

Sai Kung District Council
Housing, Planning and Development Committee
Minutes of the Third Meeting in 2020

Date: 19 May 2020 (Tuesday)

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Venue: Conference Room of the Sai Kung District Council

<u>Present</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Mr LEUNG Li (Chairman)	9:30 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr CHOI Ming-hei (Vice-Chairman)	9:30 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Ms CHAN Ka-lam, Debby	9:30 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr CHAN Wai-lit	10:15 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr CHAN Yiu-chor, Andrew	9:30 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr CHAU Yin-ming, Francis, BBS, MH	9:30 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr CHENG Chung-man	9:38 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr CHEUNG Chin-pang, Edwin	9:32 a.m.	3:30 p.m.
Mr CHEUNG Mei-hung, Chris	9:40 a.m.	3:35 p.m.
Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu	9:36 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr CHUN Hoi-shing	9:30 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr CHUNG Kam-lun	10:16 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr FAN Kwok-wai, Gary	11:48 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Ms FONG Kwok-shan, Christine	9:30 a.m.	12:50 p.m.
Mr FUNG Kwan-on	9:30 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr HO Wai-hong, Stanley	9:45 a.m.	1:55 p.m.
Mr LAI Ming-chak	9:30 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr LAI Wai-tong	9:30 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr LAM Siu-chung, Frankie	9:30 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr LAU Kai-hong	9:30 a.m.	1:00 p.m.
Mr LEE Ka-yui	10:25 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr LEE Yin-ho, Ryan	9:30 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Ms LEUNG Hin-yan	9:30 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr LUI Man-kwong	9:30 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr LUK Ping-choi	9:34 a.m.	1:56 p.m.
Mr TSE Ching-fung	9:30 a.m.	3:53 p.m.
Ms WONG Cheuk-nga, Valerie	9:30 a.m.	5:25 p.m.
Mr WONG Shui-sang	9:30 a.m.	12:40 p.m.
Mr YIP Brandon Kenneth	9:40 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr YU Tsun-ning	9:43 a.m.	6:10 p.m.
Mr CHAN Yiu-wing, Yorick (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council)1, Sai Kung District Office	

In Attendance

Miss WONG Ching-hang, Joey	Assistant District Officer (Sai Kung)2, Sai Kung District Office
Ms LAM Yee-mang, Dawn	Senior Liaison Officer (2), Sai Kung District Office
Mr LO Ka-kit, Sunny	Liaison Officer i/c (Tseung Kwan O)South, Sai Kung District Office
Mr WONG Wai-lam, William	Property Service Manager/Service (Kowloon West and Sai Kung)5, Housing Department
Mr POON Yin-ye, Jenny	Senior Estate Surveyor/Sai Kung, District Lands Office, Sai Kung
Ms TAM Yin-ping, Donna	District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands, Planning

Mr HO Lok-chi, William	Department Engineer/New Territories East (Distribution 3), Water Supplies Department	
Mr NG Kwok-lun, Wilson	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Sai Kung), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	} For agenda items II (A) & (D)
Mr MAK Kui-yin, Louis	Executive Director, The Board of Management of The Chinese Permanent Cemeteries	
Mr CHEUNG Kiu-kin, Desmond	Head – Projects, The Board of Management of The Chinese Permanent Cemeteries	} For agenda item II (A)
Ms LEE Wing-shui, Anne	Head – Operations, The Board of Management of The Chinese Permanent Cemeteries	
Ms CHOW Yuen-sai, Esther	Director, Palmer & Turner Group	
Ms CHEUNG Lai-yung, Oliver	Managing Director, OZZO Technology (HK) Limited	
Mr WONG Wing-hung, Stephen	Project Director 2, Task Force on Transitional Housing, Transport and Housing Bureau	} For agenda item II (B)
Mr LO Chi-yung, Derek	Senior Project Manager 1, Task Force on Transitional Housing, Transport and Housing Bureau	
Mr CHUA Hoi-wai	Chief Executive, The Hong Kong Council of Social Service	
Mr WONG Kin-wai, Anthony	Business Director, The Hong Kong Council of Social Service	
Mr HO Chun-kit, Charles	Project Director, Community Housing Movement Project, The Hong Kong Council of Social Service	
Ms Queenie KWOK	Project Manager, Modular Social Housing Project, The Hong Kong Council of Social Service	
Ms FOK Wai-yin, Emily	Senior Property Manager (Project Division)1, Government Property Agency	} For agenda item II (D)
Mr KO Ping-yin, Koby	Estate Surveyor (Project Division)21, Government Property Agency	
Mr AU Tze-wai, William	Senior Engineer/General Legislation 3, Electrical & Mechanical Services Department	} For agenda item IV (A) (6)

Welcome Remarks

The Chairman welcomed all Members and attendees to the meeting.

2. The Chairman said the Secretariat had not received any Notification of Absence from Meeting submitted by Members before the meeting.

I. Confirmation of Minutes of the 2nd Housing, Planning and Development Committee (HPDC) Meeting held on 17 March 2020

3. The Chairman said the Secretariat had not received any proposed amendment before the meeting. There being no other proposed amendment, the Chairman declared that the aforesaid minutes were confirmed.

II. New Items

(A) Junk Bay Chinese Permanent Cemetery Project on Proposed Construction of New Niches
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 25/20)

4. The Chairman welcomed the following attendees to the meeting:
 - Mr Wilson NG, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Sai Kung), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD)
 - Mr Louis MAK, Executive Director, The Board of Management of The Chinese Permanent Cemeteries (BMCPC)
 - Mr Desmond CHEUNG, Head – Projects, BMCPC
 - Ms Anne LEE, Head – Operations, BMCPC
 - Ms Esther CHOW, Director, Palmer & Turner Group
 - Ms Oliver CHEUNG, Managing Director, OZZO Technology (HK) Limited
5. Mr Wilson NG, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Sai Kung), FEHD, Mr Louis MAK, Executive Director, BMCPC, and Ms Anne LEE, Head – Operations, BMCPC, introduced the background information of the project. Mr Desmond CHEUNG, Head – Projects, BMCPC, introduced the content of the paper based on the presentation slides.
6. Mr LUK Ping-choi requested BMCPC to provide detailed information on the widening of carriageways and explain whether the problem of Ko Chiu Road being narrow and having many bends would be resolved.
7. Mr LAI Wai-tong enquired what measures would be taken by BMCPC to divert the grave sweepers entering or leaving the cemetery via Ko Chiu Road during the implementation of road widening works and construction works of the bus stop, particularly during the grave-sweeping seasons. Furthermore, he hoped that BMCPC would enhance the pedestrian environment by improving the footpaths, such as installing additional shelters and seats, providing covers to the stairways in the vicinity of the worshipping places, etc.
8. Mr CHUN Hoi-shing suggested BMCPC provide transport services plying between the proposed bus stop and columbarium for the convenience of the elderly and other grave sweepers.
9. Mr Edwin CHEUNG opined that BMCPC should give prime consideration to the construction of the proposed escalator system or other complementary facilities, with a view to diverting the pedestrian flow brought by the columbarium in the future. Furthermore, he enquired whether BMCPC had co-ordinated with bus companies to strengthen the diversion of grave sweepers travelling to and from the cemetery by bus in the future.
10. The response from Mr Desmond CHEUNG of BMCPC was consolidated as follows:
 - BMCPC would maintain contact with the Transport Department (TD) to look at whether there was a need to widen other road sections connecting Ko Chiu Road to the cemetery.
 - Construction works of the bus stop would be carried out in phases. During the construction period, access roads would be retained for grave sweepers to enter and leave the cemetery. Sufficient space would be provided for bus to make U-turns as well as to pick up and drop off passengers.
 - Long-term planning was required for the proposed escalator system project, and it took time for the relevant departments to carry out vetting. Therefore, construction works of the escalator system would not be carried out in parallel

with the cemetery project.

11. The response from Ms Anne LEE of BMCPC was consolidated as follows:
 - Given the growing demand for bus services plying to and from the cemetery, emphasis would be placed on the improvement of bus loading/unloading bays at the roundabout. According to the consultant's estimation, upon the commencement of operation of the two-storey bus stop, there would be an 80% increase in the carrying capacity in comparison with the present data. BMCPC therefore believed that bus services could be enhanced by then. BMCPC would also examine whether additional bus routes could be introduced in order to relieve the pedestrian flow.
 - BMCPC had discussed the arrangements for increasing the frequency of bus services in the future with bus companies and had received positive response that bus services could be enhanced during the grave-sweeping seasons to meet the demands.
 - BMCPC was currently studying the use of golf carts or electric vehicles (EVs) for the carriage of grave sweepers in need between the proposed bus stop and columbarium.
 - BMCPC had installed additional seats at appropriate locations in the cemetery and would continue to study the feasibility of providing covers to the stairways.
12. Mr LAI Ming-chak hoped that following the expansion of the bus stop, BMCPC or the bus companies would provide bus services on weekdays to assist in diverting members of the public heading for the cemetery from Tiu Keng Leng. He also invited BMCPC to provide more detailed information so that Members could ensure the proposed columbarium would not cause visual impacts to the surrounding neighbourhood. Besides, he hoped that BMCPC would provide resources to assist in the preservation of historic monuments nearby.
13. Mr CHENG Chung-man suggested BMCPC improve carriageways in the cemetery to facilitate the provision of transport services for grave sweepers with mobility difficulties. Besides, he enquired whether BMCPC would designate certain locations in the proposed columbarium for grave sweepers to perform worshipping rituals.
14. Mr LUK Ping-choi enquired whether users of the EV transport services would be charged. He also pointed out that the proposed escalator system would only be extended to sections 6-7, which was some distance away from the proposed columbarium and other worshipping places, and opined that such arrangement was not convenient for grave sweepers. Lastly, he requested BMCPC to provide more information on the whole project, including information on how crowd control measures would be implemented.
15. Mr Edwin CHEUNG believed the new columbarium and memorial plaques would bring an influx of several hundred thousand grave sweepers in total, thus resulting in traffic pressure on Tiu Keng Leng. He enquired whether BMCPC would adopt measures to divert pedestrians travelling between Tiu Keng Leng and the cemetery. Besides, he suggested BMCPC brief and consult residents of nearby housing estates on the project.
16. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan was concerned whether Tiu Keng Leng could cope with the additional pedestrian flow. Furthermore, she suggested carrying out vertical greening works on the external walls of the proposed columbarium for visual blending into the environment as far as practicable.
17. Mr Desmond CHENG of BMCPC said since the proposed columbarium would be

built on hillside, BMCPC believed that the completed columbarium would not cause visual impacts to the surrounding neighbourhood.

18. The response from Ms Anne LEE of BMCPC was consolidated as follows:
- Areas beside the proposed columbarium would be reserved for the installation of environmental friendly joss paper burners. Operation of the burners would comply with the gas emission standards stipulated by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD).
 - The provision of EV transport services within the cemetery was a facilitation measure, and the service users would not be charged.
 - Traffic impact assessment in respect of the additional pedestrian flow arising from the project had been conducted by the consultant and approved by TD. According to the consultant's assessment, completion of the proposed columbarium would bring an additional 10,000 visits to the cemetery during peak hours. The assessment results also showed that the existing pedestrian and ancillary transport facilities at BMCPC Footpath were able to cope with the pedestrian flow.
19. Mr Louis MAK of BMCPC said BMCPC would endeavour to assist in the preservation of historic monuments nearby. While taking forward the project concerned, BMCPC would take into account the transportation, pedestrian flow, environment, design, greening, and other factors. However, he hoped that Members would understand that the relevant measures or arrangements could not be implemented at one stroke. Furthermore, BMCPC had considered carrying out greening works on the external walls of the proposed columbarium. However, as the greening works might lead to the breeding of mosquitoes or other hygiene problems, BMCPC had decided to increase the provision of green facilities as an alternative.
20. Mr FUNG Kwan-on enquired whether the proposed columbarium would be open 24 hours a day.
21. Ms Anne LEE of BMCPC said at present, Junk Bay Chinese Permanent Cemetery was open from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and the existing columbarium was open from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The opening hours would remain unchanged except during the grave-sweeping seasons.
22. Mr Frankie LAM suggested BMCPC improve the ancillary transport facilities connecting Tiu Keng Leng with the proposed columbarium in parallel during the construction period.
23. Ms Christine FONG recommended BMCPC carry out consultation on the project with residents of nearby housing estates and enhance complementary facilities such as road signs and shelters. Furthermore, she suggested BMCPC consider tying in with the large-scale road projects in Tseung Kwan O and constructing an escalator system along BMCPC Footpath, with a view to diverting pedestrian flow. Besides, she suggested BMCPC devote resources in enhancing the hiking trails near the cemetery and extending the trails to Yau Tong.
24. Mr Louis MAK of BMCPC said having attached great importance to the cemetery's operation and development, BMCPC was willing to devote resources to improve the cemetery in various aspects. Yet, some of the areas mentioned by Members fell outside the purview of BMCPC. Nevertheless, if the community or government departments required BMCPC's

co-ordination or financial assistance, BMCPC welcomed and would examine the proposals from various parties. Since BMCPC knew the project might cause traffic impact to nearby areas, it had studied and proposed several improvement measures, which included increasing bus frequency and improving ancillary facilities of the bus stop. In the long run, BMCPC aspired to an escalator system connecting Ko Chiu Road, Yau Tong with the cemetery to relieve the pedestrian flow and traffic problems.

