

(Translation)

Islands District Council
Minutes of Meeting of the
Food, Environment and Hygiene Committee

Date : 8 April 2024 (Monday)
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : Islands District Council Conference Room,
14/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong

Present

Chairman

Mr HO Siu-kei

Vice-Chairman

Mr LAU Chin-pang

Members

Mr NG Man-kit
Mr YU Hon-kwan, MH, JP
Ms KWOK Wai-man, Mealoha
Mr HUI Chun-lung, MH
Ms WONG Chau-ping
Mr WAN Yeung-kin
Mr WONG Hon-kuen, Ken
Mr YIP Pui-kei
Ms LAU Shun-ting
Mr LUO Chenghuan

Attendance by Invitation

Mr TANG Chi-sum, Terence

Property Service Manager/Service (Hong Kong Island & Islands) 5, Housing Department

In Attendance

Mr LI Ho, Thomas
Mr CHAN Ka-leong

Mr YAN Ka-kit, Ric

Ms CHEUNG Suk-man

Mr YAU Pak-lun, Esmond

Assistant District Officer (Islands)1, Islands District Office
District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands),
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Chief Health Inspector (Islands)1,
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Chief Health Inspector (Islands)2,
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional South)5,
Environmental Protection Department

Secretary

Ms KWONG Tsz-wing, Wing

Executive Officer (District Council)2,
Islands District Office

Absent with Apology

Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, SBS, MH

Mr WONG Man-hon, MH

~~~~~

**Welcoming Remarks**

The Chairman welcomed representatives of the government departments and Members to the meeting.

2. The Committee agreed to accept the applications for absence from the meeting submitted by Mr CHOW Yuk-tong and Mr WONG Man-hon.

I. **Confirmation of Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 February 2024**

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

4. Members who attended the meeting had no other amendment proposals, and the minutes were confirmed unanimously.

II. **Food and Environmental Hygiene Department – Achievements of Islands District 2024 Year-end Clean-up**  
(FEHC Paper No. 12/2024)

5. The Chairman invited the representatives of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) to present the paper.

6. Mr CHAN Ka-leong briefly presented the paper.

7. Members expressed their views as follows:

(a) Members thanked the FEHD for its work and suggested that the Year-end Clean-up campaign should be held on a quarterly basis to further improve the environmental hygiene of the Islands District.

(b) The effectiveness of the captioned Year-end Clean-up campaign was evident. After the completion of the campaign, the hygiene conditions

of the public toilets in rural areas and public rental housing estates (PRH estates), including those in Mun Tung Estate, had improved. Moreover, the overall environment in Mun Tung Estate was noticeably cleaner than before.

- (c) Some restaurants along Praya Street in Cheung Chau had been dumping food scraps into the nullahs, causing unpleasant odours. There were also foul smells coming from the drains along Hing Lung Street and Tai Hing Tai Road. Members asked the FEHD to step up cleansing. In addition, the U-shaped surface drainage channel near the restaurants along Praya Street had subsided, causing damage to the road surface. Since restaurants and road surfaces were managed by the FEHD and the Highways Department (HyD) respectively, Members called on the two departments to coordinate with each other and follow up on the issue.
- (d) The overgrowth of trees next to the refuse collection points (RCPs) had become a concern as their branches blocked sunlight, hampering the operation of solar panels and creating a dim environment that would easily attract rodents. Members enquired whether the FEHD would prune the trees regularly.
- (e) Members suggested that the FEHD and the Housing Department (HD) should conduct joint operations to strengthen the cleansing of public places in PRH estates.
- (f) Many residents would walk their dogs on the footpath between Fuk Yat House and Ching Yat House. Some dog owners, however, had not cleaned up the dog faeces properly, causing odour nuisance. Members asked the FEHD to step up cleansing in that regard. Furthermore, if there were dog droppings on the lawn along the Tung Chung Promenade, it would be difficult for the public to detect them. Members therefore asked the relevant departments to follow up on it.
- (g) There had been complaints from members of the public that the public rubbish bins in Cheung Chau were always full during holidays, with the situation being particularly severe in the area of the central square and the pier. Furthermore, some people had dumped their waste beside the rubbish bins near Cheung Chau Buddhist Wai Yan Memorial College and the Pak Tai Temple, as the bins were full. Members asked the FEHD to take note of the situation.
- (h) Rodent infestation on Lamma Island and Peng Chau had been serious. While appreciating FEHD's earlier visit to Peng Chau with Members to inspect the rodent problem and follow up on it closely, Members hoped that the FEHD would explore effective solutions to ameliorate the rodent problem.
- (i) Members enquired about the locations where enforcement actions

