained Yield Act*, which require government agencies to consider the environmental effect on nature reserves of activities conducted in *adjacent* areas.

Apart from general environmental statutes, and specific statutes creating nature reserves, the *U.S. National Parks Service (NPS) Organic Act* [16 USC S.1] requires the NPS to administer national parks to "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects, and the wildlife ---- in such a manner and by such means as will leave them *unimpaired for future generations*" (emphasis added). To date, American courts have not gone so far as to rule that this provision means that the NPS *must* set aside land, beyond Park boundaries, as dedicated buffer zones.

The common law of America is also relevant to this issue. American courts have developed the *public trust* doctrine as part of their environmental common law. Under this doctrine the NPS, as *trustee* of nature reserves for present *and* future generations of Americans, has a general duty (to the people) to do *whatever* it can to *preserve* those reserves for the benefit of the people.

In *Siera Club v. Department of Interior* 398 F.Supp 284 (N.D. Cal.1975) a Federal District Court ruled that the doctrine was wide enough to require the Secretary of the Interior (the ultimate head of the NPS) to do *everything possible* to provide buffer zone protection for all parks, even to the extent of acquiring surrounding land where the park is threatened by activities on that land. In effect, the NPS (the Secretary) was mandated to do whatever it could to protect the integrity of the park. Admittedly, with the recent shift to the right in American politics, it is doubtful that the courts today would take the public trust doctrine that far.

Even with these apparently strict "buffer zone" laws, significant damage has been inflicted on all NPS parks, including destruction of wild life and its habitat, as a result of activities external to the park boundaries, according to testimony of the Chairman of the Congressional Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public lands before the House of Representatives, (3 January 1994). It is worth noting that the single biggest external cause of damage was (and remains) "urban encroachment". In his testimony, the Chairman observed:

"Problems resulting from urban encroachment, such as residential, commercial, and industrial development at or

near park boundaries, were the most frequently reported threats. For example, at Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado, the park managers stated that *construction of housing and a golf course adjacent to the park's boundaries had a negative impact on wild life habitat, scenic views, and the visitors' ability to experience the wilderness environment*" (emphasis added).

In the case of the Mai Po Reserve, the Government's generally pro-development attitude and, now, the opening of the door by the Court of Appeal to large scale development within Buffer Zone 2, make it more likely that the designated (and non-designated) Mai Po Buffer Zones will be ineffective in preventing direct impacts on the Reserve from adjacent human activity. And experience throughout the world has shown that there is no single, greater danger to the health of wild life and their habitat than the pressure of people, even well-intentioned people, carving out their urban society in close proximity!

## Digest of LEGISLATION

### WASTE DISPOSAL

**Waste Disposal Ordinance (Amendment of Schedules) Notice 1995** (L.S. No.2 to GAZETTE No. 29/1995 dated 21st July 1995/L.N. 326 of 1995 P B1472) This Notice is to rectify errors made in references to maps referred to and specified as livestock waste prohibition areas, livestock waste control areas and livestock waste restriction areas under the Waste Disposal Ordinance. (Cap.354)

### WATER

**Water Pollution Control (Victoria Harbour (Phase Two) Water Control Zone)**

**(Appointed Days) Order** (L.S. No. 2 to GAZETTE No. 30/1995 dated 28th July 1995 / L.N. 356 of 1995 P B1606) This Order is to introduce the controls imposed by the Water Pollution Control Ordinance (Cap. 358) to the Victoria Harbour (Phase Two) Water Control Zone :-

(i) Section 7(2) of the Ordinance empowers the Governor to appoint a date by reference to which discharges or deposits shall be classified as existing discharges or deposits under the Ordinance.

(ii) Section 7(3) empowers the Governor to appoint a date on and after which all existing discharges or deposits are prohibited unless licensed under the Ordinance.

(iii) Any discharge or deposit made after the date appointed under Section 7(2) of the Ordinance will be classified as a new discharge or deposit and from that day shall be prohibited under Sections 8(1)(a) and (b) and 9 unless specifically licensed under the Ordinance.

