

(Translation)

Minutes of the Follow-up Meeting of the Islands District Council

Date : 1 March 2021 (Monday)
Time : 2 p.m.
Venue : Islands District Council Conference Room,
14/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong.

Present

Chairman

Mr YU Hon-kwan, Randy, MH, JP

Vice-Chairman

Mr WONG Man-hon

Members

Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, SBS, MH
Mr YUNG Chi-ming, BBS, MH
Mr CHAN Lin-wai, MH
Mr WONG Hon-kuen, Ken
Mr HO Chun-fai (Arrived at around 2:10 p.m.)
Mr HO Siu-kei
Ms WONG Chau-ping
Ms YUNG Wing-sheung, Amy
Ms TSANG Sau-ho, Josephine
Mr KWOK Ping, Eric
Mr TSUI Sang-hung, Sammy (Arrived at around 2:10 p.m.)
Mr FONG Lung-fei
Ms LAU Shun-ting
Mr LEE Ka-ho
Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho (Arrived at around 2:25 p.m.)

Attendance by Invitation

Ms LIU Wai-han Estate Surveyor/1 (District Lands Office, Islands)

In Attendance

Ms YEUNG Wai-sum, Amy, JP District Officer (Islands), Islands District Office
Mr LI Ho, Thomas Assistant District Officer (Islands)1, Islands District Office
Ms LEUNG Tin-yee, Christy Assistant District Officer (Islands)2, Islands District Office
Mr MOK Sui-hung Senior Liaison Officer (1), Islands District Office
Mr CHAN Yat-kin, Kaiser Senior Liaison Officer (2), Islands District Office
Mr YIP Man-ying, Stanley Senior Engineer/19 (Lantau),
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Ms TAM Yin-ping, Donna	District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands, Planning Department
Mr WONG Chi-leung	Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Central Western/Southern/Islands)2, Social Welfare Department
Ms LEE Sin-man	Chief Manager/Management (Hong Kong Island and Islands), Housing Department
Mr LING Ka-fai, Kenny	District Lands Officer/Islands (District Lands Office, Islands) Lands Department
Mr TSANG Wai-man	Administrative Assistant/Lands (District Lands Office, Islands), Lands Department
Mr HO Siu-tong	Sergeant, Police Community Relations Office (Lantau District), Hong Kong Police Force
Ms KWAN Ka-mun, Karen	Chief Transport Officer/Islands, Transport Department
Ms LAI Wing-sau, Winsy	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Ms LIM Ting-ting, Sylvia	Chief Leisure Manager (New Territories West), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms SIU Kit-ping, Currie	District Leisure Manager (Islands), Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Secretary

Ms Dora CHENG	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Islands District Office
---------------	---

Absent

Mr WONG Chun-yeung



Welcome Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives of government departments to the follow-up meeting of the first Islands District Council (IDC) meeting and introduced the following representatives of government departments who attended the meeting:

- (a) Mr WONG Chi-leung, Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Central Western/Southern/Islands)2 of the Social Welfare Department who stood in for Ms IP Siu-ming; and
- (b) Mr YIP Man-ying, Stanley, Senior Engineer/19 (Lantau) of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) who stood in for Mr WONG Kwok-fai, Alfred.

IX. Question on arrangement for Islands District Council meetings
(Paper IDC 10/2021)

2. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had provided a written reply for Members' perusal.

3. Mr FONG Lung-fei briefly presented the question and added that the current IDC had operated for over a year, but the inconsistent practices of certain chairmen in chairing meetings had affected the operation of the IDC. He hoped to take this opportunity to discuss the improvement options.

4. The Chairman asked if the Secretariat had anything to add to its written reply.

5. The Secretary said that she had nothing to add.

6. Mr Ken WONG said that he had no comments on the Secretariat's written reply. With reference to Mr FONG Lung-fei's question, he clarified that he did not apply double standards when chairing meetings. According to the Standing Orders, if a motion was moved, it was not necessary to invite guests to attend the meeting to respond. He pointed out that at the District Facilities Management Committee (DFMC) meeting in question, the discussion on the issue had gone on for a dozen minutes, during which many Members had proposed moving to the vote. That was the reason why he asked Members to vote by a show of hands, yet he was unfairly accused by Mr FONG Lung-fei of stopping him from speaking. While he would like Members to fully express their views on the motions when he was chairing meetings, he would accept putting the motions to the vote immediately if that was what Members preferred. He therefore hoped to seek consensus on the proceedings in this meeting. Besides, Members who attended the said DFMC meeting had doubts as to whether seconders could move amendments. He had also not yet ascertained whether the seconders were allowed to move amendments under the Standing Orders then. Mr FONG Lung-fei's amendment was not accepted because Mr WONG Chun-yeung withdrew his seconding and no other Members seconded the amendment. It was not his personal decision, so the accusation against him was unfair.