25. Mr Frankie LAM said having considered the possibility that BMCPC would continue to increase the number of niches in the future, he requested BMCPC to ensure adequate provision of ancillary transport facilities.

26. Mr Kenneth YIP hoped that individual Members would stop setting up street counters in Tiu Keng Leng during the grave-sweeping seasons to avoid traffic impacts and obstruction of passageways.

27. Mr Louis MAK of BMCPC said BMCPC would exercise due diligence in managing its resources and would review the ancillary facilities and development of the cemetery from time to time, such as studying how to enhance operational smoothness of the cemetery, integrating the cemetery or the proposed columbarium into the community, preventing unnecessary nuisance to nearby residents as well as studying the holding of conservation and charitable activities to support the community. He stressed that BMCPC would continue to devote resources and enhance complementary facilities through different means, thereby improving the cemetery's traffic condition and the problem of pedestrian flow in the long run.

28. The Chairman thanked the representatives of BMCPC for attending the meeting. He invited BMCPC to consider Members' views, particularly views on the transportation to and from the cemetery. As the proposed columbarium was geographically in close proximity to Tiu Keng Leng, Members were worried that the project would cause impacts to the traffic and pedestrian flow in Tiu Keng Leng. Furthermore, he hoped that information concerning the traffic assessment would be provided for Members' reference. He suggested BMCPC consider attending meetings of the Traffic and Transport Committee to give a detailed account of the project's impact on the traffic flow in the vicinity. Lastly, he asked BMCPC to carry out proper consultation with stakeholders of nearby housing estates and the district.

(B) HKCSS Modular Social Housing Programme in Tseung Kwan O
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 26/20)

29. The Chairman welcomed the following attendees to the meeting:

- Mr Stephen WONG, Project Director 2, Task Force on Transitional Housing, Transport and Housing Bureau (THB)
- Mr Derek LO, Senior Project Manager 1, Task Force on Transitional Housing, THB
- Mr CHUA Hoi-wai, Chief Executive, The Hong Kong Council of Social Service (HKCSS)
- Mr Anthony WONG, Business Director, HKCSS
- Mr Charles HO, Project Director, Community Housing Movement Project, HKCSS
- Ms Queenie KWOK, Project Manager, Modular Social Housing Scheme, HKCSS

30. Mr CHUA Hoi-wai, Chief Executive, HKCSS, introduced the background

information of the programme, and Mr Anthony WONG, Business Director, HKCSS, introduced the content of the paper based on the presentation slides. Mr Stephen WONG, Project Director 2, Task Force on Transitional Housing, THB, made supplement to the content and background of the programme.

31. Mr TSE Ching-fung requested the representatives of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to attend the meeting and give an account of the construction progress of the indoor heated pool in Area 65. He continued that the questionnaires submitted by residents revealed that nearly 97.5% of the respondents opposed the modular housing programme, with inadequate ancillary facilities and the already high population density in Tseung Kwan O being the primary reasons. In view of the incomprehensive transport, healthcare, recreational and cultural facilities in the district, together with the absence of public market, he opined that Tseung Kwan O was not suitable for the development of transitional housing.

32. Mr LAI Ming-chak expressed worry that the short-term tenancy (STT) of the site granted for use as modular housing would be extended, resulting in a delay in LCSD's existing development of recreational and sports facilities at the site. He suggested HKCSS give consideration to other "Government, Institution or Community" (GIC) sites in the district which had not yet been planned for any development for the provision of transitional housing. Meanwhile, he enquired whether HKCSS would consider using idle non-"GIC" sites for such purpose.

33. Mr CHENG Chung-man said as HKCSS could not provide comprehensive ancillary facilities in respect of daily necessities for tenants of the transitional housing, he had reservations on the programme.

34. Mr LAI Wai-tong said residents were worried that the programme would hinder the progress of the existing development project on the lot. Furthermore, he asked the Planning Department (PlanD) about the feasibility of constructing transitional housing on non-"GIC" sites. He also expressed worry that prospective tenants of the modular housing would have to leave their existing social circles and face the problems of adaption or working across districts.

35. Mr Ryan LEE opined that instead of arbitrarily constructing housing on scattered land, THB should make long-term planning for resolving the problem of insufficient housing supply, thereby meeting the Government's housing supply target.

36. Ms Debby CHAN said Tseung Kwan O was already facing the problem of insufficient social welfare services and enquired whether HKCSS would provide social welfare services to the prospective tenants. She was also worried that the prospective tenants might be socially isolated.

37. Mr LUI Man-kwong was also concerned whether the programme would affect the completion of the recreational and sports facilities. He enquired: (a) whether HKCSS could shorten the duration of using the land so as to tie in with LCSD's implementation timetable; and (b) about the facilities which would be provided by HKCSS in addition to the modular housing to be constructed on the lot.

38. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan enquired whether the proposed facilities to be provided on the captioned site had been listed in the Annex of SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 36/20; whether environmental impact assessment studies or traffic impact assessment studies had been

conducted for the programme; whether the use of vacant school premises would be given prime consideration for the provision of transitional housing; whether child care services or home-based child care services would be provided to the prospective tenants and the details of such services; and about the reasons for the absence of construction timetable despite the fact that LCSD had consulted SKDC about the development project in Area 65, Tseung Kwan O in 2018.

39. Mr FUNG Kwan-on enquired how THB would assist the tenants if they were not able to obtain public rental housing (PRH) units as scheduled. If they were arbitrarily transferred to the transitional housing in different districts, they would lose their dignity. He opined that the site concerned was more suitable for constructing youth hostel so as to help young people enhance the ability of financial management and achieve their personal goals.

40. Mr Andrew CHAN said in principle, he objected to the construction of transitional housing as a mean to resolve housing problem because it could not tackle the roots of the problem.

41. Mr CHUNG Kam-lun expressed disappointment that no LCSD representative was attending the meeting. It was beyond doubt that there was a huge demand for housing in Hong Kong. However, construction of transitional housing on land which had been planned for development might lead to controversies among various stakeholders. He opined that Sai Kung district should bear part of the social responsibilities and provide sites for the construction of transitional housing. Yet, unless the Government provided a direct response regarding the implementation timetable of the indoor heated pool in Area 65, HKCSS would have to look for other sites for developing the transitional housing in order to avoid repeated delay in the indoor heated pool project due to other reasons.

42. Ms Valerie WONG said repeated renewal of STTs of vacant sites was extremely common, arousing concerns that the same situation might take place in this project.

43. The response from Mr CHUA Hoi-wai of HKCSS was consolidated as follows:

- He thanked Members for their willingness to consider and assist in the identification of sites for the provision of transitional housing.
- HKCSS would confirm the construction of transitional housing on the proposed site only if the programme would not hinder Tseung Kwan O residents from enjoying the recreational and sports facilities concerned. HKCSS undertook that the site would be returned within five years. If LCSD needed to start the construction works for the recreational and sports facilities within five years, HKCSS could also tie in with the relevant arrangements.
- HKCSS maintained an open mind in considering other possible sites. He hoped that Members would reach a consensus on site selection as soon as possible, so that HKCSS could reflect the relevant views to the Government and explore the feasibility, thereby benefiting people in need early.
- HKCSS understood the provision of child care services in the district was inadequate. Therefore, the establishment of community facilities on the proposed site had been preliminarily proposed to provide child care or other social welfare services. Meanwhile, tenants of the transitional housing might volunteer as home-based child carers or take part in other volunteering work to support to the community.
- According to past experience, applicants of transitional housing projects were usually residents living in the same area or in the vicinity. He believed the situation would also be applicable to the transitional housing project in Tseung

Kwan O, which would be easier for the tenants to adapt to the new environment and maintain their existing way of life.

44. The response from Mr Anthony WONG of HKCSS was consolidated as follows:
- After tender documents had been issued, the consultant would carry out preliminary study to evaluate the traffic and environmental impacts of the programme.
 - In other transitional housing projects co-ordinated by HKCSS, resources for operating the projects were provided by the Community Chest of Hong Kong and Hong Kong Jockey Club Charities Trust. Other resources or rental income might be used in the subsequent projects. Furthermore, HKCSS would also require the operator to arrange for a team of social workers. In addition to helping and showing care for the tenants, the social workers would also assist tenants of the modular housing in establishing a harmonious and mutual supportive network with nearby residents.
 - Tenants of sub-divided units (SDUs) often faced eviction as they were unable to afford the high rents. Affordable transitional housing would serve as a short-term relief, reducing their chance of being evicted and more importantly, enabling them to receive living support from the community and contribute to the community by utilising their strengths.
45. The response from Mr Stephen WONG of THB was consolidated as follows:
- Idle sites with long-term development uses but without confirmed implementation timetables would be considered for the provision of transitional housing.
 - Continuously increasing housing supply was the fundamental and long-term solution to the problem of insufficient housing supply. However, it took time to identify land and increase housing supply. The Government hoped to help the grassroots who had been on the PRH waiting list for a long time and those who were inadequately housed by adopting various relief measures, including the implementation of transitional housing projects.
 - The Town Planning Board (TPB) had announced on 26 November 2018 that with the support of THB, transitional housing in the urban and new town areas could be regarded as for temporary use, which was always permitted under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), if it was for a period of five years or less. If the development plan of the land concerned had been confirmed by then, THB would not support the application for renewal submitted by the community group responsible for operating the transitional housing. Therefore, in the normal course of events, tenants of the transitional housing would have to move out within five years.
 - He knew that LCSD was undertaking the development of other recreational and sports facilities in the district and believed that LCSD would provide SKDC with a detailed explanation of the development project in Area 65, Tseung Kwan O in the future.
 - Constructed by the modular integrated construction method, the construction period of modular housing was shorter as compared to residential buildings. Since modular housing units could be dismantled and moved to other construction sites for reassembling, the time required for removal would be relatively shorter, enabling HKCSS to meet the Government's demand for the site concerned more flexibly.
 - When considering HKCSS's proposal of constructing modular housing on the site concerned, THB would also examine the community services provided to

the district by the operator, with a view to helping people in need. THB visited households benefited from the Community Housing Movement Project from time to time, and had identified improvements to their living conditions as well as physical and mental health, for example, the symptoms of a tenant with depression had been relieved.

- Members were welcome to suggest other locations which they considered to be more suitable for the development of transitional housing. THB was open-minded to any other possible sites.
- He reiterated that the proposed development of recreational and sports facilities in this site was still at the preparatory stage, and it was estimated that the construction works would not commence until a few years later. THB anticipated that the operator would only require a nine-month notice for returning the site to the Government to tie in with the timetable of the long-term development.

