

Minutes of the Seventeenth Meeting of the Eastern District Council

Date : 5 March 2019 (Tuesday)

Time : 2:30 pm

Venue : Eastern District Council Conference Room

| <u>Present</u> | <u>Time of Arrival</u> <u>(pm)</u> | <u>Time of Departure</u> <u>(pm)</u> |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| Mr TING Kong-ho, Eddie | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr WONG Chi-chung, Dominic | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr WONG Chun-sing, Patrick | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr KU Kwai-yiu | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr HO Ngai-kam, Stanley | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Ms LI Chun-chau | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr LEE Chun-keung | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr LAM Sum-lim | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr LAM Kei-tung, George | 2:30 | 2:45 |
| Mr SHIU Ka-fai | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr HUNG Lin-cham, MH | 3:50 | end of meeting |
| Mr CHUI Chi-kin | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr CHEUNG Kwok-cheong, Howard | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr LEUNG Siu-sun, Patrick | 2:35 | end of meeting |
| Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, David | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Ms LEUNG Wing-man, Bonnie | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr HUI Lam-hing | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr HUI Ching-on | 2:30 | 3:30 |
| Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Aron, JP | 2:30 | 4:00 |
| Mr MAK Tak-ching | | end of meeting |
| Ms CHIK Kit-ling, Elaine | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr WONG Kin-pan, BBS, MH, JP (Chairman) | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr WONG Kin-hing | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr YEUNG Sze-chun | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Dr CHIU Ka-yin, Andrew | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr CHIU Chi-keung, BBS (Vice-chairman) | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr LAU Hing-yeung | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr CHENG Chi-sing | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr CHENG Tat-hung | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr LAI Chi-keong, Joseph | 2:30 | 4:00 |
| Mr NGAN Chun-lim, MH | 2:30 | end of meeting |
| Mr LO Wing-kwan, Frankie, MH | 3:00 | end of meeting |
| Mr KUNG Pak-cheung, BBS, MH | 2:30 | end of meeting |

Action

Absent with Apologies

Ms CHOY So-yuk, BBS, JP

In Regular Attendance (Government Representatives)

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Mr CHAN Sheung-man, Simon, JP | District Officer (Eastern), Eastern District Office |
| Miss NGAI Lai-ying, Angora | Assistant District Officer (Eastern) 1, Eastern District Office |
| Mr LO Cheuk-lun, Rayson | Assistant District Officer (Eastern) 2, Eastern District Office |
| Mr Rupert Timothy Alan DOVER | District Commander (Eastern District), Hong Kong Police Force |
| Ms LAU Tak-yi | Police Community Relations Officer (Eastern District), Hong Kong Police Force |
| Miss LEE Sin-man | Senior Housing Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands 2) and Management Control, Housing Department |
| Mr LAU Kin-kwok | Chief Transport Officer/Hong Kong, Transport Department |
| Mr TSANG Wing-lok, Gabriel | District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Eastern), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department |
| Mr LUK Chi-kwong | Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong East), Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Ms TAM Shiu-mei | District Leisure Manager (Eastern), Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Mr CHAO Ka-man, Stanley | Senior Liaison Officer (1), Eastern District Office |
| Ms WONG Sze-man, Queenie | Senior Liaison Officer (2), Eastern District Office |
| Mr KWAN Yu-keung | Senior Liaison Officer (3), Eastern District Office |
| Ms KONG Kei-kei, Hayley | Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Eastern District Office |

Action

In Attendance by Invitation (Representatives from the Government and Organisations)

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Mr LEE Kai-wing, Raymond, JP | Director of Planning, Planning Department |
| Mr KAU Kin-hong, Louis | District Planning Officer (Hong Kong), Planning Department |

Secretary

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Ms NG Yan-mei, Monie | Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Eastern District Office |
|----------------------|---|

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Councillors and government representatives to the meeting, particularly Mr Raymond LEE, JP, Director of Planning and Mr Louis KAU, District Planning Officer (Hong Kong) of the Planning Department (Plan D). He also extended his welcome to Miss LEE Sin-man, Senior Housing Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands 2) and Management Control of the Housing Department (HD) who attended the meeting on behalf of Mrs Helen CHEUNG, Chief Manager/Management (Hong Kong Island and Islands).