against littering (including feral pigeon feeding) had been more frequently taken by the FEHD. In addition, Members were aware that some members of the public would discard cigarette butts into the bushes while waiting at the bus stops (including the bus stops at Ying Tung Road and Yi Tung Road, the bus stop near Mun Tung Estate, and the bus terminus at the Citygate) and called on the FEHD to step up enforcement.

- (j) As schools in Tung Chung were often plagued by mosquito infestation problems, Members hoped that the FEHD would step up anti-mosquito efforts. In addition, it was mentioned in the paper submitted by the Department that a total of 42 schools had been inspected under the mosquito prevention and control operations. Members enquired which schools had been included in those inspections.
- (k) The anti-rodent operations did not cover schools; however, schools were also facing rodent infestation problems. Members had previously asked the HD to follow up on the rodent problem in school premises, but the Department replied that schools had to deal with the problem on their own. Members urged the relevant departments to take note of the issue and to prevent rodents from entering school areas as far as possible.
- (l) As summer was approaching, Members asked the FEHD to step up the cleaning of village drains to prevent unpleasant odours and the breeding of mosquitoes and other pests.

8. Mr CHAN Ka-leong gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) While the Year-end Clean-up Campaign was held only once a year, the FEHD, in collaboration with other government departments and stakeholders, would continue to carry out a number of cleansing operations, including an Anti-mosquito Campaign and an Anti-rodent Campaign which were implemented in 3 phases and 2 phases respectively throughout the year.
- (b) Regarding the dumping of food scraps into the nullahs by some restaurants in Cheung Chau, he pointed out that there might be illegal acts involved and the FEHD would not rule out taking prosecution actions. As for the problems of drain blockage and the subsidence of the U-shaped surface drainage channel, the FEHD would first assess the situation and, if necessary, liaise with the Drainage Services Department (DSD) and/or the HyD for further investigation before making arrangements for an on-site inspection with the Members concerned.

(Post-meeting note: The FEHD arranged for a contractor to carry out deep cleaning at the Cheung Chau Cooked Food Market and its surrounding areas on 22 April. Furthermore, the FEHD has referred the

aforementioned issues to the DSD for follow-up.)

- (c) The FEHD would step up cleaning of the nullahs at Hing Lung Street and Tai Hing Tai Road.
- (d) The trees beside the RCPs were managed by different departments. If the overgrown trees affected the operation of the solar panels, the FEHD would contact the responsible departments to arrange for pruning.

(Post-meeting note: The maintenance contractor for FEHD's solar-powered RCPs would conduct regular inspections of each RCP to ensure normal operation. If overgrown trees were found to be affecting the charging of the RCPs, the contractor would notify the FEHD so that the Department could contact the responsible departments for tree pruning.)

- (e) FEHD's joint operations with the HD against mosquito and rodent infestation were conducive to enhancing the overall effectiveness of the work. The FEHD would continue to participate actively in the joint operations.
- (f) He said that the FEHD could prosecute dog owners who had not properly cleaned up the faeces of their dogs and had fouled the streets. However, he understood that even if dog owners tried to flush the dog urine off the street with water on the spot, some odour might still remain. Therefore, the Department would step up street washing in public places around Yat Tung Estate.
- (g) The FEHD would review the usage of rubbish bins in Cheung Chau during holidays and increase the frequency of cleaning them. If necessary, the Department would also increase the number of rubbish bins if necessary.
- (h) The FEHD would carry out inspections and follow up on the rodent infestation problems on Lamma Island and Peng Chau with Members concerned after the meeting. In addition, the Department would step up rodent prevention and control work in the vicinity of RCPs, rubbish bin sites and drains.
- (i) The FEHD's enforcement locations included the public places in the vicinity of Exits A, B and D of the Tung Chung MTR Station, public places in the vicinity of Tat Tung Road Bus Terminal, Tat Tung Road and Man Tung Road in Tung Chung, public places outside the Cheung Chau Ferry Pier and in the vicinity of Praya Street, public places in the vicinity of the Tung Chung Development Pier, and the places where the planters at Ying Hei Road were located.
- (j) The FEHD would step up prosecution against indiscriminate disposal of cigarette butts.

- (k) Regarding the issue of dogs defecating on the lawn at the Tung Chung Promenade, it was understood that the Tung Chung Promenade was managed by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The FEHD would need to identify the exact locations concerned before contemplating enhancing publicity and education in collaboration with the CEDD or putting up signs at the locations to raise the hygiene awareness of people who walked their dogs.