7. Mr FONG Lung-fei clarified that he was not accusing anyone, but simply discussing with the hope that the Council could operate more smoothly. He pointed out that two amendments had been moved to a motion at the same time at the last IDC meeting. While the Chairman opined that they should be put to the vote one by one, he had doubts about such practice. He asked whether the IDC Chairman's practice meant that the DFMC meeting could have dealt with his amendment first before proceeding with Mr WONG Chun-yeung's. According to the Standing Orders, changes made in an amendment should be based on the original motion. However, many of the amendments moved by Members deviated from the intent of the original motions. Taking Mr WONG Chun-yeung's proposal of using Disneyland as quarantine facility as an example, he said that a Member changed the location to Chi

Ma Wan when moving an amendment, which obviously deviated from the intent of the original motion, so the amendment should not have been accepted, and a new impromptu motion should have been moved instead.

8. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that Mr FONG Lung-fei's question aimed to make clarification on the proceedings. As Mr Ken WONG said, the current IDC had to deal with many motions and amendments, but the procedures for motions and amendments were unclear. He enquired about the procedure for dealing with more than one amendment, recalling that he and another Member had each moved an amendment on the same motion once. He pointed out that chairmen had different ways of handling issues and suggested that the Secretariat clarify the arrangement and provide clear guidelines for dealing with motions so that the chairmen of the IDC and its committees could make consistent decisions.

9. Ms Amy YUNG said that at the last meeting, two Members had each moved an amendment on a motion. Both amendments were accepted by the Chairman and put to the vote one after the other. She said that, in her experience, only one amendment could be moved to the original motion and that any other amendment should be treated as a further amendment to the first one. No two amendments should be moved to the same original motion as they might conflict with each other.

10. Mr Eric KWOK responded to Ms Amy YUNG's remark by saying that at the beginning of the current IDC term, he had a discussion with the Chairman about arranging a mock meeting to familiarise the newly appointed and re-appointed Members with the proceedings. He hoped that the Members who chaired meetings could show understanding and tolerance to the newly appointed Members and exercise flexibility. He opined that having taken office for over a year, Members had gradually become more familiar with the proceedings.

11. The Chairman agreed with Mr Eric KWOK's remark, saying that Members had been improving and become more familiar with the proceedings as well as the requirements of the Standing Orders. Regarding the handling of more than one amendment to an original motion, he invited the Secretariat to read out the relevant provisions of the Standing Orders.

12. The Secretary said that section 20 of the Standing Orders stated that "If there is more than one motion to move amendments, they should be dealt with in the order they have been moved".

13. The Chairman said that he had accepted and dealt with the two proposed amendments at the last meeting in accordance with the above provision. However, since the Standing Orders might not cover all scenarios, chairmen would exercise discretion if necessary. For instance, if a Member had spoken three times on an agenda item and wished to speak again, he would, having regard to the circumstances, exercise discretion to allow the Member to speak. In most of the cases, chairmen would use their discretion to accept Members' impromptu motions or amendments. He admitted that he might not be able to make immediate responses when he was

chairing meetings. He thanked Mr FONG Lung-fei for raising the question and expressed his understanding of Mr FONG's doubts. As for Mr Eric KWOK's proposal, he would discuss with the Secretariat the feasibility of arranging a mock meeting. He concluded with respect to the question as follows: firstly, it was confirmed at the beginning of the current IDC term that officials would not be invited to respond if a motion was moved, but Members could make clarification of the motion, put it to the vote and raise other questions asking for responses from officials; secondly, a consensus had been reached that if more than one amendment was moved to a motion, the Chairman would deal with them one by one.

14. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that at the last meeting, a Member had raised a question on the "strong request for making amendments to the Prevention and Control of Disease (Wearing of Mask) Regulation (Cap. 599I) to prohibit food or beverage consumption on ferries". He queried why the Chairman had allowed the question to be discussed at the meeting because the District Council (DC) as an advisory body without the power to amend legislation could only discuss law enforcement matters. He quoted section 21 of the Standing Orders that "the Chairman shall determine whether a motion accepted for amending the original motion constitutes a direct negation of the original motion. If this is the case, the Chairman should ask Members to reject the original motion and draft a new motion during or after the meeting." According to the provision, the Chairman should have asked the mover of the amendment to move an impromptu motion separately. When the proposal of using Disneyland as quarantine facility was moved last year, the appropriate practice, in Mr FONG's opinion, would have been to move an impromptu motion on alternative site options after the original motion was rejected.

15. Ms Amy YUNG said she had pointed out at the last meeting that the Member who raised the question on the "strong request for making amendments to the Prevention and Control of Disease (Wearing of Mask) Regulation (Cap. 599I) to prohibit food or beverage consumption on ferries" had confused the concepts of law enactment and enforcement. She opined that the Chairman should have reminded Members not to discuss issues involving law enactment at DC meetings. As for issues related to law enforcement, requests could be made to law enforcement agencies for follow-up action. She said that the chairmen of the IDC and some committees had refused her questions without any explanations before. Only after making an enquiry with the Secretariat afterwards did she find out her questions were not within the purview of the IDC. She hoped that the Chairman would review questions equitably to allow all Members to express their demands and ensure effective discussion.

16. The Chairman expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He accepted Members' views and said that many Members wished to move an impromptu motion for following up on a question after discussion and that he had approved such requests on several occasions. He said that chairmen had the discretion to approve the moving of an impromptu motion in accordance with the Standing

Orders, but the use of discretion might not always be appropriate. If Members felt that he should minimise the exercise of discretion in accepting impromptu motions, he considered it possible to do so. He suggested Members consider submitting questions that were not urgent in writing prior to the next meeting so that other Members would have sufficient time to fully understand the questions. Such practice might be more preferable than moving an impromptu motion.

- (b) Regarding the question relating to the Prevention and Control of Disease (Wearing of Mask) Regulation (Cap. 599I), he said that Ms LAU Shun-ting had concerns that people eating, drinking and not wearing a mask for a long time on ferries would cause worries to other passengers. However, since the law allowed people not to wear a mask when eating and drinking, he considered it a livelihood issue and therefore approved it to be discussed at the meeting. His intent was conveying views to the departments concerned instead of making legislative amendments. He understood that some Members might not agree with his explanation and practice, but he would chair meetings in a fair manner. He promised Ms Amy YUNG that he would be equitable when reviewing questions. He said that he had been criticised by some Members for always being lenient in approving impromptu motions which Members might not be able to digest straight away. He reiterated that chairmen would exercise discretion as appropriate to ensure smooth proceedings while letting Members express their views fully. He said that the current IDC had operated for 14 months, and Members had been making continuous improvement. He hoped that the IDC would operate more smoothly for the rest of the term to benefit residents of the district.

(Mr Sammy TSUI and Mr HO Chun-fai joined the meeting at around 2:10 p.m.
Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho joined the meeting at around 2:25 p.m.)

XI. Question on Lantau Master Plan-related expenses under Capital Works Reserve Fund Block Allocations
(Paper IDC 7/2021)

17. The Chairman said that the consolidated written replies of the Development Bureau (DEVB) and the Sustainable Lantau Office (SLO) of the CEDD had been distributed to Members for perusal prior to the meeting.

18. Mr Erick KWOK briefly presented the question and expressed his views as follows:

- (a) The Lantau Conservation and Recreation Masterplan (the Masterplan) involved the future development of South Lantau, and some of the contents were extremely controversial. He expressed frustration that

the DEVB and the SLO had only provided consolidated written replies without responding directly. He opined that the departments paid no attention to the issue or else they would have arranged representatives to attend the meeting for an explanation. He asked Ms Donna TAM to relay his question and views to the DEVB and the SLO.

