

(Translation)

**Minutes of Meeting of Islands District Council**

Date : 27 April 2020 (Monday)  
Time : 2:00 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 (Left at around 5:55 p.m.)  
Mr YUNG Chi-ming, BBS, MH (Left at around 5:50 p.m.)  
Mr CHAN Lin-wai, MH (Left at around 6:00 p.m.)  
Mr WONG Hon-kuen, Ken  
Mr HO Chun-fai  
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  
Mr FONG Lung-fei  
Ms LAU Shun-ting  
Mr LEE Ka-ho  
Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho  
Mr WONG Chun-yeung

**Attendance by Invitation**

Dr CHAN Kwok-kuen, Ivan	Marine Parks Officer (Development) 2, Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Mr Peter Lee	General Manager, Environment, Third Runway, Airport Authority Hong Kong
Dr Jasmine Ng	Partner, ERM
Ms WU Ming-ye, Amy	Senior Town Planner/Islands 2, Planning Department
Mr KAU Tin-chak, Timothy	Town Planner/Islands 7, Planning Department
Ms YUEN Kit-fung	Engineer/Islands 2, Transport Department

Mr MOK Hing-cheung	Chief Land Executive/Islands (District Lands Office, Islands), Lands Department
Mr SZETO Hor-keung	Senior Land Executive/Land Control (District Lands Office, Islands), Lands Department
Mr LI Cheuk-sum	Land Executive/Land Control 2 (District Lands Office, Islands), Lands Department
Mr LEE Ming-tong, Timothy	Senior Building Surveyor/A1, Buildings Department
Mr TONG Siu-leung, David	Senior Geo Engineer/Mainland W 5, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr YAN Man-chi, Robin	Property Service Manager/S(HKI) 3, Housing Department
Mr FOO Chi-hung	Divisional Officer (New Territories South West), Fire Services Department
Mr WONG Yu-fai	Station Commander Tung Chung Fire Station, Fire Services Department

**In Attendance**

Mr LI Ping-wai, Anthony, JP	District Officer (Islands), Islands District Office
Mr LI Ho, Thomas	Assistant District Officer (Islands)1, Islands District Office
Ms LEUNG Tin-ye, 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 LO Siu-keung	Senior Engineer/15 (L), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms TAM Yin-ping, Donna	District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands, Planning Department
Ms IP Siu-ming	District Social Welfare Officer (Central Western, Southern and Islands), Social Welfare Department
Ms LEE Sin-man	Chief Manager/Management (Hong Kong Island and Islands), Housing Department
Ms WONG Wing-kan, Kanis	Acting District Lands Officer/Islands, Lands Department,
Mr KWOK Chi-hang, Henry	Administrative Assistant/Lands, Lands Department
Ms TAM Nga-ching	District Commander (Lantau), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr WONG Wai-yin	Deputy District Commander (Marine Port District), Hong Kong Police Force
Ms KWOK Sze-wai	Police Community Relations Officer (Lantau District), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr LEONG Seong-iam	Police Community Relations Officer (Marine Port District), Hong Kong Police Force
Ms CHOW Pui-sze, Alice	Chief Transport Officer/Boundary, 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
Mr KWAN Chung-wai, David	District Leisure Manager (Islands), Leisure and Cultural Services Department

**Secretary**

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

## Welcoming Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives of the government departments to the meeting and introduced the following representatives of the departments who attended the meeting:

- (a) Ms WONG Wing-kan, Kanis, Acting District Lands Officer/Islands of the Lands Department (LandsD) who stood in for Mr LING Ka-fai, Kenny;
- (b) Mr LO Siu-keung, Senior Engineer/15(L) of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) who stood in for Mr WONG Kwok-fai, Alfred; and
- (c) Mr WONG Wai-yin, Deputy District Commander (Marine Port District) of the Hong Kong Police Force who stood in for Mr K Jacobs.

### I. Confirmation of Minutes of Meetings held on 24 February 2020 and 2 March 2020

2. The Chairman said that the captioned minutes had incorporated the amendments proposed by the government departments and Members and had been distributed to Members for perusal prior to the meeting.

3. Members voted by a show of hands. There were 17 voted for, 0 against and one abstaining. The minutes were confirmed.

(Members voted for included: The Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice Chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Josephine TSANG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting, Mr LEE Ka-ho, Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and Mr WONG Chun-yeung. Ms Amy YUNG abstained.)

### II. Proposed Marine Park for the Expansion of Hong Kong International Airport into a Three-Runway System

4. The Chairman welcomed Dr CHAN Kwok-kuen, Ivan, Marine Parks Officer (Development) 2 of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD), Mr Peter LEE, General Manager, Environment, Third-Runway, of the Airport Authority Hong Kong (AAHK) and Dr Jasmine NG, Partner of ERM to the meeting to respond to the questions.

5. Mr Peter LEE presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint Presentation.

6. Mr Sammy TSUI said that the project had aroused concern among various sectors of the community and environmentalists after unveiling. He asked the

departments concerned about the completion date of the marine park and, apart from its management and operation, whether AFCD would be responsible for monitoring the performance of the marine park; if yes, the ways of monitoring. He further enquired which government department would follow up in case of breakdown of facilities in the marine park and whether AFCD had resources for conducting extra repairs. He noted that the project involved submarine facilities and asked AAHK to provide the relevant details. He was worried that the marine park which was established to protect the marine ecology and raise conservation awareness would turn out to be a “white elephant project” due to lack of supervision after completion. He also enquired whether measures would be introduced to prevent illegal fishing activities after the release of fish fry.

7. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho asked the departments concerned to give a detailed account on the decrease in the number of Chinese White Dolphins (CWDs) for Members to understand the ecological impact of the project. Since the reports showed a trend of CWDs moving southwards due to the impact of the project, he enquired about the ways to ensure that CWDs would return to their home range after the completion of the marine park. He also enquired whether the marine park could compensate for the inadequacies of the prevailing conservation measures or there would be other methods of conservation. He earlier found the carcass of a CWD in Cheung Chau and reported to AFCD which subsequently took follow-up action. He opined that the incident reflected the difficulty in solving the problem and requested AAHK to provide information about the study on directing CWDs to return to their home range. If the study revealed that only three CWDs or so would return to their home range, the project should not be implemented and efforts should be made to identify a more desirable habitat or direct more CWDs to return to their home range.

8. Mr LEE Ka-ho welcomed the marine park project and said that the new conservation measures sparked hope for conservation work in Hong Kong although the Expansion of Hong Kong International Airport into a Three-Runway System (3RS project) would have impacts on CWDs. Although artificial reefs would be deployed and fish fry restocked in the proposed marine park, he doubted whether fishes would be attracted and CWDs would return to their home range. He enquired whether there were ways to assess the effectiveness of the measures and if yes, he requested the relevant departments to provide detailed information. Moreover, he enquired whether the ecosystem of the marine park would be evaluated before, during and after the implementation of 3RS project.

9. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) AFCD would be responsible for management of the proposed marine park, above which was Sha Chau and Lung Kwu Chau Marine Park and below was Southwest Lantau Marine Park. The three marine parks would cover a vast expanse of conservation area. While the 3RS project would inevitably cause damage to the environment, he was glad that AAHK introduced corresponding mitigation measures. According to the information provided, fish fry would be restocked in both Southwest Lantau Marine Park and the proposed marine park, and he

was worried that it would provide incentive for illegal fishing and enquired about the measures AFCD would take to combat such activities.

- (b) Since the sonar system of CWDs would be affected by noise, he was worried that the noise generated by vessels operating at high speed on Castle Peak Fairway would do harm to CWDs on their way to the habitat and enquired how AAHK would mitigate the issue of noise and monitor the vessel speed. Moreover, it was learnt that AAHK would restock fish fry in the proposed marine park in stages with 8 000 fish fry in the first round, he enquired whether review would be carried out after the second round of fish fry restocking and what measures would be adopted in line with the deployment of artificial reefs. He asked AAHK to provide further details.

10. The Vice-chairman Mr WONG Man-hon said that many fishermen conducted fishing activities in adjacent waters but received limited information or had little knowledge about the conservation area. He suggested AFCD to arrange staff to communicate with them to avoid inadvertent entry into the restricted area. In view that the fishing area would be reduced after designation of conservation area thereby affecting the livelihood of fishermen, he proposed that AAHK should set aside funds to compensate affected fishermen of Tai O, Tung Chung, Mui Wo and Cheung Chau.

11. Mr HO Siu-kei said that some fishermen in Islands District still made a living by fishing and hoped that AAHK would provide subsidies to all fishermen. He remarked that illegal fishing was serious and the fishermen always complained about people using illegal fishing gears. Although reports were made to the Police and respective Police Division conducted joint enforcement operation with Marine Police, the number of arrests was not high and some cases even remained unresolved in the end. As such, he enquired how AFCD would manage the three marine parks and take enforcement action against fishing activities in the parks. He proposed that the department should safeguard the right of fishermen to fish in the sea continuously and earn a living, while stepping up efforts to monitor the behaviour of anglers and water sports participants to avoid polluting the ecology and destroying the seabed.

12. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that the project would affect the livelihood of fishermen in the vicinity and enquired whether relevant departments would consider providing subsidies or compensation.