(Post-meeting note: The FEHD has referred the aforementioned issue to the CEDD for follow-up.)

- (l) Under the implementation of the mosquito prevention and control operations, inspections had been carried out at 42 primary schools, secondary schools and kindergartens, including 16 in Tung Chung, 10 in South Lantau, 7 in Cheung Chau, 7 in Discovery Bay, 1 in Peng Chau and 1 on Lamma Island.

9. Members expressed their views as follows:

- (a) It had been reported by some residents that some FEHD cleansing workers would sweep leaves into the drains when they clean the streets. Members hoped that the FEHD would remind its staff not to sweep leaves into the drains.
- (b) Some residents of Cheung Chau had disposed of their household waste in public rubbish bins for their own convenience. Members called on the FEHD to take vigorous enforcement actions and prosecute the offenders to deter future contraventions.
- (c) Members enquired whether the FEHD could organise the cleansing operations twice a year if they could not be held on a quarterly basis.

10. Mr CHAN Ka-leong gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) It was a serious breach of duty for cleansing workers to sweep leaves into roadside drains. If the Department discovered such acts, a notice of blatant default would be issued to the service contractor concerned. The Department would review the situation after the meeting and investigate whether contractors of other departments were involved.
- (b) Regarding the indiscriminate disposal of waste in public places by residents, the FEHD would first conduct publicity and education for the residents in the vicinity of the affected areas, such as putting up warning signs at the black spots. If the situation did not improve, the FEHD would proceed to take rigorous enforcement actions.

11. The Chairman asked the FEHD to maintain close liaison with stakeholders in the district to address the environmental hygiene problems. He considered that food waste recycling could help ameliorate the mosquito and rodent infestation problems in the district and suggested that the EPD should step up relevant publicity work.

III. Food and Environmental Hygiene Department – Strategy and Work for Improvement of Environmental Hygiene in Hong Kong  
(FEHC Paper No. 13/2024)

12. The Chairman invited the representatives of the FEHD to present the paper.

13. Mr CHAN Ka-leong briefly presented the paper.

14. Members noted the paper.

IV. Food and Environmental Hygiene Department – Refurbishment of Tong Fuk Village Public Toilet (Lower)  
(FEHC Paper No. 14/2024)

15. The Chairman invited the representatives of the FEHD to present the paper.

16. Mr CHAN Ka-leong briefly presented the paper.

17. Members recalled that Members and the South Lantau Rural Committee had campaigned for the refurbishment of the subject public toilet in the last term of the Council in the hope of improving its hygiene conditions, and they were pleased to note that the FEHD would implement the refurbishment works. Pointing out that the public toilet was close to residential areas and had a high utilisation rate, Members requested the FEHD to closely monitor the usage and the drainage condition of portable toilets during the construction period to ensure environmental hygiene.

18. Mr CHAN Ka-leong said that FEHD would closely monitor the usage of the portable toilets and their cleansing arrangements.

V. Question on the operation of Municipal Solid Waste Charging in public housing estates and Home Ownership Scheme Courts on Lantau Island  
(FEHC Paper No. 15/2024)

19. The Chairman said that the written replies from FEHD and EPD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

20. Mr YU Hon-kwan briefly presented the question.

21. Mr CHAN Ka-leong elaborated on the written reply from the FEHD.

22. Mr Esmond YAU elaborated on the written reply from the EPD.
23. Mr Terence TANG responded as follows:
- (a) The HD was not the enforcement department for the municipal solid waste charging (MSW charging) policy. Upon the implementation of MSW charging, the PRH estates managed by the HD would handle household waste by adopting the modes of charging “by designated bag” / “designated labels”. Households were required to purchase designated bags for wrapping up their waste before disposal at refuse rooms or rubbish bins at lobbies. For oversized waste (large furniture such as dining table, book case and mattress) that could not fit into the designated garbage bags, households would be required to affix them with designated labels before disposing at specified collection points of the estates. He said that the service contractors of the FEHD would only collect refuse that was properly wrapped in designated bags or with designated labels affixed. Since the HD did not have the power of enforcement, if residents disposed of waste in violation of the regulation, the Department would issue reminders and advice to them, provide information on the violation cases to the EPD and take enforcement action in conjunction with the EPD if necessary
  - (b) The HD would require frontline estate management staff to step up patrols in the estates and monitor the identified black spots, and would install surveillance video cameras to combat illegal waste disposal.