- (b) He hoped that a public consultation could be conducted after the epidemic stabilised and asked whether the DEVB and the SLO had conducted a comprehensive environmental impact assessment study before preparing the Masterplan. The document stated that the Lantau Conservation Fund was open for application to local tax-exempt charities, local registered non-profit making companies and local post-secondary education institutions, but it was learnt that applications from non-governmental organisations (NGOs) would be accepted only if they applied together with local registered non-profit making companies, which contradicted with what was said in the document. He asked the Secretariat to enquire of the DEVB whether an application could be submitted by an NGO independently or had to be led by a registered non-profit making company.
- (c) He asked whether the DEVB had conducted a feasibility study on the five themed clusters of the Masterplan, namely the North Lantau Recreation Corridor, Northwest Lantau Eco-Cultural Corridor, South Lantau Eco-Recreation Corridor, Rural Township Improvement and Hiking Hub. According to the introduction of the Masterplan, the Government formulated the Lantau Trails and Recreation Plan to develop Lantau Island into a vacation destination. The document also highlighted the need to conserve the natural habitats in Pui O and Shui Hau. However, even though he repeatedly expressed in the past that most of the wetlands and unused lands in Pui O and Shui Hau had been damaged and filled, the DEVB did not actively address the problem.
- (d) The Traffic, Transport and District Improvement Subcommittee under the Lantau Development Advisory Committee reviewed and explored ways to enhance the waterborne transport in the district in 2017 to ease the burden on land transport. He proposed allocating funding to restore the piers in Mong Tung Wan, Pui O, Upper Cheung Sha Beach, Tong Fuk and Shek Pik to provide kaito services and increase South Lantau's tourist reception capacity.
- (e) Regarding the extension of connections between Tung Chung and Tai O and between North Lantau and Mui O, he noted that the consultant had begun to collect data and conduct a baseline feasibility study to build a computer transport model for reviewing the existing parking spaces and waterborne transport facilities, as well as studying the feasibility of expanding the cycle track network and the options for

enhancing tourists reception capacity. He requested the DEVB to provide the IDC with the completed computer model for reference.

19. Mr HO Chun-fai opined that Mr Eric KWOK had a misunderstanding of the local situation. He regretted that government departments and environmental groups did not take into account residents' needs, worrying that residents would have conflicts with other groups. He said that flooding would occur at the locations concerned during heavy rainstorms due to the blockage of river channels and drainage channels, so residents had to elevate the campsites by filling. He said that Mr Eric KWOK was welcome to attend the Rural Committee (RC) meeting to discuss solutions together. In addition, he had received complaints about government funds. Residents who engaged in organic farming also said recently that they had to work with NGOs in order to apply for government subsidies.

20. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that the Masterplan was very important, so the departments concerned should have arranged representatives to attend the meeting for discussion instead of just submitting written replies. He said that this was not an isolated incident, as the departments also only responded in writing to the issue of airport development which involved Islands District's long-term development. As such, he hoped that they would make improvement. He was dissatisfied with the written replies and called for the DEVB and the SLO to arrange representatives to attend the meeting to exchange views.

21. Mr HO Siu-kei said that he had discussed solutions to the urban-rural development issue of Lantau Island with the departments concerned in his capacity as a DC Member of Tai O. He said that many people visited Tai O by bus during the epidemic, placing an excessive burden on the traffic. Meanwhile, a lot of hikers made their way to Tai O along the country roads, which reflected the equal importance of the development of rural facilities. He was dissatisfied with the Government's planning of rural land in accordance with urban standards. He raised the issue to the IDC Chairman and the departments concerned from time to time, but only brief responses were received without serious follow-up action over the years. He opined that the departments had to strengthen communication with the IDC or else the conflict between urban and rural areas would only be exacerbated when the development policy was implemented. He called for the Transport Department and ferry operators to enhance waterborne transport services.

22. Mr CHAN Lin-wai thanked Mr Eric KWOK for his concern about the development of South Lantau but said that Mr KWOK had raised the question without understanding the actual situation. He suggested that Mr Eric KWOK should discuss with the DC Members of the area first in the future. If the issue was not resolved, he could then put it forward for discussion at the meeting. He said that the RC had all along adopted an open attitude and believed that strengthening communication between Members would help minimise misunderstanding.

23. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that the discussion had veered away from the topic and focused on conservation instead of expenditure and planning. He opined

that the Chairman should remind Members when appropriate to avoid wasting time. He understood that Members wanted their views to be placed on record, but their speeches should be relevant to the issue.