13. Mr Peter LEE made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Regarding the establishment of the marine park, it was expected that the relevant statutory procedures for the designation of marine park could be completed before the 3RS project came into full operation in 2024.
- (b) Regarding the number and monitoring of CWDs as well as the ways to attract them to return to their original waters in the future, surveys on CWDs had been conducting in the northern, western and southern

Lantau waters before the commencement of the project and the data was presented in the Environmental Monitoring and Audit (EM&A) Reports which were available online for public inspection. He said that the figures of 2016 to 2018 were relatively stable and those of 2019 were being processed. According to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report, during the implementation of marine works, CWDs might move from the North Lantau waters to western and southern waters or even outside Hong Kong waters. Relevant enhancement measures would be taken for the marine park, which included considering of fish fry release and deployment of artificial reefs, restricting the speed for vessels inside the marine park to 10 knots, and controlling new developments in the marine park. It was believed that the measures could help attract CWDs to return to their original waters. He indicated that monitoring of CWDs would be continued after the establishment of the marine park to review the effectiveness of relevant enhancement measures. He remarked that AAHK would consider strengthening the measures if they were in the right direction, and changing the strategy if no significant result was achieved.

- (c) Regarding restocking of fish fry, he indicated that AAHK conducted the first fish fry release in the waters concerned in 2019 and planned to conduct further release after the deployment of artificial reefs to monitor the existence of fish fry in the vicinity of the artificial reefs so as to evaluate the effectiveness of restocking after establishment of the new marine park.
- (d) Regarding the impacts of underwater noise on CWDs, he said that according to the EIA Report, underwater noise and operation of vessels were closely related and the higher the vessel speed, the higher the noise level. He indicated that speed limit was to be imposed inside the marine park to reduce underwater noise with a view to minimising the impacts on CWDs in the marine park.
- (e) Regarding compensation, he said that the Government had formulated compensation proposals for the 3RS and reclamation works to provide ex-gratia allowance to fishermen according to the effects on them. He indicated that prior to the project commencement, resources had been allocated to the department concerned for making ex-gratia payments to the fishermen affected according to established procedures. In addition, AAHK had set up two funds including the Fisheries Enhancement Fund (FEF). One of the aims of the FEF is to help the fishermen upgrade their skills in fishing operation or switch to other types of operation. Related support measures had been rolled out under the Fund.

14. Dr Ivan CHAN made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) After completion of the remaining consultation exercise, AAHK would submit the proposal to the Marine Parks Committee (MPC) for discussion

and then consult the Country and Marine Parks Board (CMPB). AFCD would then prepare draft maps at the direction of the Chief Executive in Council pursuant to Section 7 of the Marine Parks Ordinance and kick off the statutory procedures for designation of the marine park.

- (b) Regarding the management and law enforcement, upon establishment, the marine park would be regulated according to the Marine Parks Ordinance and Marine Parks and Marine Reserves Regulation. Fishermen with local registered fishing vessels who wished to conduct commercial fishing activities in the marine park would have to apply for a fishing permit. Where necessary, the department would collaborate with the Marine Police for enforcement and liaise with the Mainland Authority for conducting joint enforcement operations to combat illegal cross-boundary fishing activities. Upon designation of the marine park, new vessels and enforcement staff would be deployed to perform patrol and enforcement duties, with a view to enhancing the effectiveness of enforcement with the use of technology for detecting the occurrence and patterns of illegal fishing activities. The department would also visit the districts from time to time to communicate with the fishermen and gather information for combating illegal fishing activities.

15. The Chairman enquired about the number of CWDs at present. He said that many Lantau Island residents farmed in the morning and fished in the afternoon and did not join any fishermen association. He enquired whether those residents and amateur anglers could apply for a fishing permit.

16. Mr Peter LEE said that since the commencement of the project in 2016, AAHK had been conducting annual surveys on the abundance of CWDs in the waters concerned and the figures were published on the webpage. According to the survey in 2016, the abundance of CWDs was 63, whereas the abundance in 2017 and 2018 were 71 and 77 respectively. The figure of 2019 was being processed. He said that despite stable figures were registered in recent years, the EIA Report stated that during the implementation of marine works, the abundance of CWDs in the waters concerned might decrease and CWDs would return to their original waters with the enhanced environment upon works completion.

17. The Chairman enquired of AFCD whether people engaged in both fisheries and agriculture and anglers were required to apply for a fishing permit before they could operate or engage in recreational activities in the marine park.

18. Dr Ivan CHAN said that upon designation of the marine park, the Fishing Permit Working Group would discuss matters relating to the issuance of permits. Since the marine park was planned to enhance the conservation of CWDs, applications for permits would be mainly open to fishermen to minimise the impacts on their daily operation and livelihood, and there was no plan for issuing permits to members of the public for conducting recreational fishing for the time being.

19. The Chairman reiterated that, unlike general anglers, many villagers in South

Lantau farmed in the morning and fished in the sea in the afternoon to make a living. He enquired whether AFCD could process the applications with flexibility.

20. Mr WONG Chun-yeung expressed his views as follows:

- (a) While he had no objection to the planning of the marine park, he questioned whether AAHK proposed to build the marine park following the application for judicial review on the EIA Report by the public. He would like to clarify with the representative of AAHK whether he meant that the report on establishment of the marine park had not been uploaded to AAHK's webpage or there was any misunderstanding. He pointed out that as Members received related papers via email only at around 8:28 a.m. on the meeting day, they could hardly gather information and have comprehensive knowledge of the development of the marine park within three to four hours, and hence were unable to provide concrete input and reflect public opinions during the discussion. He doubted the sincerity of AAHK in consulting Members and hoped that the next time major works project was to be discussed at the meeting, AAHK would provide related information one to two weeks in advance.
- (b) As reported by the FactWire News Agency (FNA) on 2 April this year, complaints were received about vessels berthing in the waters in the vicinity of the 3RS project site hindering the works progress, exposing the waters concerned as the black spots of frozen meat smuggling. He asked AAHK to pay more attention and work with Marine Police to enhance law enforcement.

21. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that the figures about CWDs were unavailable on AAHK's webpage whereas AFCD's webpage only provided the number of CWDs as at 6 September 2018, including the dolphin population in the eastern part of the Pearl River Estuary (PRE), etc. Noting that the media such as FNA and hk01 reported the status of CWDs in Hong Kong waters only, he enquired whether CWDs in other waters should be included when counting their abundance or only the abundance in Hong Kong waters was examined and how the sea boundary of Hong Kong was delineated. Referring to the department's webpage which showed that there were about 1 000 CWDs in the eastern part of the PRE waters and less than 100 in Hong Kong waters, he enquired how AAHK would continue to conserve the several dozens of CWDs. He noted that the figures of 2019 were being processed and considered it too late to update the figures of 2019 in September 2020.

22. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that while AAHK claimed that the figures of CWDs from 2016 to 2018 were stable, the total number of CWDs in Hong Kong waters during 2011 and 2015 was reported to range from 60 to over 80, then fall to 47 during 2016 and 2018 and only 32 in 2019. He questioned whether AAHK avoided mentioning the figures because of the decrease. He requested AAHK to provide the actual figures and enquired how many CWDs would remain after the completion of reclamation. He remarked that according to the prevailing trend, the CWD numbers in Hong Kong waters might further decrease and even reduce to zero two years later, and it was



doubtful whether the deployment of artificial reefs and restocking of fish fry could attract dolphins to return to their home waters. He requested AAHK to make the figures public to enhance transparency and better reflect the effectiveness of conservation measures.

23. Mr Peter LEE made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The related figures had been uploaded to the dedicated website on environmental matters relating to the 3RS project (<http://env.threerunwaysystem.com>), and members of the public could visit the website to read the reports required under the Environment Permit, annual and monthly EM&A Reports and the Marine Park Proposal submitted by AAHK in March 2016 as required under the Environment Permit. He pointed out that AAHK proposed the establishment of the marine park as early as 2012 - 2014 during the EIA stage, and presented the proposal to various stakeholders and sought their views. Given that the statutory procedures of the proposal would soon commence, AAHK would like to communicate the relevant information to the stakeholders.
- (b) Smuggling activities were unrelated to the 3RS project but did have a bearing on the safety of project staff and their work. Recent complaints were being followed up by law enforcement departments.
- (c) CWDs not only inhabited in Hong Kong waters and sightings were sometimes recorded in west of Hong Kong and PRE. AAHK and AFCD only conducted surveys on the abundance of CWDs that were active in Hong Kong waters. The figures were shown in their respective annual reports and posted on the websites. He said that initiatives were funded by the Marine Ecology Enhancement Fund (MEEF) including surveys on CWDs in PRE and the waters to the west of PRE. With the survey on CWDs conducted in Hong Kong over 10 years, the figures collected in Hong Kong waters were comprehensive and the survey was systematic compared to the survey result of PRE which was relatively limited. The MEEF would continue to provide funding for surveys in PRE to examine more comprehensively the status of CWDs in the waters concerned for further stepping up efforts for conservation.

III. Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-TCTC/22  
(Paper IDC 48/2020)

24. The Chairman welcomed Ms TAM Yin-ping, Donna, District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands, Ms WU Ming-yee, Amy, Senior Town Planner/Islands 2 and Mr KAU Tin-chak, Timothy, Town Planner/Islands 7 of the Planning Department (PlanD); and Ms CHOW Pui-sze, Alice, Chief Transport Officer/Boundary and

Ms YUEN Kit-fung, Engineer/Islands 2 of the Transport Department (TD) to the meeting to present the paper.