  - (c) To help households adapt to the implementation of MSW charging and develop a new habit of using designated bags for waste disposal, the Government planned to make arrangement for the designated bags and labels to be sold not only at designated retail points but also at estate offices and through cleansing contractors. The arrangement was tentatively scheduled for the first three years after the implementation of the MSW charging scheme and would be reviewed afterwards. The HD had already explained the arrangement to estate management service companies and cleansing contractors and would invite them to participate in the related sales exercises in due course.
  - (d) Frontline estate management staff of the HD had already started preparatory work on the implementation of MSW charging; including enclosing and locking up RCPs, assigning personnel to monitor these points, installing closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras at refuse disposal black spots, and reviewing the modes of waste collection. Additionally, the number of rubbish bins in public places within the estates was gradually reducing. The HD had also distributed EPD’s Best Practice Guides to frontline property management staff and cleansing contractors, and provided training to frontline staff in collaboration with the EPD on the requirements of the relevant legislation and guidelines. The HD would review these efforts from time to time and work in



coordination with EPD's publicity work in preparation for the implementation of MSW charging.

24. Members pointed out that many frontline staff of property management companies were very concerned about the implementation of MSW charging. Members asked the EPD whether it was necessary for the cleansing staff to identify the household concerned and notify the Department for prosecution before handling the waste which had not been wrapped in designated bags or affixed with designated labels in the rubbish bins. As property management companies had no enforcement power, Members hoped that the Department could clearly explain to frontline staff how they should handle waste that was illegally disposed of. Members also enquired whether the Department had encountered any difficulties in the implementation of the Demonstration Scheme.

25. The Chairman considered that the EPD should explore in detail the potential issues that might arise during the implementation of MSW charging before launching the charging scheme. He also enquired whether the EPD had increased its manpower in response to the implementation of MSW charging.

26. Mr Esmond YAU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The objective of EPD's Demonstration Scheme was to pragmatically examine the actual operation of MSW charging through on-site exercises. At present, the Demonstration Scheme was being implemented in 14 different types of premises, including Moon Lok Dai Ha managed by the Hong Kong Housing Society and Lin Tsui Estate managed by the HD. The Department was currently collecting data for reference, including quantities of waste and recyclables collected, the participation rate of residents and the compliance rate, in order to examine the problems that may arise in different premises, and would report to the Legislative Council after collating the relevant information.
- (b) According to the relevant guidelines on MSW charging, if residents disposed of waste without using the designated bags, the cleansing staff would be required to put the waste into designated bags for proper disposal.
- (c) To address the potential problem of illegal disposal of waste by residents, the EPD had suggested that the property management companies should enhance publicity during the initial period of the implementation, including putting up posters and distributing leaflets. If the output was not noticeable, stepping up patrols and installing CCTV cameras might then be considered. He said that the measures had to be adjusted in the light of the actual circumstances of different public and private housing estates.
- (d) Currently the EPD was deploying the existing manpower to cope with the work related to MSW charging.

27. Members made the following comments:

- (a) Members were in favour of the introduction of waste charging to uphold the “polluter pays” principle and to promote waste reduction at source. On the last occasion when the EPD enlisted the assistance of the Community Care Teams and District Council members in distributing designated bags to the public to promote the introduction of waste charging, the promotional materials and designated bags were not pre-packaged, so that the volunteers needed to do the packaging work themselves. Moreover, only 300 designated bags were provided by the Department and were distributed quickly, resulting in limited promotion effect. Members hoped that when organising this kind of promotional activities in the future, the Department would prepare packaging in advance and increase the quantity of materials to be distributed.
- (b) Currently, quite a number of Regulated Electrical Equipment (REE) items had been abandoned at the RCPs. Since the FEHD had no authority to dispose of these items, they could only be left at the RCPs, awaiting handling by the EPD. Members had previously written to the EPD and raised questions at council meetings regarding this issue, but the situation had not improved. Members considered that the EPD should review the recycling work for REE items. Furthermore, Members were concerned that after the implementation of MSW charging, waste not properly packed in designated bags and dumped on the streets would be left unattended, thus affecting environmental hygiene.