24. Ms Amy YUNG said that the Islands District Council (IDC) comprised ten elected Members and eight ex-officio Members who were all accountable to the electors. As electors of various constituencies had different aspirations, she opined that Members representing their own constituency could discuss any items without consulting the RCs and reaching a consensus in advance.

25. Mr Eric KWOK clarified that the Masterplan was a matter of the welfare of residents and community facility development of Islands District, but the departments concerned ignored the infrastructure and livelihood issues of Lantau Island. Therefore, he hoped that the DEVB and the SLO could respond at the meeting to avoid misunderstanding. He apologised for causing misunderstanding and emphasised that he strived for the welfare of the residents. Taking the pier in Pui O as an example, he pointed out that over the years, he had requested the bureau to convert the pier into a standard Kaito pier to facilitate passengers' access to Mong Tung Wan and Cheung Sha.

26. Mr HO Chun-fai apologised for misunderstanding Mr Eric KWOK, and said that he and residents of South Lantau agreed with the views of Mr KWOK. He criticised the departments concerned for inadequate consultation and proposed stepping up communication with the public to promote community development for mutual benefits.

27. Ms Josephine TSANG said that the eight Chairmen of RCs were not appointed but returned by election and were also accountable to the residents. She said that when working in Peng Chau, she communicated with its RC to understand the local situation. While Mr Eric KWOK's concern for the affairs and conservation issues of South Lantau was appreciated, she suggested him discuss with the respective RC Chairman in advance to understand the actual situation and residents' demand, which could probably yield twice the result with half the effort.

28. Ms Amy YUNG said that the electors could express their views to the elected Members or RC Chairmen of their respective constituencies. Given that there was only one elected Member in Discovery Bay, her workload was relatively heavier.

29. The Chairman expressed his views as follows:

- (a) The eight Chairmen of RCs were returned by elections. They were elected by members of the executive committee who were also village representatives elected by villagers. He understood that some Members were dissatisfied with the existing mechanism which, however, had certain electorate base and should be respected. In addition, taking into account the broad expanse of the Lantau Island

constituency, he could not conduct site visits to all places within the constituency on a daily basis. He also needed advice and collaboration from other Members.

- (b) He opined that Mr Eric KWOK could raise the item for discussion after collecting the residents' views and understanding the actual situation. There were no conflicts among Members of various constituencies who had different electorate base and were free to express views at the meeting on behalf of the residents. However, all Members should bear in mind that they were responsible for what they said. He considered the IDC more suitable than Ms Donna TAM to liaise with the DEVB and pointed out that the consolidated written reply of the bureau and the SLO was incomprehensive.

30. Mr Stanley YIP supplemented that the Masterplan was drafted based on the proposals in Sustainable Lantau Blueprint and the Government had extensively consulted the public and Members when formulating the Blueprint in 2017. The proposals in the Masterplan were pending further studies and the department would consult relevant stakeholders in due course if necessary. He would relay Members' views to relevant divisions.

31. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to prepare a written enquiry with regard to the consolidated written reply for response from the DEVB and the SLO.

XII. Question on development of Tung Chung Area 52
(Paper IDC 12/2021)

32. The Chairman welcomed Ms TAM Yin-ping, Donna, District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands of the Planning Department (PlanD) and Ms LIU Wai-han, Estate Surveyor/1 of the District Lands Office, Islands (DLO/Is) to the meeting to respond to the question. The Chairman said that the DLO/Is had provided a written reply for Members' perusal.

33. Mr LEE Ka-ho briefly presented the question.

34. Ms Donna TAM responded that Tung Chung Area 52 was zoned "Open Space" on the relevant Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). To her understanding, there was no definite timetable for its implementation and the land was being used for temporary purposes. The departments concerned would finalise the timetable for implementation and detailed planning for the land in accordance with their policies and resources.

35. Ms LIU Wai-han said that she had nothing to supplement regarding the written reply.

36. Mr Sammy TSUI said that he and the residents wished to know the future development of Area 52 and the design of relevant structures. Citing government papers, he mentioned that lower-rise buildings and structures would be constructed in the area to avoid blocking the view. The residents would like to know whether there were changes to the current design and what the actual design was, such as whether the height of buildings facing the sea would gradually decrease, i.e. a stepped height design was adopted. He asked PlanD whether there would be commercial buildings constructed in Area 52 and requested the department to provide more information, otherwise Members could not be able to respond to residents' enquiries.

37. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that it was not the first time to allocate lands in Area 52 to the CEDD for temporary uses. Given that the DLO/Is allocated lands in Area 52 to the CEDD for five years, the residents were concerned about when the open space initially planned would be available. Referring to the response from all three departments, he asked which department was the "relevant department" and whether the relevant department could provide the development timetable of the open space. As mentioned by Mr Sammy TSUI, in view of the land being used for storing construction materials, the residents were worried about the possible change of land uses, for housing construction in particular. He hoped that the department would provide Members with the details of development, including the time limit of using the land for storing construction materials and the timetable for provision of leisure facilities, so as to ease the concern of residents.

38. Mr FONG Lung-fei expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He was worried that the DLO/Is would further extend the temporary land allocation period of Area 52, causing delay in provision of the initially planned leisure facilities for residents' use. In addition, the land was near private residential blocks, whose residents were worried that the change of land use might affect property prices in the area.
- (b) He pointed out that the CEDD had formed a group for Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE) whose members included representatives of the IDC. To his surprise, Mr LEE Ka-ho was not on the membership list. He pointed out that the development of Tung Chung Area 52 caused greater impact on the residents of Tung Chung Centre than those of Tung Chung West, and Mr LEE Ka-ho, who represented the Tung Chung Centre constituency, should be a member of the group. As Tung Chung Centre was close to Tung Chung West, some residents of Tung Chung Centre had enquired of him about the development of Area 52. However, as a Member of another constituency, he was uncertain about the situation and advised the residents to approach Mr LEE Ka-ho, who also failed to respond to the enquiries unfortunately, as non-members could not attend meetings of the group and express views at the occasion. He enquired of the CEDD about the selection criteria for group members and hoped that

the department could provide Members with relevant information for answering residents' enquiries.

39. The Chairman said that matters regarding land use was under the purview of the DLO/Is and asked its representative to respond to Members' enquiries.

40. Ms LIU Wai-han responded that the development of Area 52 was mainly subject to the long-term planning of the area, and considered it more appropriate for the representative of the PlanD to give response. As for whether the DLO/Is would continue to allocate the land to the CEDD for use as a temporary site office, it depended mainly on whether the relevant application would be submitted by the CEDD and when the long-term planning of the land will be implemented. If an application from the CEDD was received, the DLO/Is would process it in accordance with the established procedures.

41. Ms Donna TAM made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) In response to enquiries from Members on the design of structures to be provided at the site, she pointed out that the land was zoned "Open Space" on the relevant OZP so it would be developed into an open space. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, construction of structures other than those related to open space use (such as pavilions and public toilets) should as far as possible be avoided within "Open Space" zone.
- (b) Regarding enquires on the development of commercial buildings, she pointed out that development of commercial buildings on sites zoned "Open Space" on the OZP would not be permitted unless the OZP was officially amended but there was no plan to do so.
- (c) She said that a promenade and waterfront park would be provided in Area 52 but to her understanding, no detailed timetable for implementation was available yet. She pointed out that a number of reclamation works were in progress in the Tung Chung Extension Area. If the reclamation works could be completed as soon as possible, the temporary site office or construction site could be vacated for implementation of the planned use.

42. Mr Stanley YIP said that the construction site was currently used by the Highways Department (HyD). Learning that there had been no timetable for implementation yet, the CEDD applied to the DLO/Is for using the land as a temporary site office until 2025 tentatively. If land resumption was required for development in the future, the department would discuss the arrangement with the DLO/Is and relevant departments.

43. Mr Eric KWOK said that as stated in the question on the proposed open space in Tung Chung Area 52 in a paper of the District Facilities Management

Committee (DFMC) (Paper DFMC 19/2016) and the LCSD's written reply, the LCSD had reserved a temporary government land of around 10 000 square metres near the sea in Tung Chung Area 52 for running a community garden and nursery. The department would also continue to closely monitor the development of Tung Chung Area 52 for planning cultural and leisure facilities. He asked the Chairman to note the paper.