25. Ms Amy WU presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint Presentation.
26. Mr LEE Ka-ho expressed his views as follows:
  - (a) He thanked PlanD for the detailed presentation and indicated that the department's paper triggered strong opposition from the residents. He said that views were received from about 200 persons and about 95% of whom objected to the project.
  - (b) He summarised the reasons for residents' objection. First, the traffic problem in Tung Chung had been plaguing the Tung Chung residents. Noting that MTR Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West Stations would only be completed in 2029, he indicated that the increasing population, completion of more housing estates in Tung Chung East after land reclamation and new public housing developments in Tung Chung West would put tremendous pressure on road transport. Even after the completion of Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West Stations, two more years were required before the overrun tunnel was completed. He considered what the department's paper described departed from reality and that the number of development projects springing up in the vicinity would have a cumulative impact on the traffic flow, making the developments unsuitable for discussion separately.
  - (c) Second, the three buildings concerned were 184 metres high, the same as the adjacent Caribbean Coast. The attached drawing showed that upon completion of the buildings, one of them would be separated from Caribbean Coast by Man Tung Road only, completely blocking the view of one or two blocks of Caribbean Coast and seriously obstructing natural lighting and ventilation of these blocks.
  - (d) In view that large-scale construction work projects were carried out incessantly in Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West, he questioned if the 1 300 flat units as mentioned by the department could effectively address the housing problem and whether it was really necessary to make use of every inch of space on the comprehensively planned "Government, Institution or Community" (GIC) site to build more housing. He was discontented that the department continued to build residential buildings without making proper planning for ancillary facilities such as schools, education and sports venues, which was unfair to Tung Chung residents.
  - (e) He enquired whether the department would consult Tung Chung residents or launch public consultation and provide more documents to Members for reference, such as the works schedule and traffic and environmental impact assessment reports of the vicinity.

27. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He enquired about the planning of GIC site in Plan 2. It was learnt that the site was originally planned in response to the demand of residents in Tung Chung East (including Ying Tung Estate) for community facilities and suitable for the use of community hall, indoor sports centre, community service centre, kindergarten, primary school and secondary school, etc., but it was now re-designated on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for development of three private residential buildings by the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL). He pointed out that even though there were primary and secondary schools in Caribbean Coast, the planning standards specified that one primary school should be provided for every 6 000 to 7 000 persons, at least one primary school and one secondary school for every 7 500-odd persons and another primary school and secondary school for every 20 000-odd persons. Apart from Ying Tung Estate, there were currently tens of thousands of residents living in Area 99, 100, 103 and 109 of the new town, coupling with the three MTRCL private buildings, he asked whether the department considered that the education facilities in the district were not in compliance with the planning standards and requested an explanation.
- (b) He enquired why the residential site was rezoned as “Residential (Group A)” for high-density development and reckoned that the planning would only be acceptable if Tung Chung East Station was available nearby. Since Tung Chung East Station was not situated in the district, he objected that the department did not conform with the planning and design standards and pointed out that a “Residential (Group A)” site with a maximum plot ratio of 6 had to be provided with a mass transit system nearby. He queried that the planning was made to facilitate the development of the three private buildings by MTRCL for profit making and urged the department to give a detailed account to allay public concerns.
- (c) Facilities proposed by the Social Welfare Department (SWD) were mentioned, which included an integrated home care service team sub-base, a social and recreational centre for the disabled, a service base for the on-site pre-school rehabilitation services, a parents/relatives resource centre and a home care service for persons with severe disabilities, whereas there was no mention of youth centres or family and elderly facilities. He cast doubt over the designation of the lower floors of the three buildings for private commercial use or eating place only.

28. Mr Sammy TSUI expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He considered the three private buildings introduced by the department visually appealing and in an attractive setting. Nevertheless, the department should have conducted local consultation beforehand and

provided Members information about the design and development of the buildings. According to the department's paper, the proposed development included three buildings of 40-odd storeys with a total of 1 289 flats, accommodating about 4 000 persons in total basing on an average household of three persons. Coupling with the proposed five social welfare facilities mentioned by the department, more ancillary transport facilities would be needed in the future but no proposal had been put forward to cater for the transport need of an area having a population of 4 000. He enquired of the department about the future ancillary transport facilities and the response plan after the intake of several thousands of residents.

- (b) Noting that Tung Chung East Station was some distance away from the site concerned, he enquired whether feeder service would be provided. He queried the department submitted the design proposal to the District Council (DC) without formulating a comprehensive transport planning and urged it to provide more information about ancillary facilities.

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

- (a) She first responded to several major points, and referred the transport issue for the representative of TD.
- (b) Regarding the purpose of the proposed amendments and planning intention, as stated in the presentation, the Government has been increasing land supply through a multi-pronged approach for building various housing types to satisfy different needs. The proposed amendments were to optimize the use of land by assessing the feasibility of residential development atop MTRCL's facilities.
- (c) In the light of relevant policy, MTRCL had already submitted technical assessments for the proposed residential development atop the site. Upon review, the relevant departments considered the proposal technically feasible. As such, the site is proposed to be rezoned as "Residential (Group A)" residential development atop.
- (d) The average plot ratio of public and private housing in Tung Chung Town Centre was currently 5 to 6. According to prevailing policy, in general the plot ratio of private residential developments in new towns was 6 and that of public residential developments was 6.5. The proposed amendment was in compliance with the existing general standards for the developments in new towns.
- (e) Regarding community facilities, Members' concern on the supporting facilities in Tung Chung Extension Area was noted. Community facilities had been planned during the planning process of Tung Chung Extension Area, including social welfare facilities, schools or community hall. As the construction of a primary school required at

least 6 000 square metres, the two strips of government land at the site were insufficient for the construction. MTRCL had consulted SWD and would provide five social welfare facilities as advised. Other sites had been reserved in other areas of Tung Chung for the provision of secondary and primary schools and ball courts, etc.

- (f) Regarding the timetable, according to established practice, the department would submit the proposed amendments together with the comments of DC to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for consideration. Subject to the agreement of TPB, the amendments would be gazetted for public comment according to statutory procedures. For Members of the public who had any comments on the amendments, they might submit the comments to the TPB. A hearing would be conducted subsequently by the TPB to consider the public comments received.
- (g) The representative of TD would respond to questions concerning ancillary transport facilities or public transport facilities.

30. Ms YUEN Kit-fung made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) TD was very concerned about the traffic condition of Tung Chung and its vicinity. Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) conducted by MTRCL for the proposed development indicated that the anticipated traffic arising from the proposed development would not induce significant traffic impact on the adjacent roads and railway network.
- (b) The proposed development was situated to the east of Man Tung Road, which would be nearer to the future Tung Chung East railway station. As for road link, there would be the proposed Road P1 (Tung Chung to Tai Ho section) with Tai Ho Interchange connecting North Lantau Highway. According to the analysis by the consultant, the traffic volume brought by the proposed development on the roads around Tung Chung Town Centre would be small.
- (c) The department would continue to monitor the traffic condition closely.

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

- (a) TD indicated just now that the new residential development would be near Tung Chung East Station and North Lantau Highway and that residents might take MTR at Tung Chung East Station or travel by private cars. However, he pointed out that as Tung Chung East Station would only be completed in 2029 and the completion date of the housing project was still unknown, the residents would need to rely on road transport to travel to Tung Chung Station if the resident intake was earlier than the commissioning of Tung Chung East Station. He disagreed with the department that the project would have little impact on the traffic of Tung Chung Town Centre.

- (b) He said that the train frequency on Tung Chung Line was limited and there would be no increase in carrying capacity even after the completion of Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West Stations, whereas the overrun tunnel that could facilitate an increase in train frequency would only be completed in or after 2032, thus placing additional burden on the entire railway system.
- (c) With a number of development projects being underway in Tung Chung and increasing population moving to Tung Chung, he queried whether it was necessary to take forward additional projects in view of the existing large number of development projects. For the project concerned, the 1 300 households might not be a large number but would give rise to significant impacts such as adding burden to the traffic in Tung Chung district as more residents commuted to school or to work. He remarked that the impact of the project on the community should not be taken lightly.
- (d) Although consultation would be conducted by PlanD, he hoped that it would provide the project schedule as soon as possible setting out the time frame for design, construction work and submission of relevant assessment reports for Members to give comments.

32. Mr Sammy TSUI expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He urged the Government to face squarely the needs of residents and take into account the relevant ancillary transport facilities in planning. Citing Ying Tung Estate as an example, he said that there were four blocks accommodating about 3 000 households but the bus stop of the estate had insufficient space for parking, resulting in vehicles being too close with each other and traffic accidents frequently. Noting that the project comprised three buildings and there would be several thousands of people moving in, he cast doubt on what TD said that the project would have no impacts on the traffic of Tung Chung North and opined that the traffic volume would at least increase on Man Tung Road and Ying Hei Road. Moreover, five social welfare facilities would be provided in the project and shuttle service for users of the facilities would be required, hence further overloading the traffic.
- (b) He opined that the department should consider the provision of relevant ancillary transport facilities when planning for residential developments instead of waiting till their completion. According to the current actual situation, ancillary transport facilities were apparently insufficient. For example, the bus stop at Ying Tung Estate could only accommodate two parked buses and traffic accidents occurred frequently. Fortunately, there was no fatal accident. Moreover, many Tung Chung residents travelled to work via the cross-harbour route and had to make several interchanges before arriving at the workplace due to limited means of

transport in the district. He opined that the department should make plans for associated ancillary transport facilities when planning for residential developments and provide information to Members so that they might collect the views of residents for discussion.

33. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He urged PlanD and TD to ensure proper planning for provision of facilities. He cited Mun Tung Estate and Yat Tung Estate as examples and said that transport facilities and schools, etc. were not in place after the occupation of Mun Tung Estate, causing much agony to the residents. For example, owing to insufficient primary school places in Tung Chung, many students living in Mun Tung Estate had to attend school in other districts such as Tseung Kwan O and Shatin. He was very dissatisfied that the Government failed to review the education facilities and urged relevant departments to listen to Members' views and assess the demand for education and social welfare facilities holistically to cater for the needs of Tung Chung East residents.
- (b) He was discontented with the representative of TD for failing to respond to the issue of ancillary transport facilities squarely just now. He said that the existing ancillary transport facilities of Mun Tung Estate and Yat Tung Estate were in a great mess with rampant indiscriminate parking hindering the access of ambulances and fire engines, etc. He criticised the department for inadequate consideration during the initial planning and failing to take into account the views of Members seriously. He stressed that the department represented the Government and should listen to the views of members of the public attentively to avoid public resentment escalating.