46. The response from Ms Donna TAM, District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands, PlanD, was consolidated as follows:

- As stipulated in the Notes of the relevant OZP, temporary uses (expected to be five years or less) of any land or building were always permitted as long as they complied with other relevant legislation, the conditions of the lease and any other government requirements, and there was no need for these to conform to the zoned use or the Notes of the OZPs. Therefore, the relevant departments or organisations could consider the use of other suitable non-“GIC” sites for transitional housing development.
- The Government had formulated different planning standards for the provision of various community facilities. In general, PlanD would evaluate the provision of community facilities based on the provision standards as stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), which were formulated mainly on the basis of the overall population. If the provision standards of the relevant facilities were not formulated based on the planned population, PlanD would not be able to assist in evaluating and calculating whether the relevant facilities complied with the standards stipulated in the HKPSG, and the leisure pool in Area 65 was one of the examples.

47. Miss Joey WONG, Assistant District Officer (Sai Kung)2, Sai Kung District Office (SKDO), supplemented that according to her understanding, the development project in Area 65, Tseung Kwan O, was at a preliminary planning stage. LCSD had earlier conducted preliminary consultation with the District Facilities Management Committee (DFMC) on the proposed development project. Furthermore, LCSD was currently focusing on three projects which had been included in the “Five-Year Plan for Sports and Recreation Facilities” (Five-Year Plan) as announced in the 2017 Policy Address, namely the Town Park in Areas 66 and 68, Tseung Kwan O, sports centre and Town Plaza in Sai Kung, and Water Sports Centre in Area 77, Tseung Kwan O. Therefore, LCSD would formulate long-term implementation timetables for other projects in the district. LCSD would consult Members at the meetings of DFMC in a timely manner if it had more specific information about the project in Area 65.

48. Mr FUNG Kwan-on had the following views: (a) he requested HPDC to write to LCSD, urging LCSD to attend the meeting to explain the progress of the project; (b) he hoped that the organisation and department representatives would provide more detailed information on the two other sites which had been considered; and (c) he opined that youth hostels could solve the problem of grassroots poverty in the long run while transitional housing, on the contrary, could only temporarily improve the living conditions of the grassroots, and the

Government should not be so short-sighted.

49. Mr TSE Ching-fung enquired about the reasons why THB insisted to implement the programme despite opposition from residents of many housing estates nearby. He reiterated that in view of the high population density, narrow passageways, inconvenient transport, lack of public market and recreational and cultural facilities in the area of the proposed site, transitional housing should not be constructed on the site concerned.

50. Mr CHENG Chung-man supported the captioned programme. However, he pointed out that the ancillary facilities provided on the site were inadequate to satisfy the needs of tenants of the modular housing in relation to clothing, food, accommodation, transportation, education and entertainment.

51. Mr CHAN Wai-lit pointed out that the Government could not ensure whether the tenants could be allocated with PRH units within two years, and it had not explained how the tenants would be rehoused two years later. Furthermore, he believed that applicants of the transitional housing programme in Tseung Kwan O would certainly be members of the public residing in other districts as there was no SDU resident in Tseung Kwan O. He suggested the Government consider transforming the proposed development of transitional housing to the construction of youth hostel. Youths had to wait for a longer time to have their own homes and might have poor family relationship, and thus were more in need of interim housing or temporary accommodation. Meanwhile, it would be easier for youths, who had less demand for social service, to be accepted by residents living in the vicinity.

52. Mr LEE Ka-yui said the programme would take up a lot of community resources and delay the completion of the recreational facilities. He referred to the project at Nam Cheong Street, Sham Shui Po, which had been implemented for two years but was still unavailable for flat intake, to support his view that the programme, with a five-year STT, would not be able to achieve the desirable results. Besides, he hoped that HKCSS would clarify whether the programme was about the development of social housing or interim housing, so that Members could understand its objectives.

53. Mr LAI Wai-tong enquired whether HKCSS had considered other locations in the district, such as Areas 8 and 72 in Tseung Kwan O.

54. Mr Stanley HO pointed out that the modular housing programme could only treat the symptoms but not the root cause of the problem, and only long-term housing planning could tackle the problem at the root. He further enquired about detailed information on the social welfare facilities or supporting services included in the programme. Regarding the resident with depression who had felt better after moving into the modular housing unit as mentioned earlier by the THB representative, he would like to know the source of the information. He also enquired and was concerned whether the modules used for constructing modular housing were safe.

55. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan suggested writing to LCSD to request for an implementation table of the project in Area 65, thereby ensuring THB would keep its promise of not affecting the provision of sports and recreational facilities by LCSD. She also suggested writing to the Social Welfare Department (SWD) to evaluate whether HKCSS was capable of providing adequate services and community support for tenants of the transitional housing. She said the Government had never faced up to the issue of “land justice”, which had resulted in the current shortage of housing supply, thus leaving grassroots citizens with no choice but to live in transitional housing. She also opined that THB should review the housing policies in

order to really help the grassroots.

56. Mr Chris CHEUNG said the Government should bear the greatest responsibility for the severe shortage of housing supply. However, he opined that consideration should be given to all short, medium and long-term measures so as to assist members of the public in meeting their housing needs. Furthermore, he pointed out that SKDC should clarify its stance on whether to oppose the construction of transitional housing, or whether only the choice of site was debatable. If Members took a stance against the entire programme, there would be inadequacies in SKDC's efforts in fulfilling social responsibilities, and he would have reservations over the opposition. If SKDC only held opposing views on the choice of site, he recommended the District Lands Office, Sai Kung (DLO/SK) submit information on all idle sites in the district to SKDC for in-depth discussion, with a view to determining the most suitable site for the development of transitional housing in collaboration.

57. Mr LAI Ming-chak said some Members had earlier suggested other sites for THB's consideration, including Areas 8 and 11, Tseung Kwan O. He also suggested THB and HKCSS consider the feasibility of developing transitional housing on "GIC" sites in Pak Shing Kok and LOHAS Park.

58. Mr Francis CHAU declared that the organisation which he worked for was a member of HKCSS, and he was a member of three committees under HKCSS, including the Steering Committee on Community Housing Movement. He indicated that the organisation that he worked for would not apply to be the operator of the "Community Housing Movement Project". He emphasised that if SKDC considered the indoor heated pool project in Area 65 to be of a higher priority, it should request the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) and LCSD to account for the exact implementation date as well as to take forward other projects which had not been included in the Five-Year Plan according to priorities. Regarding the identification of sites, he hoped that THB and HKCSS would conduct an overall review of various idle "GIC" sites in Tseung Kwan O, including Areas 8, 15 and 72, to examine whether they were suitable for the provision of transitional housing. In conclusion, he opined that Tseung Kwan O, with high accessibility and a certain amount of ancillary facilities in respect of daily necessities, was ideal for the development of transitional housing. Therefore, he hoped that Members would support the programme.

59. Mr Chris CHEUNG reiterated his suggestion of clarifying the direction of discussion. If Members were merely having doubts about the proposed site instead of objecting to the programme itself, HPDC should ask DLO/SK to examine the idle sites suitable for the construction of transitional housing in the district and to provide the relevant information so as to facilitate Members' further discussion.

60. Mr LUI Man-kwong said as Members were concerned whether the programme would affect the existing development projects in Area 65, the emphasis should be placed on how THB and HKCSS would ensure the return of land before the termination of lease. He opined that THB and HKCSS should carry out comprehensive review on various idle sites in the district as well as conduct consultation with stakeholders in the district and SKDC in order to decide on the site for developing transitional housing.

61. Ms Christine FONG had the following views and suggestions: (a) she and her team supported the transitional housing project; (b) she suggested Tseung Kwan O or Sai Kung residents be given the priority to rent the transitional housing units; (c) she agreed to review all idle sites in the district, so that Members could carefully consider and decide on the location suitable for the construction of transitional housing; (d) she was worried that tenants

of the modular housing would be blamed for hindering the implementation of the existing projects if the transitional housing was constructed on idle land which had been planned for development; (e) she suggested THB and HKCSS consider the idle land next to Tseung Kwan O Hospital, Tin Ha Wan Village and Haven of Hope Hospital; and (f) she suggested THB take forward the planned development in Area 137, Tseung Kwan O as soon as possible.

Request HKCSS to shelve the implementation of Modular Social Housing Programme in Area 65, Tseung Kwan O and request the Leisure and Cultural Services Department to kick-start the indoor heated swimming pool project in the aforesaid area

(The motion was amended as “Request the Transport and Housing Bureau in co-ordination with non-government organisations to examine other alternative locations in Sai Kung and Tseung Kwan O with priority, such as Area 8, Tseung Kwan O, etc., for the provision of transitional housing, and request the Home Affairs Bureau and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department to kick-start the heated swimming pool project”)

(SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 66/20)

62. Mr TSE Ching-fung moved an extempore motion, namely: “Request HKCSS to shelve the implementation of Modular Social Housing Programme in Area 65, Tseung Kwan O and request the Leisure and Cultural Services Department to kick-start the indoor heated swimming pool project in the aforesaid area”. The extempore motion was seconded by Mr Andrew CHAN, Ms Valerie WONG, Messrs Ryan LEE and CHENG Chung-man.

63. In accordance with Order 13(2) of SKDC Standing Orders, the Chairman invited Members to vote on whether the above extempore motion should be included in the agenda of the meeting. With the agreement of over half of the Members present at the meeting, the Chairman declared that the extempore motion was included in the agenda.

64. Mr Francis CHAU said he had reservations about the word “shelve” in the extempore motion, opining that functions of the transitional housing programme should not be denied. Therefore, he would move an amended motion. He also hoped that HPDC would conduct an overall review of the appropriate locations in the district for the provision of transitional housing in the future.

65. Mr Stanley HO pointed out that Members should adopt a holistic approach to review the housing situation in Hong Kong, and it was therefore inappropriate to use the word “shelve” in the motion. He said he would support amendments to the extempore motion.

66. Mr Francis CHAU moved an amended motion, the wording of which was “Request for reviewing other alternative locations in Areas 8 and 72, Tseung Kwan O with priority for the provision of transitional housing, and request the Leisure and Cultural Services Department to kick-start the heated swimming pool project”. The motion was seconded by Messrs CHUNG Kam-lun and Stanley HO.

67. Mr LAI Ming-chak suggested Mr Francis CHAU amend the wording of the motion to “Request for identifying appropriate locations in the district for the provision of transitional housing, and request the Leisure and Cultural Services Department to kick-start the construction of heated swimming pool and indoor sports centre” to reflect Members’ views more accurately.

68. Mr Chris CHEUNG was in support of the amended motion. He agreed that idle sites in the entire Sai Kung district should be examined for identifying appropriate locations for the development of transitional housing.

69. Mr LUK Ping-choi invited Mr Francis CHAU to explain the content of his amended motion. He would decide whether to support the amended motion thereafter.

70. Mr Edwin CHEUNG moved another amended motion, the wording of which was “Request the Government to examine government land which had not yet been planned for development on a territory-wide basis for the provision of transitional housing”. He supplemented that as preliminary planning work had been carried out for some idle sites, residents living nearby might have expectations on the completion of the relevant facilities. Constructing transitional housing on those sites might result in controversies between tenants of the modular housing and other residents living in the vicinity. Therefore, he suggested THB consider examining all government sites which had not yet been planned for development on a territory-wide basis for the development of transitional housing. The word “territory-wide” was used to indicate that Sai Kung district would not stay out of it. The amended motion was seconded by Ms Christine FONG and Mr Chris CHEUNG.

71. Mr Gary FAN moved another amended motion, the wording of which was “Request the Transport and Housing Bureau in co-ordination with non-government organisations to examine other alternative locations in Sai Kung and Tseung Kwan O with priority, such as Area 8, Tseung Kwan O, etc., for the provision of transitional housing, and request the Home Affairs Bureau and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department to kick-start the heated swimming pool project”. He opined that the emphasis should be put on the identification of sites within Sai Kung district for the provision of transitional housing. The amended motion was seconded by Mr Frankie LAM.

72. Mr Kenneth YIP moved another amended motion, the wording of which was “Request the Transport and Housing Bureau in co-ordination with non-government organisations to examine other alternative locations in Sai Kung and Tseung Kwan O with priority, such as GIC sites in Pak Shing Kok and LOHAS Park, etc., for the provision of transitional housing, and request the Home Affairs Bureau and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department to kick-start the heated swimming pool project”. As the motion was not seconded by any Member, the Chairman declared that the amended motion would not be dealt with.