- (c) Food waste recycling machines were worth promoting as they could effectively turn waste into energy and reduce the amount of waste. The recent installation of food waste recycling machines in Mun Tung Estate had been well received by the residents. Members hoped that the EPD could increase the number of food waste recycling machines to be installed in the PRH estates in the district.
- (d) The number of waste separation bins in Tung Chung was relatively small and Members suggested that the EPD should increase the number of recycling bins in the Islands District.
- (e) Members suggested that the EPD should include Cheung Chau in the Demonstration Scheme to understand the possible problems that might arise during the implementation of waste charging and waste recovery in rural areas. For instance, there were only a small number of places in Cheung Chau where glass recycling bins had been placed, and the effectiveness of waste separation and recycling was relatively low. Furthermore, the Cheung Chau Island Women’s Association had commenced food waste recycling since 2012 and had been assisting about 350 households to recycle food waste daily with satisfactory results. Members considered that the Department could first consult

local organisations with relevant experience and conduct recycling-related publicity and education in local communities to facilitate the smooth implementation of MSW charging.

- (f) Some private housing estates had indicated that their residents were more receptive to MSW charging and would like to participate in the Demonstration Scheme. However, Members considered that the existing recycling equipment and facilities in private housing estates, including food waste recycling machines, were inadequate and hoped that the EPD could assist private housing estates in acquiring recycling-related ancillary facilities.
- (g) Members asked whether the EPD had provided guidelines to property management companies on how to handle the non-compliant waste. In addition, many frontline staff were unclear about the official implementation date of MSW charging and found it difficult to track the offenders during waste collection. Members asked the Department to take note of the aforementioned issues and explain the operation of the MSW charging mechanism to the property management companies as soon as possible.

28. Mr Esmond YAU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) He would convey Members' suggestions on the arrangements for the distribution of publicity materials and the inadequacy of waste separation bins in Tung Chung and glass recycle bins in Cheung Chau to the relevant sections of the Department after the meeting.
- (b) Regarding the situation where REE items had been abandoned at RCPs for an extended period of time without being collected, he would relay the information to the relevant sections. If necessary, the EPD could increase the frequency of collection. According to the existing regulations, REE items with empty casings were considered ordinary waste and should be collected and handled in accordance with the normal procedures.
- (c) The EPD planned to install food waste collection bins in all PRH estates before August this year. At the same time, the Department also supported the installation of food waste collection bins in rural areas and private housing estates through the Recycling Fund, the Environmental Campaign Committee and the Environment and Conservation Fund. He would relay Members' views to the relevant sections and suggest strengthening the publicity on the available funding support.
- (d) As there would be no significant change in the way of waste disposal in rural areas before and after the implementation of MSW charging, village houses were not included in the current Demonstration Scheme. He understood that the Islands District had encountered some difficulties

regarding the implementation of MSW charging, and would reflect the situation to the relevant sections.

- (e) The Cheung Chau Island Women's Association had been providing food waste recycling services to residential and restaurant premises on Cheung Chau. The EPD's contractor would also collect the food waste from 13 Cheung Chau restaurants and convert it into organic compost at the Cheung Chau Transfer Facility (CCTF) for use by the residents. The Department would review the mode of food waste collection and planned to set up a public food waste collection point outside the CCTF to facilitate recycling of food waste by nearby residents and public and private premises. He would convey the suggestion of expanding the food waste collection network to the relevant sections.
- (f) The EPD would review the information collected through the Demonstration Scheme (including the difficulties encountered by frontline staff) and adjust the measures as appropriate.
- (g) Under the existing guidelines, property management companies were responsible for purchasing and distributing designated bags to cleansing staff, who were required to wrap the non-compliant waste in the designated bags.