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

- (a) In terms of community facilities, she reiterated that during the planning process of the Tung Chung Extension Area, the entire Tung Chung New Town is planned in a holistic manner, including the provision of relevant facilities serving the existing and future residents. As for Tung Chung Extension Area, she indicated that designated sites had been reserved for the proposed government, institution and community facilities and more suitable sites might be identified in the future. The designated sites could accommodate 15 kindergartens, six primary schools and three secondary schools, which were all new facilities. Sports centre, sports ground, child care centre, youth services centre, neighbourhood elderly centre, day care centre and residential care home for the elderly would also be provided on the designated sites.
- (b) Regarding the timeline for population intake, she said that subject to the agreement of TPB, the amendment would be gazetted for public comment according to statutory procedures. Upon completion of

statutory planning procedures and approval of the OZP by the Executive Council, the land grant process for the development would commence. According to the assessment report submitted by MTRCL, the residential development were expected to be completed in around 2029, at the similar completion time of Tung Chung East Station.

(c) She invited TD to respond to the questions on transport aspect.

35. Ms Alice CHOW said that the department noted Members' concern about the service level of existing public transport service in Tung Chung North. TD would discuss with bus operators to formulate an appropriate public transport plan by making reference to the TIA Report submitted by MTRCL, such as enhancing existing bus service and consider introducing new routes to meet the additional passenger demand arising from population intake, with a view to catering for locals' transport needs before the commissioning of Tung Chung East Station.

36. Ms Josephine TSANG queried that TD was not clear about Members' views. She criticised that indiscriminate parking of vehicles and one-lane traffic had messed up the traffic of Ying Tung Estate. Nevertheless, TD only proposed increasing service frequency without understanding the road capacity constraints to accommodate additional traffic flow. She said that the problem of indiscriminate parking in Yat Tung Estate was serious, and the key was not to provide additional facilities but instead was the department's failure to address the existing traffic problem, not to mention the traffic growth in line with population increase in the future. She opined that it was necessary to increase service frequency but was afraid about the capacity of the road section to accommodate more buses plying through.

37. Mr Eric KWOK said that the responses of PlanD and TD revealed inadequate communication between the two departments. He urged PlanD, TD, the Highways Department and the Housing Department (HD) to strengthen communication and formulate plans correspondingly. In response to Members' previous enquiries about the traffic problem after occupation of the three private buildings, TD said that new bus routes might be introduced, the response of which he found dissatisfactory and opined that the issue should be considered in a holistic manner. He pointed out that the site was near Ying Tung Estate and across it were Areas 99, 100, 103 and 109, home to over 40 000 residents. He had pointed out at an earlier meeting seriously poor planning and was discontented that the department did not face the problem squarely at this meeting.

38. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He considered that there was insufficient communication on the planning of Tung Chung development and urged the departments to discuss it in a serious manner.
- (b) Citing Tuen Mun Road as an example, he said that Tuen Mun, even with proper planning, ended up with only a road linking with other places. It was similar in Tung Chung with Tsing Ma Bridge the only access,



which was not easy to solve. Mr Sammy TSUI, Ms Josephine TSANG and Mr Eric KWOK criticised just now that the planning of Tung Chung was poor with insufficient parking spaces, resulting in vehicles parking at the roadside. Things were interconnected producing a domino effect. He criticised the departments for not considering in a holistic manner and answering d questions in a piecemeal manner.

39. Ms Donna TAM said she had received letters from Members and the DC earlier, requesting a briefing by PlanD on the overall planning of Tung Chung and its implementation. When the relevant documents were ready, the department would provide a briefing together with CEDD.

40. Ms Alice CHOW responded that the department noted the limited transport facilities in Ying Tung Estate at present. Regarding the ancillary transport facilities for Tung Chung North as a whole, TD noted that land was reserved for the provision of a public transport interchange in the public housing development project of Area 99. The department would maintain close communication with HD and PlanD, etc. to plan for the ancillary transport facilities for Tung Chung North where appropriate.

41. The Chairman believed that the departments noted the views of Members. He agreed that there was a lack of communication between departments and proposed that relevant departments such as PlanD, CEDD, TD and SWD should step up communication, and organise workshops, discussion forums or briefing sessions and visit DC for a briefing to ensure Members to have a better understanding of the overall planning to minimise misunderstanding and provide advice where appropriate to enhance the overall development of Tung Chung.

#### IV. Question on breach of a quarantine order (Paper IDC 57/2020)

42. The Chairman welcomed Mr WONG Wai-yin, Deputy District Commander (Marine Port District) of the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) to the meeting to respond to the question. HKPF and the Department of Health (DH) had provided written replies for Members' perusal.

43. Mr Ken WONG presented the question briefly.

44. Mr WONG Wai-yin said that the Police was extremely concerned about the matter and had provided a written reply. He had nothing to add.

45. Mr Ken WONG was not pleased that the departments evaded the question. Furthermore, the statements made by DH, the Chief Executive and the Secretary for Food and Health Sophia CHAN were at variance with each other, sparking public concerns. It was understood that when the same happened in urban areas, the persons breaching the order were taken away immediately but the case was treated in a slipshod manner in Islands District. To his understanding, on the following day after the incident, the Police, possibly in the face of pressure or listening to well-intentioned

advice, mobilised law-enforcement officers and a negotiator to the scene but the expatriate subsequently attempted to jump from the police launch. He queried why the Police continued to allow such undisciplined person to stay at home for quarantine and whether a prosecution would be instituted instead of letting the person off with just a warning to avoid any public perception of favoritism over race.

46. Mr WONG Wai-yin responded as follows:

- (a) The Police enforced the law absolutely regardless of race. In this incident, the Police provided assistance to DH in law enforcement according to the Prevention and Control of Disease Ordinance (Cap. 599). As the location concerned was the residence of the expatriate, a warrant was required to execute the quarantine order in the private premise under the Ordinance but DH did not have any. He stressed that the Police, to address the community's pressing needs, deployed a negotiator the next day on Saturday although without a warrant in the hope of persuading the man and resolving the matter the soonest possible.
- (b) In fact, the Police had never indicated that no legal proceedings would be instituted against the expatriate. However, in the order of priority, to remove a risk from Peng Chau was considered to be of most important at that point. Therefore, he led a team of officers to Peng Chau on Saturday to take the expatriate to Chun Yeung Estate. Investigation was underway, and the Police would send the relevant details to DH after collecting sufficient evidence for appropriate legal actions.

47. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He thanked Mr WONG Wai-yin for his reply and hoped that a record would be made indicating that the Police had to obtain a search warrant for entering a private premise. He agreed that the Police should discharge its duties according to the law.
- (b) He said that the statement made by CE was at variance with what the Police did and what DH said. If the Police did the right thing, then what CE said was wrong and he hoped that the Police would respond to the question to avoid misunderstanding.
- (c) He understood that the Police addressed people's pressing needs but found that the ways things were handled in urban and rural areas were different and asked whether it was because a search warrant would be easier to obtain from DH in respect of a case in urban area so that work was done faster. In the Peng Chau incident, only a Police negotiator was deployed, and he asked whether the time required for application to DH for a search warrant varied from case to case so that the time for the Police to complete the procedure was different.

48. Ms Josephine TSANG understood that, as witnessed by many residents that

day, the Police had deployed a large amount of manpower to deal with the case, and asked whether the Police had reported to DH the situation that day and that someone had flouted the home quarantine order. She opined that the person's conduct had caused concern of the whole community and the Police should explain to DH that its entry into the premise would be justified on grounds of urgency. She queried why the Police did not do so on the first day.

49. Mr LEE Ka-ho opined that there were loopholes in home quarantine and said that the success in containing the outbreak was due to a number of factors. However, since the implementation of home quarantine measure, many people had violated the order and some even absconded while in quarantine, which was like the threat of bombs in our society. He was not pleased that no clear guidelines were given when the policy was introduced. There were also problems in law enforcement. With the spread of the disease, he hoped that the Government would review the inadequacies of the anti-pandemic policy and enhance it to prevent the crisis worsening.

50. Mr Eric KWOK said that the Police had difficulty enforcing the law under the prevailing law. Fortunately, the outbreak had been contained but we should learn a lesson therefrom. He hoped that there would be better coordination between the Government and the Police, otherwise the Ordinance would exist in name only with the Government becoming a laughing stock.

51. Mr WONG Wai-yin responded as follows:

- (a) He was not clear about the rationale behind the question of Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho mentioned in paragraph 47(b). He reiterated that what CE said was clear and consistent with the acts of the Police and DH, that is, zero tolerance against home quarantine breaches. Regarding the incident, the Police exercised the authority conferred by law and deployed manpower to remove the risk from Peng Chau and send the person concerned to Chun Yeung Estate as soon as possible.

Regarding the way the matter was handled, he stressed that there was no difference between urban and rural areas. He asked Mr LEUNG the details of the case in urban areas, e.g. whether it occurred in a public place or a private property and the nature of the case, etc. He stressed that under the Ordinance the Police was required to obtain a warrant to enter a private premise in the execution of quarantine duties. Members could refer to Section 10 of the Prevention and Control of Disease Ordinance (Cap. 599A) if they were in doubt.