2. The Chairman reminded Councillors to declare interests where necessary in accordance with Section 48 of the Standing Orders of the Eastern District Council.

I. Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the Sixteenth Eastern District Council Meeting

3. The above draft minutes were confirmed without amendments.

II. Director of Planning to Meet Eastern District Council Members

4. Mr Raymond LEE, JP, Director of Planning, briefed Councillors on the work of the Plan D.

5. Councillors declared interests as follows:

Action

| <u>Councillor</u> | <u>Declaration of Interests</u> |
|-------------------|---|
| Andrew CHIU | Advisor, Quarry Bay Waterfront Concern Group |
| | The first Alumni Manager, Canossa School (Hong Kong) |
| | Chairman, Taikoo Shing Stage V Representative Committee |

6. 24 Councillors expressed their views with enquiries as summarised below:
- (a) Mr KUNG Pak-cheung expressed great dissatisfaction with the approval of the land exchange application for the former Chai Wan depot of China Motor Bus Company Limited (Chai Wan depot) by the Town Planning Board (TPB). He condemned such planning and believed that the current problem of heavy traffic in Central Chai Wan and Chai Wan West would be aggravated.
 - (b) Mr Joseph LAI said that the proposed construction of artificial islands announced by the Chief Executive in the 2018 Policy Address had provoked strong responses in the society. Many taxpayers believed that the Government's fiscal reserve accumulated over the past years would be exhausted due to the astronomical costs of the islands. He suggested that the Plan D should assess the feasibility of constructing the islands with its professional knowledge in terms of underground pipelines, bridges, environmental protection, etc.
 - (c) Mr CHENG Tat-hung suggested that the Plan D should relocate the entrance/exit of the dangerous goods vehicular ferry pier in North Point to the side of K Wah Centre so as to provide a larger leisure park for the public by connecting the area occupied by the existing entrance/exit with the adjacent open space. In addition, he expressed great concern about the development project of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay. Apart from enquiring the Government of the reasons for not conducting a non-in-situ land exchange, he also queried the grounds for the TPB to grant a harbourfront site which was 3 times larger than the original site to the developer for constructing several 5-storey hotel and commercial blocks with a building height partly over 40 metres above principal datum instead of the 25-storey industrial building. He opined that there was a huge difference between the commercial values of the two projects. He requested the Plan D to reconsider the

Action

development project.

- (d) Mr Aron KWOK pointed out that the TPB had taken no heed of the opposition to the land exchange for Chai Wan depot from the Eastern District Council (EDC) in 2008 and 2012. In 2013, the TPB deliberately bypassed the EDC and permitted the developer to exchange a site facing industrial buildings for a bus terminus site with three open sides which was subsequently granted to the developer. Later, the TPB further ignored the opposing views put forward by the community during a district consultation conducted by the Lands Department (Lands D) via the Eastern District Office (EDO). He believed that the TPB's approval of the land exchange would give rise to suspected transfer of benefits between the TPB and the developer instead of benefitting the public. He requested the department(s) concerned to explain the grounds.
- (e) Ms Elaine CHIK said that although having conducted a public consultation about the Chai Wan depot project, the TPB approved the land exchange application without taking heed of public opposition as well as community development and needs. She believed that the above public consultation was a "fake consultation". She worried that the traffic load of the area would be increased as a result of the subsequent completion of a number of public housing estates, and requested the Plan D to explain the approval of the land exchange for Chai Wan depot.
- (f) Mr YEUNG Sze-chun criticised the Plan D's outdated practice of following the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) in land planning. Since the HKPSG only focused on the population size of a district without taking into account the age structure of the district population, the planning could not meet the genuine needs of the public. He suggested that the Plan D should amend the HKPSG. Besides, he voiced concern over the development projects of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay and Chai Wan depot and enquired why the TPB ignored the opposition from Councillors and the public.
- (g) Mr Andrew CHIU pointed out that opposing views from 1 725 submissions on the development project of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay had been received for a meeting of the Metro Planning Committee