73. Mr Edwin CHEUNG opined that insufficient housing supply was a territory-wide issue which should be planned and considered on a territory-wide basis, and Sai Kung district should not bear all responsibilities. To avoid giving a wrong message to the Government, he moved the relevant amended motion.

74. Mr CHUNG Kam-lun said members of the public awaiting allocation of PRH units were in dire straits, and Sai Kung district should bear its social responsibility to assist them in meeting their pressing needs. However, he opined that it was worthwhile to spend some time studying and selecting in detail sites which were more suitable for the provision of transitional housing so as to minimise conflicts between different stakeholders. Therefore, he supported the amended motion moved by Mr Gary FAN.

75. Mr Kenneth YIP hoped that the meeting would be suspended for a five-minute internal discussion. With the agreement of over two-thirds of Members, the Chairman declared that the meeting be suspended for five minutes.

(The meeting was resumed at 12:35 p.m.)

76. The Chairman said the amended motion moved by Mr Gary FAN would be first handled. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the amended motion was carried.

77. The response from Mr Stephen WONG of THB was consolidated as follows:

- Whether an individual site was suitable for the provision of transitional housing depended on the planned land use, its actual conditions such as topography and physical features, various technical constraints, the supporting infrastructure required, etc. Furthermore, THB did not hope that the transitional housing programme would hinder the implementation of the existing long-term planned use of the site.
- He had mentioned earlier that the person involved in the example relating to “depression” was a tenant of the Lok Sin Tong Social Housing Scheme.
- THB had studied the use of vacant school premises in different places for the development of transitional housing, such as converting the school premises of Lok Sin Tong Primary School for the purpose of transitional housing.

78. The response from Mr CHUA Hoi-wai of HKCSS was consolidated as follows:

- HKCSS would proactively consider the needs of young people and was willing to re-examine the target group of the programme. In the past, HKCSS had operated social housing projects for young people in need and had encouraged them to participate in volunteering activities to serve the community.
- The social housing project at Nam Cheong Street in Sham Shui Po was the first modular social housing project of HKCSS, and it required time for the relevant government departments to carry out vetting work and establish standards. Therefore, preparatory time for the project was relatively longer. Having taken into account of past experience, HKCSS estimated that there would be significant reduction in the preparatory time required for similar projects.
- Regarding specification for modular housing construction, safety standards for modular housing was no less stringent than those for permanent residential buildings. The modular housing units would comply with the Fire Safety Ordinance and the relevant building ordinances to ensure structural safety.

79. The Chairman asked HKCSS and THB to note Members’ views. If the matter was discussed at subsequent HPDC meetings, he hoped that HKCSS would attend the meetings together with the representatives of LCSD and HAB. Furthermore, he hoped that the relevant departments would study in detail the possible sites in the district. The departments were welcome to invite Members to conduct joint site visits with a view to facilitating further discussion in the future. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to write to LCSD, conveying Members’ views and inviting LCSD representatives to attend the meeting to explain arrangements for the development project in Area 65, Tseung Kwan O.

(C) Amendments Items on Draft Pak Lap Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-PL/3
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 27/20)

80. Ms Donna TAM of PlanD introduced the content of the paper based on the presentation slides.

81. There being a question in relation to the above motion, the Chairman suggested and Members agreed to discuss the matters together.

Planning and protection of Country Park Enclaves
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 44/20 and 56/20)

82. The Chairman said the question was raised by Ms Debby CHAN.

83. Members noted the reply from PlanD.

84. Ms Debby CHAN opined that the existing mechanism and assessment methodology adopted by PlanD could not reflect the genuine need of villagers. The Government was unable to verify the relevant data nor explain the connection between the population and genuine need. Furthermore, she believed that PlanD had not considered the situation of “destroy first, develop later” in Pak Lap when drafting the OZP.

85. Ms Donna TAM of PlanD said according to her understanding, the JR was allowed on the ground that the TPB failed to carry out its duty to inquire on the genuine need for Small House development in designating the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone. Therefore, PlanD had obtained updated and supplementary information from the relevant parties for TPB’s re-consideration. Besides, PlanD was unable to prove the genuine need of villagers for Small House development in the area at the planning stage. Relevant assessments could only be carried out based on the Small House demand figures and information obtained from the rural committees or village representatives, but the accuracy of the information could not be verified. Nevertheless, TPB would also take into account other relevant information, including the topography, environment, facilities, passageways, infrastructure, etc. when designating land use zones.

86. Mr LAI Wai-tong could not understand the reason for rezoning the site in amendment item A from “V” to “G/IC”. He enquired whether the Government or other organisations had plans to provide the facilities listed under Column 1 of Annex 1 of the captioned paper at the site concerned.

87. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan enquired: (a) about the justifications for amendment item A, the reasons why the landowner had agreed to the amendment, and whether the Government had carried out private land acquisition; (b) how PlanD would ensure that wastewater would not flow from the “V” zone to the “Conservation Area” (“CA”); and (c) about the population figures of Pak Lap in the 2016 Population By-census.

88. Mr Francis CHAU said the size of the “V” zone was too large and doubted whether agricultural rehabilitation would be carried out in the “Agricultural” (“AGR”) zones. He opined that PlanD, DLO/SK or other departments should ensure the development in the vicinity would not destroy the existing ecological features. He hoped that HPDC would submit documents on the captioned subject to TPB to reflect Members’ views.

89. The response from Ms Donna TAM of PlanD was consolidated as follows:

- Regarding the rezoning of the site under amendment item A, there were mainly two purposes: (a) to reflect the existing village office; and (b) to reserve a site for the provision of a government refuse collection point (RCP) and a public toilet.

- Since the site proposed to be rezoned as “G/IC(1)” was a government site, there was no need for the Government to acquire private land for the relevant development.
- According to the 2016 Population By-census, the population of Pak Lap was less than 50 persons. PlanD had updated and submitted the information on population estimate and other relevant information for TPB’s consideration.
- TPB adopted a consistent approach on the designation of land use zonings. PlanD had provided as much information as it could for TPB to consider the recommendations concerning the relevant land use zonings.
- Villagers should comply with the regulations in respect of sewage treatment and discharge in order to apply for a Small House grant. According to her understanding, there was no existing public sewer for the area, and each house was served by its own on-site septic tanks and soakaway system. EPD had formulated standards and regulations concerning the design and construction of the relevant facilities to ensure the wastewater generated from the houses would not flow into the river.
- After considering the representations and comments in respect of the OZP in 2014, TPB had significantly reduced the size of the “V” zone and had rezoned the concerned area to “AGR” to better reflect the fallow farmland.

90. Ms Debby CHAN said the assessment mechanism adopted by PlanD could not prove the genuine need of the villagers. She opined that many indigenous male villagers who did not own any land would sell their small house rights and applied for the construction of Small Houses on other landowners’ sites to earn money. She could not comprehend whether the behaviour of selling “‘ding’ rights” could meet the genuine need of the villagers. Besides, PlanD had not reflected the emergence of “destroy first, develop later” activities in Pak Lap in recent years to TPB.

91. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan suggested PlanD provide documents that had been submitted to TPB for HPDC’s reference. Furthermore, as the RCP was proposed to be set up at a site neighbouring to the “CA”, she enquired how PlanD could ensure the RCP’s operation would not pollute the “CA”. Besides, she enquired whether PlanD and EPD was aware of the problem of “destroy first, develop later” in Pak Lap.

92. Mr LAI Ming-chak urged PlanD to provide information on the agricultural use at the “AGR” zone concerned. He opined that if the landowner had not developed the “AGR” zone in accordance with the planning intentions, there would be no need for PlanD to reserve such a large area for agricultural purposes. Instead, part of the area should be rezoned as “CA”. In addition, he asked PlanD about the estimated number of years during which the area covered by the “V” zone could cope with the villagers’ needs for Small House development.

93. The response from Ms Donna TAM of PlanD was consolidated as follows:

- In land use planning, PlanD would only consider whether the land was suitable for the relevant purpose, and land ownership was not a relevant consideration.
- According to the comments from the relevant departments, the “AGR” zone in the eastern part of Pak Lap had good potential for agricultural rehabilitation, and it had been zoned for agricultural purposes to encourage the rehabilitation of fallow farmland.
- When reviewing the size of the “V” zone, PlanD had conducted a site visit to inspect the current situation, during which it had noticed that construction works for Small Houses had been carrying out. Since the landowners or villagers

could decide when to build Small Houses according to their own needs, PlanD was unable to estimate the implementation timeframe for the Small Houses.

- In response to Members' concerns about the proposed RCP and public toilet, she said the design and operation of such facilities must comply with the latest environmental guidelines and requirements.

94. Mr Francis CHAU enquired whether the data concerning successful applications for Small House development in "AGR" zones was available.

95. Mr Stanley HO opined that PlanD had failed to provide a convincing figure to prove that there were genuine need for Small House development. Furthermore, he expressed discontent about the "destroy first, develop later" practice and hoped that PlanD would pay careful attention to whether the "AGR" zones would give rise to transfer of benefits. He also suggested PlanD explain to TPB the reasons for rezoning a large piece of land for agricultural purposes.

Object to the excessive allocation of land for small house development in the draft Pak Lap Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-PL/3 and urge the Government to improve the plan in order to protect the country park enclaves
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 67/20)

96. Ms Debby CHAN moved an extempore motion, the wording of which was "Object to the excessive allocation of land for small house development in the draft Pak Lap Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-PL/3 and urge the Government to improve the plan in order to protect the country park enclaves". The extempore motion was seconded by Messrs Stanley HO, YU Tsun-ning, Ms LEUNG Hin-yan, Messrs LAI Ming-chak, Kenneth YIP, LAI Wai-tong, LUI Man-kwong and Francis CHAU.

97. In accordance with Order 13(2) of SKDC Standing Orders, the Chairman invited Members to vote on whether the above extempore motion should be included in the agenda of the meeting. With the agreement of over half of the Members present at the meeting, the Chairman declared that the extempore motion was included in the agenda.

98. There being no amendment or objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

99. The response from Ms Donna TAM of PlanD was consolidated as follows:

- Following the first gazettal of the draft Pak Lap OZP, TPB, having taken into account the representations and comments at that time, had decided to rezone the site in the eastern part of Pak Lap to "AGR" zone to reflect the fallow farmland. The relevant departments had also agreed that the site had potential for rehabilitation for cultivation.
- When considering and vetting the planning applications for Small House development in "AGR" zone, TPB would strictly adhere to an important criterion, i.e. reviewing whether there was available land within the "V" zone to cope with the need for Small House development. If there was still available land within the relevant villages for building Small Houses, TPB would generally not approve the planning applications. In conclusion, TPB would carefully consider and handle every application for Small House development.
- The documents submitted by PlanD to TPB were all open documents which could be browsed at the TPB website.

100. The Chairman said HPDC had just endorsed an extempore motion, indicating its objection to the excessive allocation of land for Small House development in the draft Pak Lap OZP No. S/SK-PL/3. He invited PlanD to note Members' views and asked the Secretariat to relay the relevant comments to TPB in writing.

(D) The issue referred by the Sai Kung District Council: Construction of a joint-user complex in Tseung Kwan O
(SKDC(M) Paper No. 85/20 and SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 65/20)

101. The Chairman welcomed the following attendees to the meeting:

- Ms Emily FOK, Senior Property Manager (Project Division)¹, Government Property Agency (GPA)
- Mr Koby KO, Estate Surveyor (Project Division)²¹, GPA
- Mr Wilson NG, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Sai Kung), FEHD

102. The Chairman said the Secretariat had earlier invited Members' comments on the captioned matter via email. The relevant comments had been consolidated and listed in SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 65/20. The Chairman asked Members to note the content and invited department representatives to make supplement to the paper.