- (h) The EPD expected that the amount of non-compliant waste would be higher during the initial period of the implementation of MSW charging. The Department would focus on publicity and education, and would step up monitoring work if the situation of non-compliance persisted.

(Post-meeting note: The EPD conveyed the suggestions to the relevant sections after the meeting.)

29. Members made the following comments:

- (a) Some members of the public had reflected that some toilet cubicles in the toilets of some shopping centres under the management of the HD (including Yat Tung Shopping Centre) were not open for use. It was suspected that the cleansing staff had locked some toilet cubicles to reduce their workload. Members asked the Department to follow up on the issue.
- (b) There were a total of 6 300 households in Yat Tung Estate, but there were only five food waste recycling machines in the estate, so the supply obviously fell short of demand.
- (c) The supporting facilities for the implementation of MSW charging in public and private housing estates in the Islands District were inadequate. The EPD should seriously review the situation and increase the number of supporting facilities.

- (d) The EPD had organised a number of seminars to brief the public on the MSW charging scheme, but most of the frontline staff of the property management companies in the Islands District were local residents and it was not convenient for them to travel to the urban areas to attend the seminars. Members suggested that the Department should distribute operational guidelines to property management companies and estate offices in the district for reference by frontline staff.

(Post-meeting note: The EPD conveyed the suggestion to the relevant section after the meeting.)

30. Mr Terence TANG said that Yat Tung Shopping Centre was currently under the management of The Link and the HD would follow up on the situation of toilets in the shopping centres managed by the Department.

31. The Chairman asked the representatives of EPD to convey Members' views to the Environment and Ecology Bureau and considered it necessary for the Bureau to allocate additional resources to ensure the smooth implementation of MSW charging.

VI. Question on the environmental impacts of the works projects in Tung Chung  
(FEHC Paper No. 16/2024)

32. The Chairman advised that the written replies from the FEHD, the EPD, the CEDD and the MTR Corporation Limited (MTR) had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

33. Mr YIP Pui-kei briefly presented the question.

34. Mr CHAN Ka-leong elaborated on the FEHD's written reply and added that the FEHD would step up its efforts in monitoring the environmental hygiene of public places around Ying Tung Road, Yi Tung Road, Mun Tung Estate and the Citygate.

35. Mr Esmond YAU elaborated on the EPD's written reply.

36. Mr Terence TANG responded as follows:

- (a) The Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA) would issue guidelines to contractors requiring them to install noise insulation, carry out regular cleansing of construction sites, sprinkle water on road surfaces and take other measures to ensure compliance with the requirements regarding noise, light and air pollution arising from construction works.
- (b) It was an offence for contractors to carry out works outside the specified hours. Members of the public who were aware of such violation could lodge complaints with the staff in charge of the construction site or contact the Police for further follow-up.

- (c) He had conducted an on-site inspection to the site mentioned in the question and found that the hygiene condition of the site was indeed unsatisfactory. There were construction workers smoking in public places outside the site area. The HA had alerted the contractor concerned to the situation and asked the contractor to remind workers not to smoke or litter at bus stops. The HA would also remind the contractors of the issue in regular seminars.

37. Members made the following comments:

- (a) With the continuous development of Tung Chung, Members considered that the number of works projects in the district would continue to increase, and the relevant departments were therefore asked to take note of the issues mentioned.
- (b) Members considered it inadequate for the EPD to operate only one service hotline to handle enquiries and complaints on environmental pollution problems from the whole territory. Members asked the EPD to set up a dedicated telephone hotline and assign dedicated personnel to handle enquiries and complaints about projects suspected of involving environmental pollution in Tung Chung area.
- (c) It was understood that the Environmental Team would only carry out noise and air pollution level monitoring work on the lower floors or near the ground level, but most of the complaints about noise problems came from residents of the upper floors. Members drew EPD's attention to the above issue and called on the Department to identify and adopt a more effective method to measure the noise pollution.
- (d) Members considered that the existing approach of monitoring was rather passive, as monitoring was carried out by the Environmental Team Leaders and the Independent Environmental Checkers through reviewing the reports submitted by the contractors. Members also enquired about the frequency of surprise inspections conducted by the EPD.