Action

(MPC) under the TPB about the project. 1 043 out of the 1 725 submissions were from the Quarry Bay Waterfront Concern Group while there was only one submission in favour of the project. During the presentation at the meeting, the strong opposing views of the EDC and Harbourfront Commission against the project were simply summarised into several points, including opposition to or concern about slight relaxation of the building height restriction, traffic and visual impact, request to relocate the existing pet garden and support for replacing the construction of an industrial building with the development project. He believed that such act aimed to deliberately weaken the fierce opposition from the EDC and Harbourfront Commission. On behalf of the schools nearby, alumni associations and parent-teacher associations, he pointed out with deep dissatisfaction that the viaduct proposed under the project seriously undermined students' interests. Some principals of the schools nearby had told him that the Eastern District education office under the Education Bureau (EDB) did not know about the development project, he suspected the Plan D of not having fully consulted the department concerned. He requested the Plan D to explain whether there was maladministration.

- (h) Ms Bonnie LEUNG expressed concern about the development project of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay. On another note, she hoped that the Plan D could “identify another educational site and release the woodland site”. She said that according to the EDB, the woodland site at Mount Parker was the only site reserved for school construction on Hong Kong Island, and since the EDB had a genuine need to reserve a site for school construction on Hong Kong Island to meet educational needs, the site could not be released. She enquired why the Plan D could only allocate that site to the EDB for construction of school premises on Hong Kong Island. Also, she reiterated that the residents, who had been strongly opposing the EDB's planning for school construction at that site over years, believed that the surrounding environment and traffic would be seriously affected. Therefore, she urged the Plan D to identify other alternative sites for the EDB and make a better use of vacant school premises so as to release the woodland site.
- (i) Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung criticised the TPB and Plan D for bypassing

Action

the EDC and approving the land exchange for the Chai Wan depot project without respecting procedural justice and taking heed of the opposition from the EDC and the public. Subsequently, they proceeded with the land exchange without taking into consideration the opposing views collected during the district consultation. He believed that the departments concerned were involved in “black box operation” with suspicion in collusion with the business sector.

- (j) Mr Patrick LEUNG was angry that the TPB totally ignored public opposition to the development project of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay by approving the land exchange. He queried whether the Development Bureau (DEVB) had already reached a consensus with the developer for land sale without open tendering so as to grant the precious harbourfront site to the developer for constructing several hotel and commercial blocks with sea view instead of an industrial building. He criticised that fairness was not maintained in the land exchange. He enquired about the TPB’s reasons for approving the relaxation of the building height restriction and construction of a viaduct, and urged the Plan D to reconsider the development project.

- (k) Mr Howard CHEUNG pointed out that apart from the opposing views against the development project of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay mentioned by other Councillors, the proposed viaduct, which was incompatible with the surrounding environment, would cause serious environmental nuisance to the stakeholders nearby. He urged the TPB and Plan D to listen to stakeholders’ views and reconsider the accessible alignment of the viaduct. In addition, he pointed out that the reflection from the curtain wall of the commercial block under the project would severely affect residents nearby. He added that the TPB just mentioned the opposing views of the public briefly at the meeting concerned, but in fact most of the views were against the project, so the TPB was believed to have deliberately misled the meeting. He expressed great dissatisfaction with the TPB’s approval of the application without attaching importance to public opposition. Besides, he said that the Planning, Works and Housing Committee (PWHC) under the EDC had discussed the provision of a swimming pool in Quarry Bay and that proposal also fulfilled the requirements of the HKPSG, but it was finally decided that a new swimming pool would be built in Wan Chai due to administrative planning. He

Action

enquired the Plan D of the procedures for amending the HKPSG.