103. Mr Wilson NG of FEHD said he understood Members' concerns about the public market project. FEHD would take into account various factors when identifying sites for the provision of public market, including geographical locations of the sites, existing or planned uses, available area, ancillary transport facilities in the vicinity, etc. to ensure the market was of a certain scale and viability after its completion, thereby optimising the use of public funds and land resources. He emphasised that site selection was crucial to the public market's viability, and the difficulty in identifying appropriate locations in developed areas for the provision of public market should not be overlooked. FEHD considered that the site in Area 67, Tseung Kwan O was the most suitable. In addition to being only a few minutes' walk from various housing estates, it was in close proximity to MTR Tseung Kwan O Station. Therefore, the proposed public market would not only serve residents of nearby housing estates, but would also be accessible to residents living in other areas by public transport, thus adding to the competitiveness and sustainability of the market. To conclude, FEHD had taken into account various locations in the district as well as the views of the local community on site selection when conducting the site selection exercise, and it considered the proposed site the most suitable. Regarding the management and operation mode of the market, a public market, as one of the major sources of purchasing fresh provisions for the general public, should be kept reasonably decent, clean, neat and tidy without being unduly upmarket. By adding the concept of "place-making" as far as practicable, FEHD anticipated that the new public market could serve a greater social function such that it could provide a resting and gathering place for the public in addition to a choice for fresh provisions. As the landlord of the new public market, FEHD would be responsible for determining the rental level and signing tenancy agreements with tenants. FEHD would consider adopting a new operation mode in the new market and strengthen the role of the service contractor in market management. The emphasis would be placed on unleashing the development potential of the market but not on regulating, with the aim of achieving market vibrancy as well as meeting the needs of the public. FEHD would review the existing mechanism for allocating stalls and determining rental levels and finalise the details after attending to stakeholders' views. Regarding the market's hygiene condition and transportation, service contractors of FEHD would be responsible for cleaning work of the market and arranging professional staff to carry out pest control work. FEHD would supervise the performance of the contractors from time

to time to ensure their compliance with the contract terms, thereby maintaining smooth operation of the market. According to the preliminary plan, a two-storey basement car park would be provided at the Joint-user Complex (the Complex) for public users of the Complex. In addition, loading and unloading areas for goods vehicles would also be provided at the Complex. FEHD would instruct and supervise the service contractors in carrying out day-to-day market management, such as deployment of dedicated staff to maintain the order of loading and unloading of goods, so as to ensure smooth operation of the market and avoid causing inconvenience to members of the public. As regards the specific timetable of the entire project, it could only be provided to Members after completion of technical feasibility studies and assessments. In closing, he said while taking forward the new market project, FEHD would continue to liaise closely with the relevant stakeholders, listen to their views and report the progress to SKDC in a timely manner.

104. The response from Ms Emily FOK, Senior Property Manager (Project Division)¹, GPA, regarding SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 65/20 was consolidated as follows:

- With due regard to the principle of “single site, multiple uses”, GPA recommended the Complex be constructed on the proposed site with a view to optimising the utilisation of limited land resources and providing more community and public services for meeting the needs of the residents in Tseung Kwan O.
- She noted Members’ comments on the proposed facilities to be provided in the Complex. GPA and the relevant departments would re-examine the priority of those proposed facilities or services.
- Building height restrictions had been imposed for the proposed site. GPA and the relevant government departments would take into account this factor and provide facilities or services in accordance with the needs of the local residents under the constraint of limited floor area.
- She would relay Members’ views on the design of the Complex to the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) for consideration.

105. Mr LAI Wai-tong was concerned whether the transport network in the vicinity could cope with the traffic flow and other problems which might arise from the transport of goods to and from the new market, including traffic noise and the loading and unloading of goods at the roadside. He enquired whether FEHD had consulted TD about the matter.

106. Mr LUI Man-kwong reiterated that the construction of a Joint-user Complex on the “G/IC(1)” site in Area 67 was not mentioned in SKDC(M) Paper No. 1/17, the document which had been submitted by the Immigration Department (ImmD) and GPA to SKDC in 2017. Residents were currently worried about ventilation issues that might arise. Furthermore, he requested FEHD to ensure the new market would not cause noise nuisance and hygiene problems, nor cause disturbances to residents after its completion. Besides, he hoped that FEHD would explain whether other locations in the district were not suitable for building the public market, such as the temporary open space beside Tong Ming Street Park.

107. Mr Francis CHAU hoped that SWD, the Department of Health and FEHD would provide the relevant facilities and services at the Complex as soon as possible. He also hoped that FEHD, GPA and ArchSD would carefully consider and study the design of the market to prevent noise problems arising from the loading and unloading of goods. Besides, he anticipated the provision of a footbridge connecting the Complex with buildings nearby to facilitate the use of public services by the public.

108. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan suggested designating certain locations at the market for the collection of recyclable materials. She also suggested providing relevant supporting facilities to facilitate recyclers to transfer such materials.

109. Mr LAI Ming-chak opined that more spaces should be reserved at the Complex or the number of basement floors should be increased for waste disposal or recycling as well as the loading and unloading of goods, thereby reducing the impact of market operation on the neighbourhood. Furthermore, he hoped that FEHD would take more stringent enforcement actions against wet markets or shops selling wet goods in the vicinity after the new market had commenced operation, with a view to improving environmental hygiene and providing an incentive for the relevant shop tenants or stall operators to consider moving into the new market. He also enquired whether FEHD would set out in the tenancy agreement that failure to comply with the rules or guidelines stipulated by FEHD or the service contractors would result in monetary penalties or immediate termination of the tenancy.

110. Mr LUK Ping-choi suggested parking spaces at the Complex be let to the public during non-office hours. He enquired the number of parking spaces to be provided at the Complex. Furthermore, he hoped that FEHD would provide Members with the layout plan of the market as soon as possible and expressed his wish that the design would take into account hygiene conditions as well as logistic and management needs.

111. Mr LAI Ming-chak suggested providing a footbridge connecting the Complex with the new government office building in Area 67, Tseung Kwan O so that members of the public or government employees could access other places via the footbridge at the new government office building.

112. Mr CHENG Chung-man suggested the parking spaces at the Complex be provided for public use during non-office hours. Furthermore, he hoped that the elements of “mechanical parking space” or “smart car park” would be incorporated into the car park.

113. Ms Debby CHAN hoped that the relevant departments would seek to understand the needs of other social welfare organisations in the district and examine the provision of social welfare facilities or services at the Complex. Furthermore, she suggested that in addition to introducing energy efficient devices in the design and infrastructure facilities of the Complex, a system should be installed to monitor electricity consumption so that better energy saving arrangements could be made in the future.

114. Mr Wilson NG of FEHD said he would relay Members’ views on the design of the market to ArchSD for consideration. After strategic assessments had been conducted, a more detailed design concept plan could be provided. Furthermore, the provision of storage facilities on the ground floor and at the two-storey basement of the proposed Complex had been considered. He would reflect Members’ views to the relevant departments for follow-up work and would report to SKDC when the detailed layout plan of the market was available.

115. Ms Emily FOK of GPA said in order to adhere to the “single site, multiple uses” initiative, which had been put forward by the Chief Executive in 2018-19, the Government had reviewed the sites reserved for “GIC” purposes, and had considered that portion of the site in Area 67, Tseung Kwan O, which had originally been reserved for the provision of civic centre, could be carved out and designated for the construction of the Complex, and LCSD had been duly consulted in this regard. This explained why the construction of the Complex on the site concerned was not mentioned in the paper which had been submitted by ImmD in

2017. Regarding Members' hope for the provision of a footbridge connecting the Complex with the MTR Tseung Kwan O Station, GPA would refer the relevant suggestion to TD and the Highways Department (HyD) for studying the feasibility of the suggestion. Furthermore, according to the approved Tseung Kwan O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TKO/26, building height restrictions had been imposed on the relevant site, and the height of the basement floors would also be counted towards the total building height. If the number of basement floors of the Complex was increased as suggested by the Member, the number of floor and the resultant floor areas for the proposed facilities would need to be reduced correspondingly. Besides, GPA would co-ordinate with TD in exploring feasible measures to increase the provision of parking spaces at the basement of the Complex, including the introduction of automated parking systems.

116. The Chairman invited the department representatives to reflect Members' views to other relevant departments for consideration and examination.

(E) Updated membership list of the Working Groups established under HPDC
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 28/20)

117. Members noted the updated membership list of the Working Group on the Rezoning of Green Belt Sites in Tseung Kwan O for Public Housing Developments.

118. There being no objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the above list was endorsed.

119. In view that the discussion of new items had taken a longer time than expected, the Chairman suggested and Members agreed that the meeting would be suspended for a lunch break and be resumed at 3:00 p.m.

(The meeting was resumed at 3:00 p.m.)

III. Matters Arising

(A) Request to resolve the access congestion at Kin Ming Estate and to install an elevator or escalator at the appropriate location
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 29/20)
(Paragraphs 81 to 83 of the minutes of the last meeting)

(The chairmanship of the meeting was temporarily passed to the Vice-Chairman)

120. Members noted the statistics on the flow of people submitted by the Housing Department (HD).

121. There was no other comment from Members.

(B) Request to install digital monitoring system ("sky eye") at Shin Ming Estate, Sheung Tak Estate and Kin Ming Estate
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 30/20 and 31/20)
(Paragraphs 84 to 96 of the minutes of the last meeting)

122. Members noted the situation report on objects dropped from height submitted by HD and the reply from the Hong Kong Police Force.

123. There was no other comment from Members.

(C) Situation Report on Itinerant Hawkers

Urge government departments to coordinate their efforts in solving the problem of itinerant hawkers in Tseung Kwan O

(SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 32/20)

(Paragraphs 97 to 100 of the minutes of the last meeting)

124. Members noted the situation report submitted by HD on illegal hawking in public housing estates in Tseung Kwan O.

125. There was no other comment from Members.

(D) Request for thorough inspection of fresh water pipes in public housing estates and carrying out regular replacement or comprehensive rehabilitation of fresh water pipes

(Paragraphs 101 to 111 of the minutes of the last meeting)

126. Mr CHENG Chung-man suggested retaining the matter for continued discussion in the next meeting.

127. The Vice-Chairman said the Chairman and he himself agreed that the matter should be retained.

(E) Request the Housing Department to assist District Council members and ensure that ward offices can be set up within the constituencies

(Paragraphs 112 to 141 of the minutes of the last meeting)

128. Mr Andrew CHAN said several SKDC Members were still unable to seek appropriate places within their constituencies for use as ward offices. He hoped that HD would continue to provide assistance and suggested retaining the matter.

129. Mr CHAN Wai-lit opined that a long-term review on HD's policy on the allocation of units to DC Members for use as ward offices should be conducted. He also suggested retaining the matter.

130. Mr William WONG, Property Service Manager/Service (Kowloon West and Sai Kung)5, HD, said HD would continue to pay attention to whether there were appropriate locations in various public housing estates in the district for leasing to SKDC Members for use as ward offices.

131. Mr FUNG Kwan-on said it had been two months since he had started renting HD's non-domestic unit in Po Lam Estate for use as ward office, but HD was still unable to provide wired telephone and broadband internet services for the unit. He hoped that HD would provide the necessary assistance as soon as possible.

132. Mr CHAN Wai-lit pointed out that as the major stakeholder of Choi Ming Court, HD should help him invite representatives of HD and The Incorporated Owners of Choi Ming Court (the Incorporated Owners) to discuss in detail his demand for renting the unit which had been leased to the former SKDC Member for use as ward office.

133. Mr William WONG of HD said he would contact staff of the relevant estate office to follow up the situation of the unit concerned in Po Lam Estate. Furthermore, HD had

conveyed Mr CHAN Wai-lit's demand to the Incorporated Owners and would continue to reflect the relevant situation at the next meeting of the Incorporated Owners.

134. Mr CHENG Chung-man suggested HD arrange a meeting with Members who were unable to set up ward offices within their constituencies to discuss the assistance that could be provided by HD.

135. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan requested HD to provide a list setting out the actions taken and the relevant outcomes concerning its assistance to SKDC Members in the establishment of ward offices within their constituencies.

136. Mr LAI Wai-tong enquired about the reasons why it was difficult for HD to arrange non-domestic units in Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) courts for use as ward offices of SKDC Members. He hoped that HD would study the feasibility of designating the non-domestic units in Yung Ming Court for use as ward offices by making reference to the leasing of units in Kwong Sui House, Kwong Ming Court to the then SKDC Members.