**Statement of Water Quality Objectives (Victoria Harbour (Phase Two) Water Control Zone)** (L.S. No. 2 to GAZETTE No.30/1995 dated 28th July 1995 / L.N. 357 of 1995 P. B1608) This Statement sets out the established water quality objectives of the Victoria harbour (Phase Two) Water Control Zone.

### SHIPPING

**Merchant Shipping (Control of Pollution by Noxious Liquid Substances in Bulk) (Amendment) Regulation 1995** (L.S. No. 2 to GAZETTE No. 21 of 1995 dated 26th May 1995/ L.N. 186 of 1995 P. B688) This Regulation amends the Merchant Shipping (Control of Pollution by Noxious liquid Substances in Bulk) Regulations (Cap. 413 sub. leg.) to reflect

the recent amendments to Annex II of MARPOL 1973/78 adopted by the Marine Environment Protection Committee of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the introduction of new editions of the IBC Code and the BCH Code by IMO.

**Merchant Shipping (Prevention and Control of Pollution) (Charges for Discharge of Polluting Waste) Regulation** (L.S. No. 2 to GAZETTE No. 28/1995 dated 14th July 1995/L.N. 320 of 1995 P. B1454) This Regulation prescribes the charges payable to the Director of Marine and the procedures for the use of reception facilities provided by the Chemical Waste Treatment Centre for the purpose of discharging polluting waste from sea-going ships. [Note : the Secretary for Economic Services appointed 1st August 1995 as the day on which the Regulation shall come into operation under Merchant Shipping (Prevention and Control of Pollution) (Charges for Discharge of Polluting Waste) Regulation (L.N. 320 of 1995) (Commencement) Notice 1995 (L.S. No. 2 to GAZETTE No. 29/1995 dated 21st July 1995/L.N. 352 of 1995 P. B1592).

**Nuclear Material (Liability for Carriage) Ordinance 1995** (Ord. No. 45 of 1995 L.S. No. 1 to GAZETTE No.24/1995 dated 16th June 1995 P. A1032) This Ordinance is to regulate liability in respect of injury or property damage caused by the carriage of nuclear material in Hong Kong. It imposes a duty on :-

(i) the relevant operators to secure that no occurrence taking place wholly or partly within Hong Kong causes injury to any person or damage to any property of any person other than that operator.

(ii) the other persons carrying

nuclear material or causing nuclear material to be carried to secure that no occurrence involving that nuclear material causes injury to any person or damage to any property of any person other than the responsible party.

(This Digest covers Legal Supplements to the GAZETTE Nos. 21 and 28 - 30 of 1995.)

## HONG KONG Briefing

### ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC HEALTH

**A DEVELOPER** faces prosecution after flouting police and government stop-work orders and continuing to bulldoze Tai Long Wan beach in Sai Kung. The bulldozer belongs to Master Choice Development, which has said it intends to develop an outdoor, recreation resort on village land adjoining the beach. It began preliminary work on public land without government permission. (SCMP 22nd April 1995)

**THE WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE (WWF)** urged the Government to speed up its efforts to complete the process for designation of the Mai Po Marshes as a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention. WWF criticised the Government for delaying the application process, which must be sent via authorities in Britain to the Ramsar bureau in Switzerland. (EE 28th April 1995)

**SECRETARY FOR PLANNING, ENVIRONMENT AND LANDS** Bowen Leung has dismissed accusations that heavy waste-disposal charges have compelled manufactures to lay off workers. The catering and bleaching industries have slammed the government for

imposing the heavy charges which they say have forced them to shut down business or move to the mainland, rendering hundreds of workers unemployed. (EE 20th May 1995)

### PLANNING AND LAND USE

**VILLAGERS** said yesterday they blamed the Government for forcing them to accept a proposed resort development project at Tai Long Wan, one of Hong Kong's last unspoiled beaches. An outdoor recreation and sports centre is planned for the shores of the beach. (SCMP 24th April 1995)

**THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY** has thrown its support behind proposals to curb further reclamation in Victoria Harbour. Opponents of the massive reclamation programme now plan to introduce a private member's bill in the Legislative Council to make the harbour a protected zone. (SCMP 24th April 1995)