- (l) Mr CHUI Chi-kin requested the Plan D to make early planning for the severe problem of insufficient district elderly community centres, nurseries and sports centres. He criticised the outdated HKPSG for leading to an acute shortage of parking spaces and urged the Plan D to amend the HKPSG and review the standards for the sizes of parking spaces. He further said that the Plan D encouraged public engagement in consultation exercises on one hand, but “not applicable” was displayed on the relevant webpage of its website on the other hand. He enquired how the Plan D encouraged public engagement. In addition, he opined that the TPB ignored public opposition with “black box operation”. As regards the project of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay, he enquired whether the Plan D would still plan for future development according to the Hong Kong Island East Harbourfront Study in 2012. Finally, he enquired whether the Plan D had discussed the long-term development planning for sites under short-term tenancy with the relevant department(s) so as to reduce the number of idle sites.
- (m) Mr MAK Tak-ching believed that there was a suspicion of collusion between the TPB and the business sector as the TPB had approved the development project of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay and granted a precious harbourfront site to the developer without giving consideration to public opposition. He said that the Plan D was suspected of transfer of benefits in the Chai Wan depot project and criticised the TPB for paying no attention to public demand for livelihood facilities. As a number of community groups raised the issue of insufficient sites for social welfare purpose during the big debate on land supply, he enquired the Plan D whether more sites had been zoned for such purpose. In view of the serious problem of ageing population in Eastern District and the time-consuming process for building elderly facilities, he requested the Plan D to give an account of the planning for elderly facilities in Eastern District.
- (n) Mr LAM Sum-lim said that public requests for provision of more facilities such as libraries, swimming pools and sports centres in the district had always been received. However, the requests were brought to a halt due to the HKPSG. He suggested that the Plan D

Action

should review the HKPSG according to the prevailing situation. Also, he mentioned that no updates on his proposed construction of sports facilities at the site at Tung Hei Road, Shau Kei Wan had been received over the past few years, so he would like to enquire the Plan D of the progress. Lastly, he enquired the Plan D whether specific planning had been made for promenades along the coast of Hong Kong Island.

- (o) Mr Eddie TING criticised “the Government for ignoring public views and the TPB for fake consultation” under the development project of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay. He pointed out that the EDC raised fierce opposition to the land exchange proposal, particularly to relaxation of the building height restriction to 41 metres, in two respective PWHC meetings. In addition, the TPB had approved the development project in spite of the developer’s non-provision of relevant traffic assessment data to support the proposed construction of hotel and Grade A office blocks at the site. He said that the TPB received 1 725 submissions against the project during the public consultation, but there was only one submission in favour of it. He might convey his views on the “fake consultation” to the Office of the Ombudsman since the TPB had ignored public views.
- (p) Mr Dominic WONG pointed out that the mission of the Plan D was to make Hong Kong a better place to live and work, but the insufficient communication between the Plan D and the public had led to EDC’s keen dissatisfaction with the TPB’s approval of the Chai Wan depot project and the development project of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay. In addition, he said that housing was a top priority and hoped that the Plan D would cater for the housing needs of the grassroots.
- (q) Mr Patrick WONG pointed out that the MPC under the TPB approved the development project of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay without taking heed of the opposition on 22 February. He did not understand why the TPB still allowed the developer to exchange a small industrial site for a harbourfront site available for the construction of 4 hotel blocks and one commercial block despite the receipt of almost 1 800 opposing submissions and only one supporting submission. He said that a number of Councillors expressed their hope for construction of cultural and recreational or park facilities at the said lot at previous EDC meetings; however, the department(s) concerned had not seized

Action

the time to formulate a comprehensive harbourfront development plan after the rezoning of the lot in 2003. To his astonishment, the TPB said that the development project approved was compatible with the development purpose of the said lot. He also requested the Plan D to explain the grounds for relaxing the height restriction to 41 metres.