137. Mr LAI Ming-chak agreed that HD should arrange a meeting, inviting Mr CHAN Wai-lit and the Incorporated Owners for a tripartite discussion. Mr FUNG Kwan-on echoed his view.

138. Mr William WONG of HD said HD would arrange for Mr CHAN Wai-lit to meet with the Incorporated Owners as early as possible.

139. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan suggested HD provide written responses one by one to Members who required its assistance.

140. The Vice-Chairman asked HD to note the relevant views and declared that the matter was retained.

(F) Request the representatives of the Lands Department and Sunevision to attend the HPDC meeting to report and follow up on the improvement proposals endorsed on 15 January 2019 for the new data centre in Area 85
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 33/20 and 34/20)
(Paragraphs 142 to 152 of the minutes of the last meeting)

141. Members noted the replies from DLO/SK and SUNeVision Holdings Ltd. (SUNeVision).

142. Mr Chris CHEUNG requested HPDC to obtain the building plan of the new data centre by writing to SUNeVision once again as well as to follow up on the problems of mosquito infestation and accumulation of stagnant water at the construction site of the new data centre by writing to FEHD.

143. The Vice-Chairman asked the Secretariat to convey Members' views to SUNeVision and FEHD in writing. Regarding the problems of gas emission and noise nuisance arising from the existing data centre, there being standing representatives of EPD to attend meetings of the Environmental Hygiene, Climate Change, Agriculture and Fisheries Committee (EHCCAFC), the Vice-Chairman suggested and Members agreed to refer the above matter to EHCCAFC for follow-up work.

(G) Request the Housing Department to solve the problem of rust stains on newly installed laundry rods in housing estates in the district
(Paragraphs 153 to 164 of the minutes of the last meeting)

144. Mr CHAN Wai-lit requested HD to disclose all information on the quality of the new laundry rods, including an inspection certificate concerning the quality of the laundry rods and the name of the inspection body.

145. Ms Valerie WONG said although some residents of Hau Tak Estate had earlier reflected their wish for the installation of new laundry rods to HD, the contractor had not yet carried out installation works for them. She requested HD to explain and properly solve the problem.

146. Mr CHENG Chung-man said HD had all along insisted that rust stains on the new laundry rods were dirty marks but had failed to provide a certificate concerning the quality of the laundry rods, rendering its claim unconvincing.

147. Mr LEE Ka-yui said although the new laundry rods were reportedly made of 304 stainless steel, which was what cooking utensils were made from, rust stains had appeared on the laundry rods. He opined that HD should provide clarification as soon as possible to ease residents' concerns and avoid doubts about corner-cutting or corrupt practice.

148. Mr William WONG of HD said HD had all along been monitoring and testing the quality of the construction materials. If individual Members had doubts about the laundry rods, he suggested the Secretariat collect the questions, and HD would later provide information to the Members concerned.

149. The Chairman asked HD to contact the Members concerned and reply to their questions directly. The Members included Mr CHAN Wai-lit, Ms Valerie WONG, Messrs CHENG Chung-man and LEE Ka-yui.

150. Mr William WONG of HD said staff of the estate office concerned would contact Ms Valerie WONG directly after the meeting to follow up the relevant situation.

151. The Vice-Chairman suggested and Members agreed to retain the relevant matter.

(H) Urge the Planning Department to impose restrictions on rural development of Sai Kung and reserve the site at Heung Chung for social welfare purposes to ensure protection of landscape and ecological features in Sai Kung rural areas
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 35/20, 36/20 and 37/20)
(Paragraphs 182 to 201 of the minutes of the last meeting)

152. Members noted the replies from TD, PlanD and SWD.

153. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan had the following views and enquiries: (a) she opined that the approach adopted by PlanD in presenting the data was unclear; (b) she enquired whether PlanD had included the estimated population involved in planning application no. A/SK-HC/317 into the Hebe Haven Outline Zoning Plan; and (c) she pointed out that PlanD had not directly answered how it would ensure the protection of landscape and ecological features in Sai Kung rural areas.

154. Mr LAI Ming-chak opined that PlanD should actively urge the relevant departments to proceed with the development for land with planned uses, with a view to narrowing the time gap between land use planning and the actual development. Furthermore, he pointed out that SWD had not stated in its written response whether the social welfare facilities in Sai Kung rural areas were able to address residents' needs. He enquired whether SWD had plans to purchase premises in Sai Kung rural areas for social welfare purposes.

155. The response from Ms Donna TAM of PlanD was consolidated as follows:

- PlanD would generally assess the provision of community facilities based on OZPs or District Council constituency boundaries. Besides, various departments would consider the appropriate time for developing the relevant facilities by taking into account their policies, priorities and other factors.
- The population in the rezoned site at Heung Chung on the Hebe Haven OZP had been included in the tables provided.
- Before the formulation of land uses and OZPs, PlanD would assess different planning proposals taking into account planning considerations, in particular those for rural areas or places with natural scenery, and would consult relevant government departments on the appropriateness of the proposed land use or development. PlanD would incorporate relevant departments' comments and requirements in respect of the environment or land use into the OZPs, including long-term planning intentions, planning intentions of various land use zones, planning enforcement, etc.

156. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan opined that PlanD was unable to provide the information she had requested. She hoped that PlanD would resubmit the relevant documents according to her requests so as to reflect the actual situation of social welfare facilities.

157. Ms Donna TAM of PlanD said the tables on the provision of "GIC" facilities and open spaces in Sai Kung district and in the Approved Tseung Kwan O OZP No. S/TKO/26 mainly gave information on the planned population size, current and planned provision of open spaces and major community facilities within the district or areas covered by the OZP. If Members requested information concerning a specific area, she could refer the request to the relevant departments for follow-up work.

158. There being no objection from Members, the Vice-Chairman declared that the relevant matter was retained.

IV. Motions Raised by Members

(A) The 6 motions raised by Members

- (1) Request the Housing Department (HD) to enhance participation in estate management matters and retrieve management information from relevant property management companies for reporting to the District Council regularly (SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 38/20 and 49/20)

159. The Vice-Chairman said the motion was moved by Mr CHAN Wai-lit and seconded by Messrs CHEUNG Wai-chiu, FUNG Kwan-on and he himself.

160. Members noted the reply from HD.

161. Mr CHAN Wai-lit would like to understand HD's authority and functions in Po Lam Estate, King Lam Estate, Tsui Lam Estate and Choi Ming Court. Choi Ming Court was a housing estate comprised both PRH and HOS blocks, among which four were owned by HD. As the flat owner, HD should learn of the management information of the housing estates to understand whether the tenants had misconducted themselves and follow up on the matter. He could not comprehend why HD could only disclose the relevant management information with the consent of the property management companies (PMCs). He opined that HD failed to perform the role expected of it, including actively co-ordinating between SKDC Members and the owners' corporations (OCs) as well as following up management issues of the housing estates. He suggested inviting the chairmen of all OCs to HPDC meetings for discussion on estate management matters.

162. The Vice-Chairman opined that the representatives of OCs could be invited to attend the meetings of the Working Group on Building Management for detailed discussion on management matters of the housing estates concerned.

163. Mr FUNG Kwan-on hoped to clarify HD's powers and responsibilities in managing the relevant housing estates. He pointed out that HD had not tried its best to relay the views of tenants or SKDC Members to the PMCs or OCs concerned, nor had it endeavoured to report to SKDC Members. He opined that instead of simply reflecting tenants' views on estate management to OCs, HD should proactively handle and follow up on the relevant management matters. If HD failed to discharge its duties, he hoped to invite the representatives of OCs to the meeting so as to convey Members' views.

164. Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu hoped that HD representatives attending the meetings of OCs or owners' committees would take its responsibility to speak up for the tenants and to strengthen the monitoring of PMCs.

165. The Chairman supplemented that the Vice-Chairman's suggestion of inviting the chairmen of OCs to attend meetings of the Working Group on Building Management would allow more time for Members and OC representatives to discuss the management matters of various housing estates.

166. Mr CHEUNG Wai-chiu said the suggestion was impractical. Since members of OCs participated in estate management matters on a voluntary basis, he did not expect the OC representatives would attend the meetings. Besides, he opined that after attending OC meetings, HD representatives should report to Members on the follow-up on estate management matters.

167. The Vice-Chairman said as the representative of PRH tenants and owner of a large number of shares, HD should participate in estate management matters more proactively.

168. Mr William WONG of HD said HD would further relay tenants' views on estate management to the OCs at the relevant meetings and had already reflected Members' request to retrieve management information to the PMCs.

169. Mr Frankie LAM declared that he was the chairman of one of the OCs. He continued that in general, OCs did not want political parties to intervene in estate management matters. He suggested the tenants authorise SKDC Members to attend the meetings of OCs on their behalf, so that SKDC Members could directly reflect their views to the OCs. Meanwhile, SKDC Members could directly account to the tenants seeking assistance.

170. Mr William WONG of HD said HD representatives would proactively co-ordinate with the OCs and follow up on tenants' views.

171. There being no amendment or objection from Members, the Vice-Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

(2) Request HD to install fresh air supply fans at appropriate locations at the escalators in Kin Ming Estate
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 39/20 and 50/20)

172. The Vice-Chairman said the motion was moved by the Chairman and seconded by Messrs Gary FAN, CHUNG Kam-lun, Frankie LAM, LUI Man-kwong, LAI Ming-chak, LAI Wai-tong, FUNG Kwan-on and CHUN Hoi-shing.

173. Members noted the reply from HD.

174. The Vice-Chairman opined that the installation of fans could not improve air ventilation.

175. Mr William WONG of HD said HD was conducting feasibility study on the installation of fresh air supply fans at appropriate locations at the escalators in Kin Ming Estate. Since it took time to conduct the study and install fresh air supply fans, HD suggested first installing fans at appropriate locations. Meanwhile, locations of the existing fans would be adjusted, and the frequency of cleaning the fans would also be increased, thereby improving air ventilation.

176. The Vice-Chairman suggested HD provide data on the rate of air change at the locations concerned so that Members could know whether the air ventilation at the locations was adequate.

177. Mr William WONG of HD said HD would consider submitting the relevant data.

178. There being no amendment or objection from Members, the Vice-Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

(3) Request the Hong Kong Housing Society to suspend increases in the management fee and basic service charges of Jolly Place, to review and enhance the adjustment mechanism of various charges as well as to waive charges and provide fee concessions for tenants in view of the recent epidemic
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 40/20 and 51/20)

179. The Vice-Chairman said the motion was moved by Mr Andrew CHAN and seconded by Mr CHENG Chung-man and Ms Valerie WONG.

180. Members noted the reply from the Hong Kong Housing Society.

181. There was no other comment from Members.

182. There being no amendment or objection from Members, the Vice-Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

- (4) Request HD and Link to improve slip resistance of floor tiles and slabs at the covered walkways in Sheung Tak Estate
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 41/20, 53/20 and 54/20)
183. The Vice-Chairman said the motion was moved by Mr LEE Ka-yui and seconded by Messrs LUK Ping-choi and TSE Ching-fung.
184. Members noted the replies from HD and Link Asset Management Limited (Link).
185. There was no other comment from Members.
186. There being no amendment or objection from Members, the Vice-Chairman declared that the motion was carried.
- (5) Request HD to tackle the problems of insufficient water pressure in flats on upper floors and noise caused by pump rooms in Hau Tak Estate, Sheung Tak Estate and Ming Tak Estate
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 42/20, 57/20 and 58/20)
187. The Vice-Chairman said the motion was moved by Ms Valerie WONG and seconded by Messrs CHENG Chung-man and LEE Ka-yui.
188. Members noted the replies from HD and EPD.
189. Ms Valerie WONG said insufficient water pressure in flats on the upper floors of Hau Tak Estate had been a long-standing problem. Recently, salt water supply to one of the buildings in Hau Tak Estate had been temporarily suspended. She opined that ageing of water pipes was very common in Hau Tak Estate. Besides, she believed that the noise generated from pump rooms was due to the ageing of components and hoped that HD would follow up on the matter.
190. Mr CHENG Chung-man said inadequacies in the design of some public housing estates might have resulted in the problem of insufficient water pressure. If the problem regarding water pressure which had occurred in Ming Tak Estate, Hau Tak Estate and Sheung Tak Estate were individual cases, he asked HD to enhance repair and maintenance services.
191. Mr William WONG of HD said HD attached great importance to water pressure, salt water supply and the quality of fresh water. HD would also continue to conduct weekly inspections on the relevant components in the pump rooms. If any problems were identified in the components, corresponding repair or improvement works would be carried out immediately.
192. The Vice-Chairman enquired whether the problem of insufficient water pressure would affect the quality of fresh water.
193. Mr LEE Ka-yui enquired the reasons for frequent suspension of water supply to Sheung Tak Estate in recent days.
194. The Chairman said some households on the middle floors of Kin Ming Estate had also encountered the problem of insufficient water pressure which might be caused by the ageing of valves or pressure reducing valves. He hoped that HD would proactively inspect the aged public housing estates in the district and carry out inspection and repair for the

relevant fresh water supply systems as soon as possible to prevent the recurrence of similar situations.