- (e) Members pointed out that there had been incidents at a construction site in Area 99, in which cement mortar and concrete had fallen from height onto the road. Members asked the HD to check whether similar incidents had occurred at construction sites in Areas 99 and 100 and to take follow-up actions.
- (f) Members noted that some construction workers from a HA construction site had previously engaged in improper behaviour in a nearby PRH estate. While understanding that workers might occasionally rest outside the construction sites, Members urged the contractors and the HA to supervise the behaviour of workers to avoid causing nuisance to

residents nearby.

- (g) Members noted that some heavy goods vehicles had unloaded goods at the emergency vehicular access (EVA) near Yat Tung Estate late at night. As the noise caused by tyres running over the uneven manhole covers would give residents a wrong impression that works were still in progress, Members hoped that the HD would enhance the management of the EVA concerned by, for instance, assigning security personnel to guard the entrance and exit of the car park opposite to Fuk Yat House or restricting the lifting of gate barrier at night, so as to prevent goods vehicles from unloading goods at the EVA concerned.

38. Mr Esmond YAU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance, the contractor was required to regularly monitor the noise level of the works and the impact on air and water quality. The EPD would determine the installation locations of the monitoring equipment having regard to the works requirements, the impact of the works on the residents and other factors. He would convey Members' suggestions on the altitude of noise monitoring points to the Environmental Team for consideration.
- (b) If a member of the public lodged a complaint against a construction site with the EPD, the EPD would conduct an investigation to understand the actual situation and would reply to the complainant with the investigation results and the direct contact information for the project concerned.
- (c) According to the records, the EPD had instigated three prosecutions against contractors for carrying out works within the restricted hours in 2021 and had secured convictions. In 2022 and 2023, the Department conducted a total of 110 and 98 regular and surprise inspections to construction sites in the Tung Chung area respectively. As at 31 March 2024, a total of 38 regular and surprise inspections had been carried out.
- (d) Regarding the issue of construction materials falling from dump trucks, the person in charge of the construction site should check the relevant equipment before the vehicle left the site. If the situation affected road safety, members of the public could contact the Police for follow-up action.

39. Mr Terence TANG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) He would look into the issue of heavy goods vehicles using the EVA for unloading goods in the vicinity of Yat Tung Estate after the meeting. If the manhole covers on the EVA were managed by the HD, the Department would follow up on the issue. He would also find out after the meeting whether the gate barrier of the car park opposite to Fuk Yat

House was managed by the Department.

- (b) As regards the issue of construction materials falling onto the road, he would look into the matter after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The HD had enquired with the works contractor and noted that there were no recorded incidents of cement mortar and concrete falling from height at the site on 21 and 22 March 2024. The Department and the works contractor attached great importance to industrial safety. In view of this, metal platforms and safety nets had been installed at the site to prevent sand and gravels from falling out of the site and injuring passers-by.)

- (c) If construction workers smoked in public places of PRH estates, the HD could not initiate prosecution against them but could only drive them away. However, if construction workers threw away cigarette butts indiscriminately, the Department would issue fine tickets to them. He assured Members that the Department would keep in view the situation.

40. A Member said that some residents had reflected that construction workers in Area 100 were discreetly carrying out works late at night. However, it was difficult for members of the public to lodge effective complaints due to the irregular working hours of the workers and the lack of a channel for immediate feedback. The Member asked EPD to keep an eye on the situation.

41. Mr Esmond YAU said that he would relay information regarding the aforementioned situation to the relevant section after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The EPD had relayed information regarding the situation to the relevant section and taken follow-up actions after the meeting, and had replied to Members with the results and the relevant contact details.)

## VII. Any Other Business

42. No further business was raised by Members.

## VIII. Date of Next Meeting

43. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m. The next meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 3 June 2024 (Monday).

-END-