- (r) Mr WONG Kwok-hing pointed out that the TPB had granted a government site to the developer directly without open auction when examining the land exchange application for the Chai Wan depot development project, which was considered as a serious political scandal. The TPB had ignored both the opposition from the EDC between 2008 and 2012 and the opposing views collected during the district consultation conducted by the Lands D via the EDO. In addition, the Transport Department (TD) had not submitted a traffic assessment report to the EDC. At previous PWHC meetings, the EDC requested the department(s) concerned to submit a study report and relevant information, but the department(s) only tabled a lengthy report at the meeting date without giving sufficient time for Councillors to study it. He had invited Mr Aron KWOK, Legislative Council (LegCo) Member cum Eastern District Councillor, to follow up in the LegCo.
- (s) Mr KU Kwai-yiu said that the TPB still approved the land exchange application for the Chai Wan depot in 2013 in spite of EDC's opposition in 2008 and 2012. Also, it had approved relocation of the garden to a site near the industrial area without consulting the EDC. In addition, he criticised that the consultation period of the district consultation conducted by the Lands D via the EDO was too short, and that the department(s) concerned still proceeded with the land exchange even though most of the views collected were against the application while only two of the submissions received were in support of it. He believed that there was suspected collusion between the Government and the business sector, and urged the Director of Planning to give an account of the incident.
- (t) Mr Stanley HO expressed deep concern about the development project of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay. He also raised opposition to the development project of Chai Wan depot, believing that it would have an impact on the traffic around Siu Sai Wan and Chai Wan. Besides,

Action

he pointed out that the problem of serious illegal parking in Eastern District stemmed from the shortage of parking spaces in the district. He urged the Plan D to review the relevant planning standards in the Guidelines and consider planning for large integrated car parks.

- (u) Ms LI Chun-chau said that the problem of ageing population was rather serious in Eastern District, and hoped that the Plan D could install lifts for hillside housing estates for the convenience of the elderly. Furthermore, she was of the view that the TPB should have fully consulted the EDC and the district before proceeding with the relevant procedures and approving the application for the development project.
- (v) Mr Frankie LO believed that the Government should listen to and accept public opinions, and hoped that the Plan D would seriously consider the opposing views of the EDC and public against the development project of Chai Wan depot and review the land exchange application.
- (w) The Vice-chairman hoped that the Plan D could make improvement in regard to the planning deficiencies and inadequacies mentioned by other Councillors. He pointed out that the severe shortage of commercial car parks in Eastern District had led to serious illegal parking, and hoped that the Plan D could plan for more car parks. Furthermore, as regards the suspected collusion between the Government and the business sector and the suspected transfer of benefits arising from the TPB's approval of the land exchange applications for individual development projects, he urged the Plan D to rectify the unhealthy practice by listening to the views of the EDC and public. Lastly, he expressed support for reclamation and believed that it could facilitate the long-term development of Hong Kong.
- (x) The Chairman said that population ageing was serious in Eastern District. According to the information provided by the Social Welfare Department (SWD), Eastern District would rank first among the districts with the highest percentage of elderly population in 3 years' time, so he urged the Plan D to arrange for the construction of multi-service complexes for the elderly in Eastern District as soon as

Action

possible. He enquired about the grounds for TPB's approval of the relaxation of the height restriction to 41 metres under the development project of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay. He believed that such decision would seriously affect the harbourfront sites along the northern shoreline of Eastern District. Furthermore, he pointed out that Siu Sai Wan and Chai Wan currently had a population of approximately 150 000, and that Chai Wan would become more crowded after the completion of a number of projects on Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme, Home Ownership Scheme and two government complexes in that area. He opined that the TPB was involved in suspected collusion with the business sector in approving the development projects of Chai Wan depot and Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay.

7. Mr Raymond LEE, JP, Director of Planning, thanked Councillors for their views, and responded to their views and enquiries as follows:

- (a) As regards the development project of Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay, the building plan, which was approved as early as 2001, allowed the applicant to construct a 25-storey industrial building at the private lot originally zoned for "industrial" purpose. In 2003, the TPB reviewed the land use of the whole Quarry Bay harbourfront and decided to rezone the area originally designated for industrial purpose and as public filling barge loading and unloading area as well as cargo handling area to "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Cultural and/or Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses" and "Open Space" so as to enhance the harbourfront for the public. In 2017, the applicant commenced the construction of the industrial building at the private lot according to the approved building plan, which had aroused much concern. Therefore, the DEVB had taken the initiative to contact the lot owner in order to work out a development proposal that was more compatible with the surrounding environment. The lot owner subsequently put forward an alternative proposal for harbourfront leisure, tourism and commercial development, and then submitted a planning application to the TPB. When considering the application on 22 February 2019, the MPC under the TPB believed that the development proposal could achieve the planning intention of the area, and that slight relaxation of the height restriction could create a