**THE GOVERNMENT** has lost its final attempt to save the area around Mai Po Marshes from developers. A High Court ruling yesterday paves the way for a \$2 billion golf course and luxury housing scheme. The ambitious development was twice dismissed by the Town Planning Board but the decision was overturned by the independent Town Planning Appeal Board. In a High Court challenge this month the Planning Board claimed it was illegal for the appeal board to allow developers to destroy the fishponds. Counsel Audrey Eu Q.C. said planning rules demanded that changes to the area should protect its ecological importance which centred on the ponds. But Mr. Justice Yam threw out the application for judicial review and said the fish ponds were not "of intrinsic importance". (SCMP 29th April 1995)

### NEW TERRITORIES

clansmen yesterday seized their former village from a property developer in the climax to a 15 years dispute over the sale of Sha Lo Tung. Sha Lo Tung was sold to a property syndicate. Sha Lo Tung Development Company in 1979 and was intended to be developed as a golf course and country club. But environmental objections have since put the project on hold and the developers have refused to meet their commitment to re-house the villagers nearby. (EE 20th May 1995)

### "PADS" UPDATE

**GREEN GROUPS** had a minor victory over the Government, in respect of its Lantau port development plans, when the Government ruled out a proposal to quarry rocks from a hill on Lantau Island. The proposed reclamation at Penny's Bay, for which the rocks were to be used, will be filled by marine sand instead. One of the reasons for the change is that the old proposal would cause too much air pollution. However, Green groups are still nervous about the effect on the removal of so much sand will have on marine life. (SCMP 29/4/95)

**STEPS** have been taken in the diverse projects under the Hong Kong Airport Core Programme aimed at minimizing the impact of construction, especially in air and water quality as well as in noise levels. Special assessments of environmental impact are carried out in the planning and design stages of each project. If necessary, some remedial measures are then taken to minimize the impact to an acceptable level. The Programmes Environmental Project Office has done some good work in this regard in both West Kowloon and Kwai Tsing. The Office is managed by

environmental experts, who supervise environmental monitoring of the construction phases of projects and co-ordinate any environmental remedies if necessary. Additionally, a public complaints hotline is in operation. Landscaping work will be carried out where required on completion of projects. Efforts in marine conservation include the establishment of a dolphin sanctuary near the island of Sha Chau, off Chek Lap Kok, to protect the Chinese white dolphins. (Young Post 5/5/95)

**THE PROVISIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY** announced that all the blasting works at Chek Lap Kok will be finished in June this year. Then, the island will be completely transformed into a platform for the Hong Kong's new airport. The construction programme was now ahead of schedule and contractors had formed 95 per cent of the 1,248 hectare site. The foundations for the passenger terminal complex will also be completed in early June. Construction of the airport's traffic control tower also commenced recently. (SCMP 11/5/95)

**THE HONG KONG GOVERNMENT** has told the Chinese Government that the new Chek Lap Kok airport will not open until at least early 1998. Hong Kong officials have refused to confirm whether the airport would be ready on July 1, 1997 - a target set by the British Government to mark the handover of sovereignty. A senior mainland official said that he had been informed by the British Government that the timetable for the whole project could only be formulated after the signing of the financial support agreements for the airport and airport railway projects. (SCMP22/6/95)

**THE HONG KONG**

**GOVERNMENT** and green groups have a joint plan to prevent the wholesale destruction of delicate marine life in the eastern waters of Hong Kong. The existing development and reclamation pressures have forced the government to find a new source of landfill. In the past, Mirs Bay and the eastern waters were at the top of the hit list because of the easily accessible sand deposits present throughout the area. More than a million cubic metres of sand was required for various public construction works and the dredging would inevitably destroy the region's extensive coral beds. A compromise was reached between the Government and green groups by which the Government promised that most of the sand to be used in future projects will come from sources in other countries, such as China, in order to limit further damage to the territory's marine environment. (SCMP22/6/95)

## CASELAW UPDATE

Wheeler and Another v J.J. Saunders Ltd. and Others (1995)  
Times 3 January (Court of Appeal, England)

Town planning - grant of permission to enlarge existing piggery - consequential increased smell from piggery - grant of permission did not confer immunity from liability in private nuisance.