- (b) Regarding the Peng Chau incident, although the Police did not have a warrant, it explored various means to resolve the matter proactively, including arrangement of a negotiator and friends of the expatriate to persuade the expatriate.
- (c) On coordination, he said that the Police maintained liaison with DH for two consecutive days to explain the situation and obtain a warrant from

the Court. If a warrant was issued, it would be easier to deal with. However, no warrant was issued eventually and details could be checked with DH since the Police was in no position to comment.

52. Mr Ken WONG expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He did not think that the matter was handled satisfactorily. Ms Josephine TSANG and he were present that day. The police officers said that the expatriate insisted on staying at the flat and DH also instructed that he could continue to undergo home quarantine after a warning. He opined that the Police should send an officer to stand guard outside the flat in case the man absconded again, but the Police replied that it would withdraw while DH just administered a warning. He opined that the matter was not handled appropriately.
- (b) He said that DH had an establishment of just several hundred personnel, so it had to rely on the assistance of the 30 000-strong force. The matter had caused public concern. Did the way the Police and DH deal with the case mean that members of the public could undergo self-quarantine at home without heeding the quarantine orders?
- (c) He criticised that the Police withdrew from the scene without arranging guard duty to help set the mind of the public at ease. He understood that the Police had no warrant and could not enter private premises, but it could stand guard outside and arrest the people under quarantine immediately if they left the premises. If the people stayed at the premises, the Police could wait for a warrant.

53. Mr HO Siu-kei pointed out that a warrant had to be applied from the court via DH. Since the matter had a significant impact on residents, he asked whether the Police could apply to the judge direct for a warrant given the manpower shortage in DH and the exigency.

54. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that he understood that a warrant was required before the Police could enter a private premise. However, the Police entered a godown in Fo Tan without a warrant in response to a burglary on 1 August 2019. He questioned whether extraordinary measures could be taken in the exigency. He accepted the Police's handling of the matter but hoped that an explanation could be given as to why the Police could enter private premises to deal with other cases without a warrant, and under what circumstances the police could enter private premises without a warrant.

55. Mr WONG Wai-yin responded as follows:

- (a) The Police noted Mr WONG's view and would find out the details of communication between the Police and Mr WONG at that time after the meeting. It was unfair that Mr WONG commented on the incident on the ground of the 30 000-strong force. People should note that the

number of police officers attached to Peng Chau was limited and they had to carry out other police work on the island. The Police provided assistance to DH in enforcing provisions of the Ordinance. It received an instruction from DH on Sunday to administer a warning to the person concerned and then withdrew. He said that the Police would strengthen coordination with DH in handling similar cases in the future.

- (b) Regarding the case of Fo Tan cited by Mr LEUNG about entering private premises without a warrant, he said that the cases were different in nature, and the Police would enforce the law according to the relevant ordinances. In the Peng Chau case, the Police was required to apply for a warrant from the court under Section 10 of the Prevention and Control of Disease Ordinance (Cap. 599A) to execute the quarantine order. As for the Fo Tan case, he did not have the details but in criminal cases, the Police had the power to enter private premises to make arrests under the Police Force Ordinance (Cap.232) without warrant to prevent people from running away. He added that it was for general information only and the Police would enforce law depending on the situation.

56. Ms Amy YUNG noted that the Police dealt with the case according to the Prevention and Control of Disease Ordinance (Cap. 599). However, under exceptional circumstances, e.g. where criminal offences were involved, the Police needed not obtain a warrant and was empowered by the Police Force Ordinance (Cap.232) to execute duties. The incident had caused an uproar as the person in home quarantine, if infected, would spread the virus in Peng Chau and bring grave consequences after he absconded. She asked whether Police had the power to enter private premises to make arrests under Cap. 232.

57. Mr WONG Wai-yin said that regarding the home quarantine breach in Peng Chau, it would be inappropriate to exercise the power conferred under Cap. 232 to force entry to make an arrest.

V. Question on suspected unlawful occupation of Government land on Kwun Yam Wan Road

(Paper IDC 49/2020)

58. The Chairman welcomed Mr MOK Hing-cheung, Chief Land Executive, Mr SZETO Hor-keung, Senior Land Executive and Mr LI Cheuk-sum, Land Executive of the District Lands Office, Islands (DLO); Mr LEE Ming-tong, Timothy, Senior Building Surveyor/A1 of the Buildings Department (BD); Mr TONG Siu-leung, David, Senior Geotechnical Engineer/Mainland West 5 of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD); and Mr WONG Wai-yin, Deputy District Commander (Marine Port District) of the Hong Kong Police Force to the meeting to respond to the question.

59. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho briefly introduced the question. He noted that the Police had taken follow-up action and DLO had written to Cheung Chau police station

on the matter. However, the staff at scene had no knowledge of it and just advised the persons concerned to leave without informing the Police to take law enforcement action. He reckoned that there was inadequate communication among the Police and other departments. Noting that the police officers only recorded the identity card numbers of the persons involved, he opined that the Police should take the initiative to follow up and check whether to temporarily detain the persons for follow up by DLO. He was aware that DLO had hired security staff to station at the site but the works at the private land continued despite the issuance of removal order by BD. He enquired whether an application for the two works projects at the site was received, what the application result was and when the unauthorised works would suspend. With a fence wall as high as three metres at the site and the installation of fences by the Administration, members of the public might have thought that the Administration supported the implementation of unauthorised works. He was worried that landslides would be resulted during the rainy season.

60. Mr MOK Hing-cheung said that apart from fencing off the government land concerned, DLO hired security guards to guard the government land at Kwun Yam Wan which was suspected of being unlawfully occupied. Where unlawful occupation was found, the security guards would drive away the persons concerned from the government land and report to the Police if necessary. DLO had been maintaining close liaison with the Police. If the particulars of the persons involved were recorded by the Police at scene, DLO would ask for the details from the Police for follow-up. Since the above-mentioned government land was fenced off and guarded by security staff, unlawful occupation had ceased.

61. Mr Timothy LEE said that unauthorised building works (UBWs) at the private lots at 29 Kwun Yam Wan Road and House 1 of Villas Des Roses involved site formation, slope excavation and construction of retaining wall. Removal orders were served to the owner concerned at the end of March requiring removal of the UBWs. If an owner wished to carry out minor works on the private lots, registered minor works contractor (RMWC) might be appointed to carry out the works through simplified requirements under the Minor Works Control System (MWCS). BD had earlier received the documents submitted by the Authorised Person (AP) and RMWC appointed by the owner of the above premises for the construction of new fence wall on the private lots.

62. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho enquired whether the excavation works and fence wall at Lot No. 899 were permitted.

63. Mr Timothy LEE said that under the MWCS, an owner might appoint RMWC to construct new fence wall on private lots through simplified requirements. As regards the new fence wall was in compliance with the requirements for minor works, the AP and RMWC needed to provide further information for clarification.

64. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho indicated that the owner was approved by the department to perform minor works but he or she constructed a fence wall unlawfully. When he reported the matter to the Police, the workers claimed that they were carrying out authorised minor works but the fence wall went up taller and taller. He questioned

how to ascertain whether the workers were carrying out authorised or unauthorised works. He proposed that DLO should suspend all works at the site, otherwise it would be difficult for the Police to effectively stop the workers carrying out unauthorised works.

65. Mr Sammy TSUI was discontented that the department all along allowed the construction of unauthorised fence wall at the site and only took actions at the end of March when the matter got media attention. He said that DLO could take aerial photos to monitor whether UBW was carried out by the villagers but its staff did nothing despite inspections and had the owner construct the fence wall. He suspected that DLO delayed taking action due to the political background of the owner, which raised suspicions of partiality. The owner even claimed that he/she had nothing to do with the fence wall and that the Government could demolish it.

66. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that the works concerned had continued for years and the department did nothing other than putting up a sign indicating that the works were unauthorised works. He opined that DLO should immediately suspend the works instead of instituting prosecution only after completion of the works.

67. Mr Timothy LEE said that the department took appropriate actions in an impartial manner pursuant to the Buildings Ordinance (BO) and prevailing enforcement policy. The department received a report of UBWs from Cheung Chau residents in December last year and staff of the department inspected site on the same day. Joint inspections were also conducted in January and March this year with staff of the Lands Department and CEDD. Orders were issued to the owner after assessment at the end of March requiring removal of the UBWs. Under the BO, any person who knowingly contravened the Buildings Ordinance was guilty of an offence and the department might consider instigating prosecution against the persons concerned for the contravention including the owner, AP and RMWC appointed. On 24 April 2020, staff of the department inspected site again and found that new works in progress. Further assessment would be made to consider whether the works were exempted under the MWCS. Appropriate actions would be taken pursuant to the BO and prevailing enforcement policy against UBWs.

68. Mr MOK Hing-cheung said that DLO had put up a notice board on the land concerned stating that it was government land, fenced it off and deployed security staff to guard the land. He stressed that regulatory action would not be influenced by the identity of any person.

69. Mr LEE Ka-ho enquired whether the owner would be prosecuted for carrying out UBW. He opined that if only the contractor was prosecuted, the owner could pay the contractor double to continue with the works, thus unauthorised works would only be suspended if the owner discontinued the works.

70. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that the workers performed authorised works when the department staff conducted inspection, but the fence wall went up higher the following day. Since the security guard did not patrol round the clock, he proposed that the department should suspend the authorised works as well for investigation.

71. Mr Timothy LEE said that if the owner did not comply with the order to remove the UBWs by the due dates, the department would consider instigating prosecution against the owner. For persons knowingly contravened the Buildings Ordinance to continue carrying out works without approval, evidence would be collected from the parties concerned before instituting prosecution. Under the MWCS, an owner might appoint RMWC through simplified requirements to construct new fence wall on private lots. If the works did not comply with the requirements of the MWCS, the department might issue removal order to the owner requiring removal of the UBWs.

72. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho understood that the works at 29 Kwun Yam Wan Road were authorised works but the fence wall was not. He enquired what he should do if he reported to the Police when seeing someone constructing the fence wall but when the police officers arrived, the persons concerned were carrying out authorised works at the private lot. He questioned whether the department would only take action against the UBW upon completion of the fence wall a few months later.

73. Mr Sammy TSUI enquired how the works could be stopped effectively or prosecution would be made given that the matter had come to light and the department had issued a removal order at the end of March. If the workers continued the unauthorised works after the department staff left, he hoped that the department would give a concrete reply.

74. Mr Timothy LEE said that documents had been received earlier from the AP and RMWC appointed by the owner of the above premises for construction of new fence wall on the private lots. In general, if suspected UBW was found, enquiry or report could be made to BD for follow up action under the BO and prevailing enforcement policy. If an owner wished to carry out minor works, for instance, village house owner wished to construct 1.8-metre high fence wall on his/her private lot, he/she might appoint a RMWC for carrying out works through simplified requirements under the MWCS.

(Post-meeting note of BD:

According to the record of BD, the AP and RMWC appointed by the owner submitted documents respectively in February and March 2020 for the construction of new 4-metre high fence wall on the private lot at 29 Kwun Yam Wan Road and 2.8-metre high fence wall on the private lot at House 1 of Villas Des Roses.)

75. The Chairman said that it could have happened in other districts and Members would do their best to speak up for the residents. He proposed that BD should provide contact information for Members to approach the department direct when necessary.

76. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that when the department staff inspected the site, the fence wall was about three metres high, far in excess of 1.8 metres, and he was discontented that the fence wall had not been demolished since December to date. He knew that it was the responsibility of CEDD to demolish the fence wall, but BD failed to provide a concrete reply when he enquired just now how unauthorised works could



be effectively stopped. He considered that BD had been dragging its feet and not been responsible.

(Post-meeting note of CEDD:

It should be clarified that demolition of fence walls was not the responsibility of CEDD. Unauthorised fence walls on public land fell within the ambit of DLO, whereas those on private land were within the ambit of BD.)

77. The Chairman said that the fence wall was higher than 1.8 metres but the department did not take any enforcement action. He hoped that the department would put forward a practical solution.

78. Mr Timothy LEE reiterated that the department had issued removal orders to the owner concerned requiring removal of the UBWs. If the owner did not comply with the order to remove the UBW by the due date, the department would consider instituting prosecution against the owner. Regarding the alleged works in progress, staff of the department inspected site again on 24 April 2020 and would take appropriate action under BO and prevailing enforcement policy against UBWs. Besides, the retaining wall and fence wall constructed outside the private lots were outside ambit of the BD.

VI. Motion on setting up working group on promotion of bazaar development in Islands District  
(Paper IDC 50/2020)

79. The Chairman said that the motion was moved by Mr Eric KWOK and seconded by Mr FONG Lung-fei.

80. Mr Eric KWOK briefly presented the motion.

81. The motion was endorsed unanimously.

VII. Question on education facilities and sports venues in Tung Chung  
(Paper IDC 51/2020)

82. The Chairman welcomed Ms LIM Ting-ting, Sylvia, Chief Leisure Manager (New Territories West) and Mr KWAN Chung-wai, David, District Leisure Manager (Islands) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to the meeting to respond to the question.

83. The Chairman said that LCSD and EDB had provided written replies for Members' perusal.

84. Mr Sammy TSUI briefly presented the question.

85. Mr David KWAN briefly presented the written reply of LCSD.

86. Mr Sammy TSUI wished to know if construction of the sports centre in Area 107 would be advanced. He also expressed concern about the number of students shown at the annex of the written reply of EDB. For students in Islands District, he enquired if the number of Tung Chung students could be shown separately. He also requested a breakdown of number of schools in Tung Chung by type (i.e. kindergartens, primary schools and secondary schools) to determine if the numbers were proportional to the population.

87. The Chairman said that EDB did not send representatives to the meeting but the Secretariat could write to EDB to request the statistics in response to questions raised by Mr Sammy TSUI.

88. Mr LEE Ka-ho was concerned about the provision of standard sports ground. A standard sports ground had all along been shown on the concept map provided for Members. He enquired if the sports ground mentioned by LCSD was put under discussion since the stage 1 consultation and if a concrete implementation timetable was available. He was disappointed at EDB's failure to send representatives to the meeting. Since a number of non-Asians lived in Tung Chung, there was demand for international schools apart from ordinary schools. He enquired if EDB had plans to build an international school in Tung Chung. As the population of Tung Chung would increase to 200 000 in the future, he wondered if it had any plans on the number of schools to be provided therein.

89. Mr Eric KWOK also expressed concern about the issue regarding standard sports ground. He had organised a petition with schools and students in the area and had submitted his views to the Council in his previous term of office. Therefore, he wished to know if construction of a standard sports ground was committed.

90. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to record Members' questions directed to EDB and request written replies from the bureau. He also asked the District Planning Officer to invite EDB to send representatives to future seminars to discuss matters related to school nets and education policies with Members direct.

91. Mr David KWAN responded that the implementation timetable for the construction of sports centre in Area 107 was not available at present but LCSD would relay Members' concern to the Architectural Services Department in the hope of expediting the feasibility study and initial design. As for the development of Tung Chung East including construction of a sports ground and two sports centres, a more concrete timetable would only be made available upon completion of the reclamation and infrastructure works by PlanD.

92. Ms Donna TAM said that land had been reserved for a standard sports ground within the Tung Chung East reclamation area in Tung Chung New Town Extension. The land was included in the last phase of reclamation works which was expected to complete in 2023, while relevant infrastructural works was expected to complete in 2027. The land would be handed over to LCSD afterwards for development according to its plan.

93. The Chairman asked the District Planning Officer to note Members' concern about the matter and discuss it at the seminars held in the future.

94. Mr Sammy TSUI said that it took too long to complete the project. The development of a new town was multi-faceted. The land delineated as sports ground was still under reclamation, so it was unknown whether such facility could be provided in the future. It was outrageous and unfair to the existing Tung Chung residents.

VIII. Motion on request for re-provision of Urban Council  
(Paper IDC 52/2020)

95. The Chairman said that the item was raised by Mr WONG Chun-yeung and seconded by Mr Eric KWOK.

96. Mr WONG Chun-yeung briefly presented the motion.

97. The Chairman said that Mr WONG Chun-yeung's motion was "Islands District Council (IDC) requests re-provision of Urban Council by the Government" in brief.

98. The Chairman asked if there was any amendment.

99. Ms LAU Shun-ting proposed an amendment as follows:

"Motion on request for enhanced functions of DC

At present, DC is mainly a district advisory body in accordance with the provisions of Basic Law. However, after implementation of the municipal service reform for 20 years, it is necessary to take appropriate measures over time, including studying the feasibility of formation of a new structure (akin to the former Urban Council and/or further enhancement of the functions of DC so as to improve public facilities and services in the district, promote the rights of residents and enhance its role in handling livelihood issues more effectively."

100. The Chairman said that the amendment proposed by Ms LAU Shun-ting appeared to combine the background information and the motion moved by Mr WONG Chun-yeung and a structure mentioned might not necessarily be the Urban Council.

101. Mr WONG Chun-yeung agreed with Ms LAU Shun-ting on details of the amendment but disagreed with the change of the title to request for devolution of responsibility to DC. By proposing re-provision of Urban Council, he hoped that the public would understand the difficulties encountered by DC and the role of Urban Council in empowering the public to request government departments to follow up on livelihood issues and even keep a check and balance on property developments of local real estate developers. He had reservations on the amendment if devolution was requested. He hoped that the Urban Council could be set up first, with devolution of responsibility to DC considered afterwards.

102. Mr Sammy TSUI considered what Ms LAU Shun-ting suggested was another motion but not an amendment. The motion moved by Mr WONG Chun-yeung clearly requested re-provision of Urban Council, while the one moved by Ms LAU Shun-ting requested enhancement of the functions of DC, which were entirely different from one another. As such, the motion moved by Ms LAU Shun-ting should only be regarded as a provisional one.

103. Ms Amy YUNG pointed out what Ms LAU Shun-ting mentioned was just background information and should not be regarded as a motion. She agreed to the summary given by the Chairman of the motion moved by Mr WONG Chun-yeung.

104. The Chairman recapitulated the main points as “IDC requests re-provision of Urban Council by the Government”.

105. The Chairman said that the motion moved by Mr WONG Chun-yeung provided detailed background information with a clear objective. The amendment proposed by Ms LAU Shun-ting contained the functions of DC and was a provisional motion. He enquired if anyone seconded the provisional motion moved by Ms LAU Shun-ting.

106. Mr HO Siu-kei said that re-provision of Urban Council could not be achieved overnight. He supported the provisional motion moved by Ms LAU Shun-ting, which requested enhancement of the functions of DC at the meantime so that it could continue serving the community.

107. Mr Ken WONG said that the two motions had their own merits and both could be processed.

108. The Chairman suggested processing the motion moved by Mr WONG Chun-yeung, which was “IDC requests re-provision of Urban Council by the Government” first. The motion was seconded by Mr Eric KWOK. The result was 8 votes for, 3 against and 7 abstention. The motion was endorsed.

(Members voted in favour included: Mr Ken WONG, Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Mr LEE Ka-ho, Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and Mr WONG Chun-yeung; Members voted against included: Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming and Mr CHAN Lin-wai. The Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice Chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Josephine TSANG and Ms LAU Shun-ting abstained.)