195. Mr William WONG of HD said HD would step up efforts to carry out repair and maintenance works as well as inspections in various housing estates. Furthermore, he pointed out that temporary suspension of fresh water supply could be attributed to a whole host of factors. Apart from the ageing of pressure reducing valves or other components, in-flat maintenance works or water suspension might also affect the water pressure.

196. There being no amendment or objection from Members, the Vice-Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

(6) Request the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department to strengthen monitoring of lift contractors of housing estates in Hang Hau, Sai Kung and Tseung Kwan O and improve the control mechanism of lift maintenance (SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 43/20 and 55/20)

197. The Vice-Chairman said the motion was moved by Mr CHENG Chung-man and seconded by Messrs Andrew CHAN, LUK Ping-choi, Ryan LEE and LEE Ka-yui.

198. The Vice-chairman welcomed Mr William AU, Senior Engineer/General Legislation 3, Electrical & Mechanical Services Department (EMSD), to the meeting.

199. Members noted the reply from EMSD.

200. Mr CHENG Chung-man had the following views and enquiries: (a) some residents had reflected to him that a lift falling incident had recently occurred at Wo Ming Court. He enquired whether the lift contractor concerned had reported the incident to EMSD; (b) he hoped that EMSD would provide information about the lift failures occurred at Wo Ming Court or the number of complaints against the lift contractor for Members' reference; (c) he heard that many contractors would turn off the safety switches of the lifts while carrying out repair and maintenance works, so that the lifts could still operate even if their components had not been replaced. He enquired whether EMSD had identified this situation during the inspections and about the follow-up measures taken by EMSD.

201. Mr CHUNG Kam-lun opined that the limited choice of lift maintenance service providers resulted in inadequate competition in the market. He hoped that EMSD would, besides carrying out inspections, also step up efforts in educating owners or OCs how to determine whether the operation of a lift was normal, how to manage or monitor the performance of lift contractors, etc.

202. Ms Valerie WONG criticised that the replacement of an entire lift was not included in the Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme. Furthermore, she opined that the guidelines on the scheme provided by the Government to OCs or management offices were inadequate. She therefore asked the Government to provide sufficient support for OCs or management companies.

203. The response from Mr William AU of EMSD was consolidated as follows:

- EMSD had conducted inspections at Wo Ming Court to follow up on the complaints about the relevant lift incident in December 2019 and March 2020.
- After learning of the occurrence of any of the lift incidents specified in Schedule 7 to the Lifts and Escalators Ordinance (Cap. 618), the responsible person for the

lift (RP) should report the incident to the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services within 24 hours. At present, quite a number of OCs had handed over the responsibility for reporting lift incidents to the contractors. According to past records, lifts installed in the buildings in Sai Kung district had not been involved in any severe incidents. In case members of the public noticed any lift failures or problems, they should immediately notify the caretaker so that the caretaker could suspend the operation of the lift and arrange for the contractor to examine the lift as soon as possible. If they had any doubts, they could call 1823 or relay their views to EMSD through different channels.

- Any person who wilfully disturbed or caused malfunction to the safety devices of a lift and led to unsafe operation of the lift may have already committed an offence and be held criminally responsible. Members with information in relation to the suspected cases were invited to provide such information to EMSD after the meeting for follow-up work.
- Along with the advancement in Internet technology and popularisation of online platforms, it was now easier for RPs to obtain information on lift technology. Some contractors could purchase components for different models of lifts through online platforms and obtain type approval for those components from EMSD. In the “Responsible Persons’ Corner” on the official website of EMSD, a lot of information on lifts and escalators was provided, including daily management of lifts, contractors’ performance rating, lift maintenance price figures, sample contracts for maintenance services, etc., to facilitate RPs to properly manage the daily operation of lifts and escalators and help raise the awareness of the public on lift and escalator safety. Besides organising community talks on lift maintenance each year, EMSD would also distribute promotional cards to RPs from time to time and understand their satisfaction level of lift contractors as well as their understanding of the Lifts and Escalators Ordinance during its daily inspections, thereby strengthening communication between the two sides. Besides, members of the public could call EMSD directly for enquiries or assistance.
- The funding scope of the Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme covered lifts which were not equipped with any or some of the “necessary safety devices” (e.g. unintended car movement protection device, double brake system, ascending car overspeed protection device, etc.). Furthermore, building owners or OCs could decide whether to appoint their own consultants or to use the free consultancy services provided by the Urban Renewal Authority. The consultant would provide reports for the reference of owners or OCs, enabling them to decide on their own whether to retrofit the existing lifts with “necessary safety devices” or to replace the entire lifts. If necessary, owners or OCs could seek advice from EMSD.

204. Mr FUNG Kwan-on reflected that abnormalities of the lifts in Po Lam Estate had often be detected and opined that the lifts had showed signs of ageing. He suspected that the maintenance contractor had only removed the defective parts instead of replacing them. Therefore, he requested EMSD to inspect the lifts in each block of Po Lam Estate and submit the inspection reports to HPDC.

205. Mr CHENG Chung-man enquired whether EMSD had a system of sanctions to enhance management and supervision of the performance of registered lift contractors.

206. Mr LAI Wai-tong hoped that EMSD would enhance the regulatory system for contractors and assist in handling the repair and maintenance of lifts in housing estates.

207. The Vice-Chairman said he had also observed in person the abnormalities of the lifts in Po Lam Estate. Therefore, he hoped that EMSD would note and follow up on the relevant situation.

208. The response from Mr William AU of EMSD was consolidated as follows:

- Information on the inspections and law enforcement actions carried out in Po Lam Estate could be provided for Members' reference after the meeting.
[Post-meeting note from EMSD: Large-scale inspections had been conducted in Po Lam Estate on 11, 15 and 16 June 2020. Based on the inspection results, an advisory letter had been issued to the relevant RP, requesting the RP to monitor the contractor's follow-up on the improvement measures. EMSD would pay close attention to the quality of the maintenance works and the progress of the improvement measures.]
- EMSD, as the law enforcement agency of the Lifts and Escalators Ordinance (Cap. 618), would not issue inspection report to the relevant RP every time after an inspection had been completed. If EMSD staff spotted any areas requiring improvements, an advisory letter would be issued to the relevant RP, requesting the RP to supervise the maintenance contractor to complete improvement works in respect of the safety of lifts/escalators within a specified period, and a copy of the letter would be sent to the contractor. If the conditions of the lifts had not been improved, EMSD would consider issuing advisory letters, warning letters, examination orders, improvement orders or use restriction orders, etc. in light of the actual circumstances.
- If EMSD discovered any irregularities of contractors or RPs, in addition to issuing warning letters, it would consider exercising more stringent actions depending on the severity of the irregularities, including the institution of criminal prosecutions and disciplinary proceedings against the registered persons concerned.
- Regarding the "abnormalities" of lifts as mentioned by some Members, the abnormalities could generally be attributed to the insensitivity of the sensing systems of the carriers and cars, which resulted in the activation of the safety systems. The abnormalities were related to the daily usage of the lifts and tuning carried out by maintenance staff, and had nothing to do with safety issues.
- With the availability of new resources, EMSD had set up an additional enforcement team particularly for inspecting and monitoring the quality of maintenance works and special maintenance works for aged lifts. Meanwhile, feasibility studies on mandatory lift modernisation works had been commenced.

209. There being no amendment or objection from Members, the Vice-Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

(B) The 5 questions raised by Members

- (1) Planning and protection of Country Park Enclaves
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 44/20 and 56/20)

210. The Vice-Chairman said the above matter had been discussed together with another motion earlier on.

(Note: Please refer to paragraphs 80 to 100.)

- (2) Planning standards for social welfare facilities in Sai Kung rural areas (SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 45/20, 59/20 and 60/20)
211. The Vice-Chairman said the question was raised by Ms Debby CHAN.
212. Members noted the replies from SWD and PlanD.
213. Ms Debby CHAN said a lot of rural OZPs was formulated many years ago. She asked PlanD whether the OZPs of Sai Kung rural areas tallied with the latest figures and circumstances. Furthermore, she asked SWD whether the social welfare facilities in Sai Kung rural areas could satisfy residents' needs.
214. Regarding PlanD's written response (SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 60/20), Ms LEUNG Hin-yan enquired about the areas indicated by "Sai Kung district" and the actual percentage indicated by "generally". Furthermore, she opined that PlanD had not specially designated any social welfare facilities for Sai Kung rural residents in the rural areas, which did not only bring inconvenience to rural residents, but also hinder their family members or caretakers from providing the assistance needed. Therefore, she requested SWD to examine the demand for social welfare facilities and services in Tseung Kwan O and Sai Kung rural areas separately. Besides, she hoped that HAB would reply whether the provision of arts venues in Sai Kung rural areas were adequate or met the requirements set out in HKPSG.
215. The response from Ms Donna TAM of PlanD was consolidated as follows:
- PlanD could provide the information on the population figures and provision of community facilities according to planning scheme area of rural OZPs. If Members requested for the relevant information, PlanD could follow up on the matter.
 - "Sai Kung district" referred to the constituency areas under the purview of SKDC. Population estimates were projected based on the demarcation of DC constituency areas, and relevant information were generally provided to the public on this basis.
 - In addition to following the guidelines set out in HKPSG, the relevant departments would also take forward the development of the relevant facilities by taking into account the policies of respective departments, use and allocation of resources, etc.
216. Ms Debby CHAN hoped that PlanD would provide the updated information on Sai Kung rural areas based on the rural OZPs.
217. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan said PlanD was welcome to enquire the Member who raised the question if they did not understand the content of the paper. Meanwhile, she hoped that PlanD would provide a table showing the provision of "GIC" facilities and open spaces based on the areas covered by the rural OZPs of Sai Kung district. Furthermore, she enquired once again the exact meaning of "generally" mentioned in PlanD's written response.
218. Mr Francis CHAU pointed out that SWD was the government department responsible for implementing policies on social welfare facilities at the final stage. He also opined that the matter being discussed by HPDC at the moment might overlap with the work of another committee. Besides, he hoped that SWD would give an account of the progress of the "Pak Sha Wan Elderly Hostel" Development Project and the development project in Hong Chung as soon as possible.

219. The Vice-Chairman suggested and Members agreed that the matter should be retained and decision on whether to refer the matter to the Education, Health and Social Welfare Committee (EHSWC) for follow-up work should be made at the next meeting.

220. Mr LAI Ming-chak suggested holding a joint meeting of HPDC and EHSWC for discussion of the captioned matter.

221. Mr CHUNG Kam-lun suggested the Member who had raised the question submit the relevant papers to EHSWC to facilitate discussion between Members and the SWD representatives in attendance at the meeting. Furthermore, he suggested SWD and non-profit-making organisations provide social welfare services to meet the needs of rural residents by organising outreach programmes and applying for DC funds respectively.

222. The Vice-Chairman declared that the matter was retained and asked the Secretariat to convey Members' views to SWD in writing.

223. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to enquire whether the arts venues in Sai Kung rural areas were able to cope with community needs by writing to HAB.