Action

varying building height profile and widen the distance among the blocks so as to enhance visual permeability and air ventilation. At the meeting, the TPB also discussed the impact of relaxing the height restriction of 3 blocks (by 4 to 6 metres) on the surrounding environment, but it noted that there was a distance of about 200 to 400 metres between the site and the residential buildings nearby. In addition, the TPB also took into account all public views attached in the paper concerned when considering the application. After paying heed to various considerations, the TPB finally approved the planning application by imposing additional terms. Approval from the Chief Executive in Council should be obtained for the land exchange proposal under the development project and the project could be rolled out only after the developer's payment of premium.

- (b) On the development project of Chai Wan depot, since there were industrial sites in the east and north of the depot and a liquefied petroleum gas station nearby and developing the original site of the depot for residential purpose would be incompatible with the land use, the TPB agreed in 2001 that part of the land in the east of the original site of the depot would be rezoned as open space while the site of the current bus terminus would be rezoned as part of a comprehensive development area so as to improve the overall planning for land use. In 2002, the TPB approved the master layout plan submitted for the development of the depot. Under the project concerned, it was planned that 4 residential buildings would be constructed with a plot ratio of 8.28 and a building height of 192 metres; however, the planning permission became invalid in 2011 with no implementation of the project. In 2012, the developer submitted a planning application for a new master layout plan to the TPB, but the MPC of the TPB rejected the application since no appropriate arrangements had been made for issues about traffic impact, building design and public open space. The developer subsequently made a review application and provided further information to address the MPC's concerns about traffic impact, building design and public open space. Taking into account that the applicant had addressed the issues about traffic, building design and public open space, the TPB granted a planning permission when considering the review application in August 2013. The said planning applications were processed under the requirements of the Town Planning Ordinance with public

Action

consultation. The Plan D would pass Councillors' views about the land exchange application for the development project of Chai Wan depot to relevant department(s) for follow-up actions.

- (c) As to the Guidelines, the Plan D mainly played the role of an editor and the relevant policy bureau(x) and department(s) would update and review the Guidelines from different aspects from time to time. The TD had amended the Guidelines according to the results of its territory-wide parking study conducted in 2014. When answering LegCo Members' enquiries about the shortage of parking spaces, the Secretary for Transport and Housing said that nighttime parking spaces would be designated at suitable roadside locations, developers would be requested to provide a higher number of parking spaces under their development projects as mentioned in the Guidelines, and public car parks would be provided in suitable future government, institutional or community facilities. For Eastern District, the Government had proposed to provide public parking spaces in the future Water Supplies Department and Correctional Services Department complex in Chai Wan. In addition, the Government's consultancy study on commercial parking spaces, which was commenced in December 2017, would be completed this year. The results would facilitate decision on whether amendment and update would be required for the Guidelines. The Government would explore the possibility of building government multi-storey car parks and implementing an automated parking system in various locations.
- (d) As regards the provision of social welfare facilities under the Guidelines, the Labour and Welfare Bureau incorporated provisions based on population age distribution into the Guidelines in December 2018. The Plan D was currently co-operating with the SWD in providing suitable welfare facilities under new development projects according to the Guidelines to cope with population ageing.
- (e) The Plan D noted that the Secretary for Education had explained the need to reserve the woodland site at Mount Parker for educational purpose to the EDC. It was difficult to identify another suitable site to meet the EDB's need for school construction in a built-up urban district such as Eastern District. However, if the EDB found it necessary, the Plan D would make an effort to identify another site.

Action

- (f) As for the proposal on the construction of artificial islands near Kau Yi Chau under the Lantau Tomorrow Vision, the DEVB would consult Panel on Development under the LegCo and provide more details in late March. In the past few years, the Government had been identifying land for short, medium and long-term development to meet housing needs. For example, the Plan D had rezoned several sites in Eastern District for housing purpose and they could be provided for housing development in the short term. New development areas in the New Territories would be the main source of land supply for medium-term housing development, and it was expected that housing sites would be made available from 2023 or 2024. Land demand for long-term development could be satisfied by developing strategic growth areas such as construction of artificial islands near Kau Yi Chau.
- (g) The Plan D noted Councillors' views, and would take follow-up actions and make improvement appropriately.