109. Ms LAU Shun-ting moved a provisional motion as follows:

“Motion on request for enhanced functions of DC

At present, DC is mainly a district advisory body in accordance with the provisions of Basic Law. However, after implementation of the municipal service reform for 20 years, it is necessary to take appropriate measures over time, including studying the feasibility of formation of a new structure (akin to the former Urban Council) and/or

further enhancement of the functions of DC so as to improve public facilities and services in the district, promote the rights of residents and enhance its role in handling livelihood issues more effectively.”

110. The provisional motion was seconded by Mr HO Siu-kei.

111. A vote was taken on the provisional motion moved by Ms LAU Shun-ting. The result was 15 votes for, 1 against and 2 abstention. The motion was endorsed.

(Members voted in favour included: the Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice Chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Josephine TSANG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting and Mr WONG Chun-yeung. Member voted against was Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho while Ms Amy YUNG and Mr LEE Ka-ho abstained.)

IX. Question on provision of public markets in Tung Chung  
(Paper IDC 53/2020)

112. The Chairman welcomed Ms LAI Wing-sau, Winsy, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands) of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) to the meeting to respond to the question.

113. Mr Eric KWOK briefly presented the question.

114. Ms Winsy LAI briefly presented the written replies of Food and Health Bureau (FHB) and FEHD.

115. Mr Sammy TSUI expressed his views as follows:

- (a) New Town development took time. Reclamation works off Ying Tung Estate was in progress. If the markets and bazaars were set up after completion of reclamation, the whole project was estimated to take eight to 10 years.
- (b) Given that the Government organised temporary bazaar in Tin Shui Wai last year, he suggested FEHD identify a location in Tung Chung for setting up a temporary bazaar or a temporary market to serve the residents.
- (c) There was only a small market in Ying Tung Estate selling a limited variety of goods at a relatively high price. As such, most residents bought food for a few days in Tsuen Wan. He did not support the scheme mentioned in the Policy Address, and proposed that FEHD should follow the practice of Tin Shui Wai to build a temporary market to serve the residents over the next eight to 10 years.

- (d) For Tung Chung North, in addition to housing estates like Century Link and The Visionary, Home Ownership Scheme housing development sprang up nearby and resident intake was expected to take place two years later, resulting in a further increase in population. He opined that the department should organise bazaars or provide markets in the area to offer more choices for the residents. He also pointed out that many people working in the area went to in Ying Tung Estate for lunch but only a limited choices of restaurants were available. Therefore, it was necessary to build a temporary market in Tung Chung North.

116. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) In respect of building a public market in Area 6, he requested the department to provide a timetable and detailed information on the cost of works, construction period, date of works commencement and operating cost at the meeting, and to attend future DC meetings to respond to questions with the launch of public consultation.
- (b) He proposed that the department should outsource market management and taking a leaf from the Estate Management Division of HD set up a market committee, and residents, community groups and small business representatives should be invited to attend the meeting and express their views on market operation.

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

- (a) Members were concerned about site selection and interior layout of the market in Tung Chung Area 6, including whether dry and wet goods areas and a cooked food centre would be provided. He pointed out that Members suggested provision of a cooked food centre where food would be prepared in a kitchen and tables and chairs would be available for dine-in. However, FEHD replied that it might consider providing cooked food stalls selling snacks, which were entirely different from what Members suggested.
- (b) Managing market was within the purview of FEHD but it was stated in the written reply that a contractor would manage the market. He raised enquiries about the contractor and pointed out that the residents cast doubts on the criteria for determining the rental level and mode of management by market contractors. Currently, a number of markets in the housing estates of Tung Chung were outsourced and the commodity prices were high. Contracting out the operation of a new market might result in soaring commodity prices in the area. He opined that public markets should provide goods at an affordable price and the department should squarely face the problem and conduct reviews accordingly.
- (c) He requested the department to provide a timetable. Implementation of the Tung Chung market project was not yet confirmed while the plans

and date of works commencement of the Tin Shui Wai market project which was announced at the same time were unveiled. The reply given by the department was identical to the one provided two years ago. He was discontented with a lack of information concerning the timetable, detailed plan and number of storeys requirements, etc. and requested the department to provide them promptly.

118. Mr FONG Lung-fei pointed out that the date of completion of the public market was not mentioned in the written reply of the department. He enquired if it could open a bazaar from 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. or 8:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. in the transition period to allow the elderly of the Old Village to sell home grown vegetables as a pastime without affecting the price and supply of goods in the market. He said that “morning bazaar” had been held a few times at the footpath off Fuk Yat House, Yat Tung Estate and been well received.

119. Ms Winsy LAI made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) For the proposal raised by Mr Sammy TSUI of building a temporary market in Tung Chung North, no relevant information was available at this stage but the proposal would be referred to relevant division for follow-up.
- (b) Regarding the request for provision of timetable made by Mr Eric KWOK and Mr LEE Ka-ho, detailed information, as stated in the written reply, would be provided upon completion of the ongoing technical feasibility study on the entire commercial building development project (including the public market) and relevant assessment. The department understood the concern of Members and the public about building a new public market and would brief the DC in due course.
- (c) As for the proposal of setting up a market committee, she said that a “Market Management Consultative Committee” had been set up for all public markets under FEHD (including Cheung Chau Market, Peng Chau Market and Mui Wo Market) and meetings were convened regularly. Committee members included representatives of market stall tenants, DC Members of the constituency and representatives of government departments.
- (d) As for whether seats would be provided at cooked food stalls, she said that seats were available in cooked food centres in general and the concerns would be conveyed to relevant division for follow-up after the meeting.
- (e) With respect to the concerns of Members that contracting out the management of the market would result in rent increase, she reiterated that FEHD was the landlord of the new market responsible for determination of the rental level and the signing of tenancy agreements with tenants. The preliminary idea was to adopt a new operation mode

for the new public market. At present, outsourced contractors were responsible for cleansing, operation and management of the markets and their performance were monitored by the department.

(f) The proposal of organising bazaars was within the purview of HD.

120. Mr FONG Lung-fei pointed out that “morning bazaar” had been held a few times along a footpath in Yat Tung Estate.

121. Ms Winsy LAI said that given the formation of the Working Group on promotion of bazaar development in Islands District (WGPBD) under IDC, she proposed matters on bazaars be discussed at the meetings of the working group which would be attended by representatives of the department.

122. The Chairman agreed to discuss matters on bazaars at the meetings of WGPBD. He understood the pressing demands of the public for markets and bazaars. While providing another sales channel for old farmers, the proposal enabled the residents to purchase food at a cheaper price, thus improving their livelihood. In addition, he asked the department to identify a location for provision of a temporary market and the proposal would be raised at the meetings of WGPBD.

(The Chairman suggested discussing items 13 and 16 first due to time constraints.)

XIII. Proposed Islands District Council Funds Allocation in 2020/2021  
(Paper IDC 47/2020)

123. Ms Amy YUNG requested more cultural and arts activities in Tung Chung and Discovery Bay under the District Cultural and Arts Activities, with \$60,000 in sponsorship for each district.

124. Mr LEE Ka-ho enquired why no funds were reserved for printing working reports/publications and producing souvenirs of DC.

125. Mr Eric KWOK enquired why the ceiling of over-commitment of District Minor Works (DMW) was \$34 million this year compared to over \$74 million the previous year. He also pointed out that formation of WGPBD had been endorsed by IDC and enquired if funds had been reserved for it.

126. Mr LEE Ka-ho enquired how committees or working group that might be formed under IDC later secured resources.

127. The Chairman said that funds were allocated as over-commitments. Small amounts of funds such as \$120,000 requested by Ms Amy YUNG were not major concern. As for the several thousand dollars requested by the Traffic and Transport Committee Bus Routes Working Group (BRWG) for renting coaches for site inspection, he believed the funding request could be approved. If funds were reserved for committees and working groups yet to be formed, there might be a surplus at the



end of the financial year so resources could not be fully utilised. He proposed that Members should endorse the funding proposals.

128. Ms Christy LEUNG said that the annual over-commitment of DMW was calculated at 200% of the provision for the year. Since there were a lot of post-Mangkhut repair works in 2019/2020, the amounts of provision and over-commitment limit increased. The provision for 2020/2021 returned to the previous level.

129. The Chairman pointed out that the Secretariat would allocate an additional sum of \$120,000 in response to the request of Ms Amy YUNG for organising cultural and arts activities in Tung Chung and Discovery Bay.

130. Mr Eric KWOK requested reserving funds for WGPBD and BRWG. In addition, he wished to know why the provision for DMW in 2019/2020 was \$24 million while that for 2020/2021 was only \$11 million.

131. Mr Anthony LI said that the Secretariat prepared this year's budget based on the expenditure of the previous year. As Mr Eric KWOK had mentioned the formation of WGPBD which was also formed under IDC of the previous term, the Secretariat reserved \$160,000 for the working group. If Members agreed with the allocation and the request of Ms Amy YUNG, the Secretariat would amend the proposed funds allocation.

132. Ms Christy LEUNG said that the provision for 2019/2020 increased due to typhoon "Mangkhut". The provision for DMW for 2020/2021 was \$18 million, similar to the amount allocated before the passage of typhoon "Mangkhut".

133. The Secretary responded that as the working reports of DC had been uploaded to the official website, no funds would be reserved for report printing starting from this financial year. She supplemented that the cultural and arts activities in Tung Chung and Discovery Bay mentioned by Ms Amy YUNG should be financed by dedicated allocation but not District Festival Subsidy.

134. Mr Eric KWOK requested increasing the funds for WGPBD to \$200,000, and enquired further why the provision for DMW would reduce by over \$100,000.