The defendants were granted planning permission by the relevant planning authority to intensify their pig farming operations. This resulted in increased offensive smells to which two of the defendants' neighbours, Dr. Wheeler and his wife, objected. They brought an action for private nuisance, and succeeded at first instance.

The defendants (appellants) argued that their piggery was operated in accordance with the planning approval and that, accordingly, they could not be liable in private nuisance for the effects (such as obnoxious smells) which resulted.

The Court of Appeal rejected that argument. In his judgment, Staughton L.J. observed that until recently there had been no direct authority on the point. He referred to Allen v. Gulf Oil Refining Ltd. [1981] AC 101 in which the House of Lords decided that where Parliament authorised the construction and use of certain works, that authorisation conferred immunity from a claim in nuisance with respect to the effects of those works. Their Lordships, however, did not equate planning permission with specific statutory authorisation. In the same case, when it was before the Court of Appeal, Cumming Bruce L.J. stated that planning permission would *not* ordinarily confer such immunity, as the planning authority "has no jurisdiction to authorise a nuisance", except "(if at all) in so far as it has statutory power to permit the change of the character of a neighbourhood".

Staughton L.J. also cited Gillingham Council v Medway Dock Co [1993] QB 343 in which Buckley J. held that planning approval gave the defendant an immunity from an action in *public* nuisance (in respect of the approved activities/development). Buckley J. ruled that "only a nuisance inevitably resulting from the authorised works" came within the immunity. The *nuisance* was to be measured by reference "to a neighbourhood with that development or use" as part of it, i.e. in the context of the *changed character* of the neighbourhood. However, in this case Staughton L.J. concluded that it would be a

"misuse" of language to describe the approval of increased piggery operations as "a change in the *character* of the neighbourhood". There was, therefore, no immunity (from an action in nuisance) incidental to the planning approval in this instance.

Peter Gibson LJ agreed with the result reached by Staughton LJ (as did the third judge, Sir John May) but on slightly different grounds. He agreed, however, that the test for immunity from action which was applied in Gillingham was whether the subject planning approval changed the *character* of the neighbourhood as a whole, so that the complained of activity could no longer be said to be an unreasonable use of land in that neighbourhood. He noted that Gillingham concerned planning permission for a very large development, and, therefore, in the *public interest* it would be inappropriate to grant an injunction stopping the approved activity on the ground of the consequential *nuisance* it created. His Lordship did not accept that the principle applied in Gillingham would necessarily

apply to every planning decision, and he warned that courts should be slow to agree to the extinction of private rights (i.e. causes of action) by administrative decisions.

**Commentary**

It is likely Hong Kong courts would follow Wheeler so that unless the statute conferring jurisdiction on the relevant planning authority expressly provides that activities carried out in conformity with the conditions of planning approval cannot be the basis of a claim in of migratory birds each year rely on the marshes as a nuisance, which is *not* presently the case in Hong Kong, the holder of the planning approval remains potentially liable to his neighbours in nuisance (and, presumably, trespass and Rylands v Fletcher) even if he complies strictly with the approval conditions. However, if the approval was *intra vires* the authority's powers (the authority being, usually, the Town Planning Board) and the approved project effectively changed the *character* of the subject neighbourhood (which is

a matter of fact) then the court will assess the "nuisance value" of the complained of activity within the context of the *changed character* of the neighbourhood. It follows that compliance with the land-use terms of a Crown lease would not, per se, be a defence to an action in nuisance.

This case does not, of course, open up new avenues of action against creators of a nuisance - such as factories which discharge, or allow to leach, pollutants onto neighbours' land, or into public sewers or waterways. However, the decision (if followed by Hong Kong courts) does remove any doubt (insofar as the vagaries of case-law allows that) as to any supposed legitimacy conferred by planning approval on otherwise nuisance - category activities, subject to the exception of an activity or development which is so large as to change the *character* of the neighbourhood to such an extent as to render the complained of activity *reasonable* and, therefore, not a *nuisance*.