(Post-meeting note of the LCSD: Part of land in Area 52 was reserved for relocation of the Tung Chung community garden and nursery next to Tat Tung Road Garden which would be vacated for the intended use.)

44. Mr LEE Ka-ho expressed his views as follows:

- (a) According to the response of the representative of the DLO/Is, he queried whether the land would be constantly allocated to various departments for use if there were no long-term development plans. He was also worried that the open space would continue to be used for storing construction materials. Given that the LCSD had reserved lands in Area 52 in 2016 as mentioned by Mr Eric KWOK, he considered it necessary to clarify whether the lands would only be used for storing construction materials until 2025 and be developed into a promenade afterwards, or whether the development of the land would have to be initiated by the LCSD. Otherwise, the two departments would wait for each other, resulting in indefinite delay in the completion of the promenade even if lands were reserved.
- (b) He did not have confidence in the land use planning of the OZP and pointed out that the MTR Corporation Limited suddenly claimed to have obtained approval from the Town Planning Board for using the two "Government, Institution or Community" sites opposite to Caribbean Coast for housing construction. As such, it was hard to guarantee that the open space would not be rezoned for housing purpose. He hoped that government departments could give clear response to keep the public informed of when the promenade would be constructed, open for public use, and extended from the pier to Tung Chung North.

45. Mr FONG Lung-fei criticised the PlanD for pointing out that some departments had reserved land, or that an organisation was applying for land allocation, but it refused to disclose which departments or organisation they were, which was puzzling. He enquired of the PlanD if confidentiality agreements were involved, and if not, it should disclose to the meeting the departments which had submitted applications. He reiterated he was surprised that Mr LEE Ka-ho had not been appointed as a group member and opined that the group should include all Members representing Tung Chung, so that they would have a clear understanding of the development of the area.

46. The Chairman expressed his views as follows:
- (a) He believed that Area 52 had a clear planning intention of providing leisure facilities and the LCSD had probably planned for their provisions. However, the works had not commenced as the land was being used by the HyD and the CEDD until 2025. Members could explain to the residents that the land would be temporarily used as a site office and a materials storage area of the HyD and the CEDD.
 - (b) He said that the new Tung Chung MTR Station would be completed in 2029, therefore, there would be a keen demand for leisure facilities in the area from 2028 to 2030. Members hoped that leisure facilities could be constructed immediately after the CEDD handed over the land in 2025, with a view to the completion for use in 2027. He asked Ms Donna TAM to relay the views to the departments concerned, discuss with them whether the works of leisure facilities in Area 52 could commence in 2025 or two or three years after, and provide Members with a timetable in one to two months. He pointed out that Members might barely accept works commencement in 2027 but probably not a delay until 2029.
 - (c) He asked the CEDD to respond to Mr FONG Lung-fei's question on the reasons for not including Mr LEE Ka-ho as a group member.
47. Mr Stanley YIP enquired about the name of the group Mr FONG Lung-fei referred to and said that he could relay Members' views to the group concerned.
48. Mr Eric KWOK said that the group in discussion was the community liaison group of the TCNTE. He opined that Mr LEE Ka-ho should be appointed as a group member as he was closely related to the project.
49. The Chairman requested Mr Stanley YIP to follow up on the issue of not appointing Mr LEE Ka-ho as a group member.
50. Ms Currie SIU said that the LCSD had learnt that the PlanD had zoned Area 52 as open space and pointed out that not all open spaces would be managed by the LCSD. The planning timetable for Area 52 was not available partly because the HyD and the CEDD were using the land, which was expected to be handed over in 2025. The LCSD had reserved lands for provision of leisure and sports facilities in the TCNTE Area. It would formulate preliminary plans as soon as possible in the next few years and consult DC members in due course.
51. The Chairman said that as the LCSD expressed its interest in developing Area 52 when responding to the question on the proposed open space in Tung Chung Area 52 at a DFMC meeting in 2016, he requested the relevant departments to conduct discussions with the LCSD and enquired if the LCSD intended to provide a

park or leisure facilities in Area 52. If yes, he asked for provision of a planning timetable, and if no for the time being, Members could consult Ms Donna TAM or approach relevant departments for follow-up on the intended use of the open space.

XV. Date of Next Meeting

52. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m. The next meeting would be held on 26 April 2021 (Monday) at 10:30 a.m.

-END-