135. Ms Christy LEUNG said that since 2012/2013, the funding for DMW had maintained at around \$18 million. Additional funds were provided for 2019/2020 due to typhoon "Mangkhut" and the funding for 2020/2021 returned to the level under normal circumstances so there was no reduction of funds for DMW.

136. The Chairman proposed two dedicated allocations of \$60,000 each for Tung Chung and Discovery Bay under District Cultural and Arts Activities. He also proposed allocating \$180,000 to WGPBD.

137. For the proposals in the paper and three allocation amendments raised by the Chairman, there were 15 votes for and 1 vote against. The paper was endorsed.

(Members voted in favour included: the Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice Chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting and Mr LEE Ka-ho. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho voted against. Ms Josephine TSANG and Mr WONG Chun-yeung left the meeting temporarily.)

XVI. Nomination for representative(s) in public organisation

138. The Chairman asked the departments and organisations to make nominations one by one, first the nominations for the six committees under the Central Western, Southern and Islands District Social Welfare Office, and he nominated Mr Eric KWOK to the Central Western, Southern and Islands District Welfare Planning and Coordinating Committee. The nomination was endorsed by 17 Members.

(Members voted in favour included: the Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice Chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Amy YUNG, Ms Josephine TSANG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting, Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho. Mr WONG Chun-yeung left the meeting temporarily.)

139. Next was the nomination to the Central Western, Southern and Islands District Co-ordinating Committee on Family and Child Welfare Services, and he nominated Mr Sammy TSUI. The nomination was endorsed by 17 Members.

(Members voted in favour included: the Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice Chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Amy YUNG, Ms Josephine TSANG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting, Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho. Mr WONG Chun-yeung left the meeting temporarily.)

140. He nominated Mr HO Chun-fai to the Central Western, Southern and Islands District Co-ordinating Committee on Elderly Service, and the nomination was endorsed by 16 Members.

(Members voted in favour included: the Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice Chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Amy YUNG, Ms Josephine TSANG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting and Mr LEE Ka-ho. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and Mr WONG Chun-yeung abstained.)

141. He nominated Mr FONG Lung-fei to the Central Western, Southern and Islands District Co-ordinating Committee on Rehabilitation Service, and the nomination was unanimously endorsed.

142. He nominated Mr LEE Ka-ho to the Central Western, Southern and Islands District Co-ordinating Committee on Promotion of Volunteer Service, and the nomination was unanimously endorsed.

143. As for Central Western, Southern and Islands District Local Committee on Services for Young People, both Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and Ms LAU Shun-ting were nominated. After voting, Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho received seven votes while Ms LAU Shun-ting received 11 votes. Ms LAU Shun-ting was eventually nominated to the committee.

(Members voted for Ms LAU Shun-ting included: the Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice Chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Josephine TSANG and Ms LAU Shun-ting. Members voted for Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho included: Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Mr LEE Ka-ho, Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and Mr WONG Chun-yeung.)

144. As for the nomination as member of RTHK Programme Advisory Panel, there were two candidates, i.e. the Chairman Mr Randy YU and Mr WONG Chun-yeung. The Chairman Mr Randy YU received 10 votes and Mr WONG Chun-yeung seven votes. The Chairman Mr Randy YU eventually became the panel member.

(Members voted for the Chairman Mr Randy YU included: the Vice Chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Josephine TSANG and Ms LAU Shun-ting. Members voted for Mr WONG Chun-yeung included: Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Mr LEE Ka-ho, Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and Mr WONG Chun-yeung.)

145. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho, Mr WONG Chun-yeung and Mr LEE Ka-ho were nominated to be the “Sports Ambassadors” of LCSD unanimously.

146. As for the candidacy for the Organising Committee of the 8<sup>th</sup> Hong Kong Games (HKG), there were two nominations, i.e. the Vice-chairman Mr WONG Man-hon and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho. The Vice-chairman Mr WONG Man-hon received 11 votes while Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho received seven votes. Mr WONG Man-hon eventually became a member of the organising committee.

(Members voted for the Vice Chairman Mr WONG Man-hon included: the Chairman Mr Randy YU, the Vice Chairman Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Josephine TSANG and Ms LAU Shun-ting. Members voted for Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho included: Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Mr LEE Ka-ho, Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and Mr WONG Chun-yeung.)

147. In addition, the use of IDC logo in publicity activities and on promotional materials of the 8<sup>th</sup> HKG and provision of a hyperlink for the dedicated website of the 8<sup>th</sup> HKG on the website of IDC were unanimously agreed.

148. Lastly, Ms Amy YUNG was nominated to the Selection Panel of the “Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme” and “Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme” unanimously.

(Mr YUNG Chi-ming left the meeting at around 5:50 p.m.)

X. Question on fire apparatus access road in Yat Tung Estate  
(Paper IDC 56/2020)

149. The Chairman welcomed Mr YAN Man-chi, Robin, Property Service Manager/S(HKI) 3 of HD as well as Mr FOO Chi-hung, Divisional Officer (New Territories South West) and Mr WONG Yu-fai, Station Commander Tung Chung Fire Station of the Fire Services Department to the meeting to respond to the question.

150. Mr FONG Lung-fei briefly presented the question.

151. Mr Robin YAN said that the emergency crash gates were located at the emergency vehicular access (EVA) near Fuk Yat House, Chui Yat House and Sui Yat House, Yat Tung Estate. The Estate Office discovered that some crash gates were broken or improperly used, with one being repaired earlier. The remaining repair works were expected to complete in mid-May. Meanwhile, the Estate Office would step up patrol at the locations concerned to keep the EVA clear. Access to the concerned EVA by non-emergency vehicles was prohibited.

152. Mr FONG Lung-fei enquired if Link Asset Management Limited (LINK) was authorised to manage the EVA, and whether the penalty charged for impounded vehicles would be used as reward to security guards or for other purposes.

153. Mr Eric KWOK understood that the management company discharged management duties but hoped that HD could deploy additional manpower in view of the seriousness of illegal parking thereat. He also wished to know how the proceeds of fines was used. He was regretted over the failure of LINK to send representatives to the meeting to give response as the location concerned was within its purview.

154. Mr Robin YAN said that the EVA was located at the Estate Common Area (ECA) of Yat Tung Estate which was held jointly by HD and LINK. The fines imposed on impounded vehicles would not be used as reward to the security guards but credited to a specific account whose information would be provided later.

155. The Chairman asked Mr Robin YAN to provide the information after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note of HD:

the fines imposed on impounded vehicles would be credited to the ECA account of Yat Tung Estate, which was opened for the management of ECA (areas which were held jointly by HD and LINK) in the estate.

156. Ms WONG Chau-ping asked if the fire apparatus access road would be open for public use.

157. Mr Robin Yan responded that the objective of provision of the emergency crash gates at the concerned estate road section was to prevent non-emergency vehicles from accessing the EVA.

158. Mr FOO Chi-hung supplemented that the purpose of EVA was to allow safe and unobstructed access of vehicle of the Fire Services Department to the building, and to provide for the safe operation of such vehicle in the event of fire or other emergency. Effective management by property owners was essential for maintaining EVAs clear from obstruction.

(Mr CHOW Yuk-tong left the meeting at around 5:55p.m.)

XI. Progress Report of Major Projects in Islands District  
(Paper IDC 45/2020)

159. The Chairman noted the work progress report of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). Members could submit their views on the report, if any, to the Secretariat for forwarding to CEDD.

XII. Lantau District Action Plan 2020  
(Paper IDC 46/2020)

160. The Chairman asked Members to make direct questions due to limited time.

161. Mr Sammy TSUI said that the paper provided information on fighting crimes but give no analysis of the figures, such as comparison with last year. For street management, no information on bicycle thefts in Tung Chung was provided. He had written to the Police before the meeting requesting increased police presence to prevent bicycle thefts. A number of residents of Century Link, the Visionary and Ying Tung Estate, etc. reflected to him the prevalence of bicycle thefts in recent months. While some residents reported the cases to the Police, some did not for various reasons. Bicycles, despite not expensive, were a major mode of transport for the residents. He was worried that the number of bicycle thefts would increase due to economic slowdown, and pointed out that a few days before a bicycle theft, residents of Ying Tung Estate saw some strangers wandering around the bicycle parking spaces. He hoped that the Police could take stringent actions to combat such crimes.

162. Mr WONG Chun-yeung reflected that there were thefts at bicycle parking spaces in Tung Chung but the residents considered reporting to the Police would not be able to help. He hoped that the Police could draw on the experience in Project “Lantau Eyes” and install closed-circuit televisions in each and every cycling area as far as possible to ease residents’ concern and deter crimes.

163. Ms TAM Nga-ching responded that any crimes not set out in the paper should not be taken as not being tackled by the Police with vigorous actions. Project “Lantau Eyes” aimed at raising residents’ crime prevention awareness through education and publicity. Closed-circuit televisions were installed by the residents at their own expenses. She pointed out that building a safe and harmonious community required not just the effort of Police but concerted efforts of all stakeholders. Members were welcome to provide views on the action plan.

(Mr CHAN Lin-wai left the meeting at around 6:00 p.m.)

XIV. Reports on the Work of the IDC Committees  
(Paper IDC 54-55/2020)

164. The Chairman asked Members to note the paper and inform the Secretariat in writing if they had any doubts.

XV. Approval for Using DC Funds by circulation from 6 January to 31 March 2020  
(Paper IDC 58/2020)

165. The paper was endorsed by the 15 Members present unanimously.

XVII. Date of Next Meeting

166. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m. The next meeting would be held on 22 June 2020 (Monday) at 10:30 a.m.

-END-