**This report does not constitute advice of a legal nature. Whilst all effort has been made to ensure completeness and accuracy at the time of publication, no responsibility is accepted for errors or omissions. Further information, inquiries and advice in respect of this report should be directed to:**

**HONG KONG**

**FRED KAN & CO.**  
*Solicitors & Notaries*

31/F., Central Plaza  
18 Harbour Road  
Hong Kong

Telephone: (852) 2598 1318  
Facsimile: (852) 2588 1318

**CANADA**

**Smith, Lyons, Torrance, Stevenson & Mayer**  
*Barristers & Solicitors*

Suite 6200, Scotia Plaza  
40 King Street West  
Toronto, Canada M5H 3Z7

Telephone: (416) 369 7200  
Facsimile: (416) 369 7250

World Trade Centre  
Suite 550-999 Canada Place  
Vancouver, Canada V6C 3C8  
Telephone: (604) 662 8082  
Facsimile: (604) 685 8542

**UNITED KINGDOM**

**IRWIN MITCHELL**  
**SOLICITORS**

St. Peter's House  
Hartshead  
Sheffield S1 2 EL  
United Kingdom  
Telephone: (742) 767 777  
Facsimile: (742) 753 306

190 Corporation Street  
Birmingham B4 6QD  
Telephone: (21) 212 1828  
Facsimile: (21) 212 2265

URBAN PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL LAW QUARTERLY

Comparative Table of Environmental Convictions:  
April - June 1995

	Number	1st Offence	2nd Offence	3rd + Offence	Highest Fine
APCO	10	5	3	2	\$ 25,000
	13	5	1	7	\$ 50,000
	16	10	3	3	\$ 20,000
WPCO	15	13	2	0	\$ 60,000
	25	19	3	3	\$ 60,000
	28	18	5	5	\$ 100,000
NCO	13	10	1	2	\$ 50,000
	13	6	5	2	\$ 175,000
	16	12	2	2	\$ 35,000
OLPO	3	3	-	-	\$ 25,000
	-	-	-	-	-
	1	1	-	-	\$ 10,000
DASO	-	-	-	-	-
	1	1	-	-	\$ 5,000
	2	2	-	-	\$ 2,500
WDO	11	11	-	-	\$ 10,000
	5	4	-	1	\$ 30,000
	1	1	-	-	\$ 500
Total	52	42	6	4	
	57	35	9	13	
	64	44	10	10	

ABBREVIATIONS

<b>AFD</b>	Agriculture & Fisheries Department
<b>APCO</b>	Air Pollution Control Ordinance
<b>CFCs</b>	Chlorofluorocarbons
<b>DASO</b>	Dumping At Sea Ordinance
<b>EC</b>	European Community
<b>EE</b>	Estern Express
<b>EPCOM</b>	Environmental Pollution Advisory Committee
<b>EPD</b>	Environmental Protection Department
<b>EXCO</b>	Executive Council
<b>FEER</b>	Far Eastern Economic Review
<b>HKS</b>	Hong Kong Standard
<b>HKU</b>	University of Hong Kong
<b>JLG</b>	Joint Liaise Group
<b>LDC</b>	Land Development Corporation
<b>LEGCO</b>	Legislative Council
<b>LS</b>	Legal Supplement
<b>NCO</b>	Noise Control Ordinance
<b>NT</b>	New Territories
<b>OLPO</b>	Ozone Layer Pollution Ordinance
<b>PAA</b>	Provisional Airport Authority
<b>PADS</b>	Port and Airport Development Strategy
<b>SCMP</b>	South China Morning Post
<b>SMP</b>	Sunday Morning Post
<b>WDO</b>	Waste Disposal Ordinance
<b>WPCO</b>	Water Pollution Control Ordinance

April figures appear on the first line, May figures on the second, and June figures on the third of each item. Source: EPD, Anti-Pollution Prosecution Figures.