8. The Chairman thanked Mr Raymond LEE, JP, Director of Planning and his colleagues for attending the meeting, and invited them to note Councillors' views.

III. Information Items

Chairman's Report on the Discussion Items of the Regular Meeting

9. The Chairman reported that the discussion items had been set out in the report of the Chairman/Vice-chairman for Councillors' reference. The regular meeting for March 2019 was scheduled on 13 March. Councillors might pass their enquiries or views to the Chairman or Vice-chairman for relaying at the regular meeting in March.

IV. Application for DC Fund for Employing Dedicated Staff to Assist

District Council to Discharge Its Duties

(EDC Paper No. 2/19)

Action

10. The Secretary briefed the meeting on Paper No. 2/19.
11. Councillors approved the funding application mentioned in the paper.

V. Financial Position of Eastern District Council Funds

(EDC Paper No. 3/19)

12. The Secretary briefed the meeting on Paper No. 3/19.
13. Mr Andrew CHIU enquired whether there were any problems with the financial commitment as there was a high level of over-commitment of funds.
14. The Secretary replied that since the actual spending of some district council activities was lower than the approved amount and some cross-year activities would be funded in the next financial year, to make better use of resources, the Home Affairs Department allowed over-commitment of funds and the current financial position was relatively healthy.
15. Councillors noted the financial position of the above funds.

VI. Report on the Seventh Meeting of District Facilities Management Committee

(EDC Paper No. 4/19)

16. Councillors noted the above report and endorsed the funding proposals under Items I, III, V, VII and VIII in the paper.

VII. Report on the Seventh Meeting of Culture, Leisure, Community Building and Services Committee

(EDC Paper No. 5/19)

17. Councillors noted the above report.

VIII. Report on the Seventh Meeting of Traffic and Transport Committee

Action

(EDC Paper No. 6/19)

18. Councillors noted the above report.

IX. Report on the Seventh Meeting of Food, Environment and Hygiene Committee

(EDC Paper No. 7/19)

19. Councillors noted the above report.

X. Report on the Seventh Meeting of Planning, Works and Housing Committee

(EDC Paper No. 8/19)

20. Councillors noted the above report.

XI. Report on the Seventh Meeting of Vetting Committee

(EDC Paper No. 9/19)

21. Councillors noted the above report and agreed that the amended “Arrangement for Handling Declaration of Interests by DC and Co-opted Members in Vetting Funding Applications” was applicable to the EDC and its committees and working groups as mentioned in Paragraph VIII(a) in the paper. They also endorsed the amendments and updates to “Category 8 – Other Declarable Interests” in “Registration Form on Personal Interests of Members of a District Council or Its Committees” of the Standing Orders of the Eastern District Council. The amendments and updates had been incorporated into the Standing Orders of the Eastern District Council on the EDC website.

22. Councillors agreed that the authorisation arrangement mentioned in Paragraph IX in the paper was applicable to the EDC and its committees.

23. The Chairman said that the Secretariat would distribute the amended Standing Orders of the Eastern District Council to Councillors after the meeting, and requested Councillors to update the information under “Category 8 – Other Declarable Interests” in “Registration Form on Personal Interests of Members of a

Action

District Council or Its Committees” for uploading to the EDC website for public access.

XII. Report on the Seventh Meeting of Task Group on Publicity about the Work of Eastern District Council

(EDC Paper No. 10/19)

24. Councillors noted the report of the task group.

XIII. Report on the 229th Meeting of the Eastern District Management Committee

(EDC Paper No. 11/19)

25. Councillors noted the above report.

XIV. Date of the Next Meeting

26. The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 pm. The Eighteenth EDC Meeting would be held at 2:30 pm on 30 April 2019 (Tuesday).

Eastern District Council Secretariat
April 2019