(3) Extension of fibre-based networks to villages in remote areas
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 46/20, 61/20 and 62/20)

224. The Vice-Chairman said the question was raised by Ms Debby CHAN.

225. Members noted the replies from the Office of the Communications Authority (OFCA) and SKDO.

226. Ms Debby CHAN enquired how OFCA would assist residents of villages which were not included in the Subsidy Scheme to Extend Fibre-based Networks to Villages in Remote Areas (the subsidy scheme). Furthermore, although some villages were covered by fibre-based networks, the speed of broadband services enjoyed by different residents differed significantly. She enquired how OFCA would provide assistance in this regard.

227. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan suggested inviting the representatives of OFCA to the meeting to discuss the matter and further explain the progress and content of the subsidy scheme.

228. Mr CHENG Chung-man opined that the Government had not paid attention to the needs of rural residents for broadband services. The Government had also led to the monopolisation of broadband services by a single telecommunications service provider, which was not conducive to the provision of affordable and better quality services to residents. He also requested the representatives of OFCA to attend the next meeting for giving a detailed explanation.

229. Mr Ryan LEE said rural residents should be entitled to enjoy fibre-based broadband services. However, OFCA had always given different reasons for not extending fibre-based networks to remote areas, which he considered to be an unsatisfactory situation. He also requested the representatives of OFCA to attend the next meeting to respond to Members' enquiries.

230. Mr YU Tsun-ning also requested OFCA to attend the next meeting and explain how it would provide incentives to introduce competition to the market so as to provide more affordable broadband services to rural residents.

231. The Vice-Chairman asked the Secretariat to invite OFCA to attend the next HPDC meeting in writing.

(4) Enquiry about whether the Planning Department has considered the needs of boat dwellers in the future planning of Sai Kung Town (SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 47/20 and 52/20)

232. The Vice-Chairman said the question was raised by Ms LEUNG Hin-yan.

233. Members noted the reply from PlanD.

234. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan had the following views: (a) PlanD had not directly responded to whether boat dwellers had been included in the “future” planning of Sai Kung Town; (b) PlanD had no concrete plans and measures to support the daily lives of boat dwellers and to enable them to maintain their way of life; (c) she requested PlanD to specify what “planned facilities”, as mentioned in its written response, referred to; and (d) she suggested writing to the Census and Statistics Department (C&SD), enquiring whether the boat dwellers residing in Sai Kung district had been covered by the 2016 Population By-census. If yes, she hoped that C&SD would indicate the sea areas covered by the by-census as well as respond to whether the relevant population figures had been included in that of Q03 constituency area.

235. Ms Donna TAM of PlanD said PlanD had mentioned in its reply that according to the 2016 Population By-census, the number of boat dwellers in Hong Kong was approximately 1200, and information on the distribution of boat dwellers by district was not available. On the provision of facilities based on the population figures, even if all 1200 boat dwellers had been included in any one of the districts, the number of boat dwellers would still be insufficient to impact on the provision of the relevant facilities. Nevertheless, apart from examining the relevant population figures and distribution, various departments would also take into account their respective policies, resources, priorities and other factors in planning the needed district facilities and development progress of such facilities.

236. Ms Debby CHAN opined that when planning the land use and development for Sai Kung Town, PlanD should consider the needs of boat dwellers and provide the basic living facilities they needed, such as berthing, refuse collection and sewage facilities.

237. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan enquired whether PlanD was responsible for the planning for Sai Kung waters. She opined that PlanD should understand the lifestyle of boat dwellers and obtain the exact figures of boat dwellers residing in each district, with a view to examining the types and amounts of resources they needed.

238. Mr CHENG Chung-man opined that unavailability of the statistics on boat dwellers by district revealed the Government’s complete disregard for their needs. He requested the Government to provide suitable ancillary facilities for boat dwellers.

239. Mr LAI Ming-chak said despite the relatively small marine population, the provision of additional facilities might still be required if the boat dwellers and the population of Sai Kung district were considered as a whole. Therefore, he hoped that PlanD would take into account the population figures of boat dwellers in the district when formulating OZPs.

240. Ms Donna TAM of PlanD stressed that PlanD was responsible for land use planning. If population increase was detected in the course of land use planning, PlanD would invite the

relevant departments to examine the provision of and planning for community facilities. In response to some Members' views on the provision of facilities needed by boat dwellers, such as sewage, refuse collection or embarking and disembarking facilities, she said it was not within the purview of PlanD. If Members considered there was a lack of the relevant facilities in Sai Kung district, they could reflect their views to the relevant departments.

241. Ms Debby CHAN enquired whether boat dwellers were eligible to register as electors.

242. Mr Frankie LAM pointed out that it was difficult to determine the major residing areas of boat dwellers.

243. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan asked SKDO about the relevant departments involved in the planning for boat dwellers.

244. Miss Joey WONG of SKDO said the relevant information was not available at the moment, but she believed that the Registration and Electoral Office (REO) would allocate constituencies to boat dwellers according to the principal residential address provided.

245. The Vice-Chairman asked the Secretariat to convey Members' views to C&SD and REO in writing.

(5) Enquiry about the development plans of various departments for Sai Kung town centre and implementation progress of the Sai Kung Town Outline Zoning Plan (SKDC(HPDC) Paper Nos. 48/20, 63/20 and 64/20)

246. The Vice-Chairman said the question was raised by Ms LEUNG Hin-yan.

247. Members noted the joint reply from PlanD and DLO/SK and the reply from LCSD.

248. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan asked TD about the construction progress of the public car park in Sai Kung town centre. Furthermore, she requested PlanD to clarify which departments were responsible for sites which had not yet been developed according to their planned land uses. She also asked DLO/SK and PlanD to submit a written response to HPDC after the meeting, listing the progress of development projects in different land use zones covered by the OZP.

249. Ms Jenny POON, Senior Estate Surveyor/SK, DLO/SK, said as land boundaries were not specified in the question, the joint reply had earlier given a general overview in responding to the question. If the Member requested information on the development progress of all land planned for specific uses and the implementation timetables of the relevant facilities, she believed that DLO/SK did not possess such information. She suggested the Member clearly indicate a particular piece of land to facilitate DLO/SK to provide the information on its development progress.

250. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan said if DLO/SK did not understand which area she was referring to, DLO/SK could make reference to the relevant planning data of each piece of land provided on the Statutory Planning Portal website or as shown in the Sai Kung Town Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-SKT/6 before responding to her enquiry. She reiterated her requests for a list of the land allocated to each department for development, implementation timetables of the relevant departments, and responses from the departments on how to carry out the planned land use set out in the OZP as soon as practicable.

251. Ms Donna TAM of PlanD said PlanD would make its best effort to provide detailed information about sites designated for public purpose or “GIC” purpose in the Sai Kung Town Outline Zoning Plan, including a list of the specific planned uses of the sites concerned and the departments responsible for taking forward the development projects and formulating the implementation timetables, if any. Regarding land lots which had to be developed by private land owners or developers, e.g. sites which had been zoned for residential use, the owners would, having regard to their own needs, take forward development projects on the land lots according to the planning intentions stipulated in the Sai Kung Town Outline Zoning Plan.

252. Ms Jenny POON of DLO/SK said DLO/SK would work together with PlanD to consider the ways of providing the relevant information for Members’ reference. Furthermore, as mentioned by the representative of PlanD, although some private land lots had been planned for specific uses, DLO/SK would not know the development proposal of the owners or developers. Therefore, DLO/SK was not able to provide the implementation timetables for the land lots concerned.

253. Mr Francis CHAU hoped that PlanD and DLO/SK would list in detail the development status of the relevant public facilities on land lots zoned for “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) and “Other Specified Uses” in Sai Kung Town, in addition to that of “GIC” sites, for an early review of the overall planning and development for Sai Kung Town.

254. Ms Debby CHAN opined that the relevant departments should provide implementation timetables of the development projects in Sai Kung Town, look into the reasons for the slow progress in developing the sites or the failure to commence the projects, so as to review whether TPB’s initial proposal for developing Sai Kung Town into a “tourism gateway” was still appropriate.

255. In response to the Member’s request for PlanD or DLO/SK to provide the implementation timetables of the public facilities on the lots zoned for “CDA” and “Other Specified Uses”, Ms Donna TAM of PlanD stressed that many of the land lots concerned were involved in private development projects, for example, most areas of the “CDA” site in the northern part of Sai Kung Town were privately owned, and the developer concerned had proactively submitted Master Layout Plan (MLP) for TPB’s consideration. Since the developers might be required to provide specific public facilities on the sites, e.g. public car park, TPB would examine the planning applications submitted by the developers and consider whether they could meet the requirements of the relevant departments before approving the applications. Besides, when vetting the planning applications for the “CDA” site in the northern part of Sai Kung Town, the relevant departments had identified different technical problems, which had to be addressed by the developer. Therefore, the relevant MLP had not yet been approved by TPB. PlanD would continue to follow up on the matter. She hoped that the developer would formulate a more comprehensive development proposal, thus achieving the relevant planning intentions.

256. The Vice-Chairman asked PlanD and DLO/SK to work together in providing the information on the development progress of public facilities on the land lots covered by the Sai Kung Town Outline Zoning Plan after the meeting.

V. Any Other Business

- (A) Raise objection in writing to the Environmental Protection Department to the development of Tai Sheung Tok Transfer Station, express views on the environmental problems covered by the Technical Memorandum on Environmental Impact Assessment Process and request departments concerned to submit reports on the project
(SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 68/20)

(The chairmanship of the meeting was passed back to the Chairman)

257. Ms Leung Hin-yan moved an extempore motion, the wording of which was “Raise objection in writing to the Environmental Protection Department to the development of Tai Sheung Tok Transfer Station, express views on the environmental problems covered by the Technical Memorandum on Environmental Impact Assessment Process and request departments concerned to submit reports on the project.” The motion was seconded by Ms Debby CHAN, Messrs CHENG Chung-man, Ryan LEE, LAI Wai-tong and Kenneth YIP.

258. In accordance with Order 13(2) of SKDC Standing Orders, the Chairman invited Members to vote on whether the above extempore motion should be included in the agenda of the meeting. With the agreement of over half of the Members present at the meeting, the Chairman declared that the extempore motion was included in the agenda.

259. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan opined that the vehicular flows arising from the development would bring about catastrophic impact on Sai Kung district, particularly on New Clear Water Bay Road, Tseung Kwan O and LOHAS Park. Therefore, she hoped that objection to the relevant development would be raised by writing to EPD and other relevant departments under the name of HPDC.

260. Mr LAI Wai-tong expressed support for the extempore motion. He was concerned that the construction of a refuse transfer station (RTS) at Tai Sheung Tok would result in an increasing number of heavy vehicles for carrying waste travelling along Clear Water Bay Road, Ying Yip Road, Hang Hau Road, On Sau Road and Po Lam Road North, thus aggravating the traffic load of Tseung Kwan O. He therefore suggested that the Government should examine in detail the traffic impact of the proposal on Tseung Kwan O.

261. Mr CHUNG Kam-lun opined that no projects in relation to cavern development should be supported unless a definite timetable for the closure of the fill bank at Area 137 was available. Furthermore, he requested the relevant government departments to submit more detailed information to explain the routing for the transportation of waste, ways of handling waste, impact on the surrounding area, etc.

262. Mr Francis CHAU pointed out that the project would affect most of the traffic networks in Tseung Kwan O. He asked the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and relevant departments to provide a detailed analysis of the impact of the RTS’s operation on the entire Sai Kung district in the consultancy reports.

263. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan reminded Members that the deadline for submission of views to EPD was 26 May 2020. Besides, she had the following concerns: (a) how EPD would carry out environmental impact assessment (EIA) before the transportation routes had been formulated; (b) since the estimated number of vehicles for transporting waste was extremely large, Clear Water Bay Road, at which the RTS portals would be designated, might be unable to bear the vehicular flows; (c) overnight storage of waste at the RTS might cause odour nuisance or hygiene problems to nearby residents; (d) how the Government would ensure the

green areas nearby would not be contaminated by the wastewater generated from the RTS; and (e) the scope of EIA studies conducted by EPD was not comprehensive enough.

264. Mr CHENG Chung-man opined that in addition to the dropping of waste during transportation, vehicles for transporting waste would also affect the quality of road surfaces and increase the burden on the relevant roads. Therefore, the project should not be implemented in a hasty manner.

265. The Chairman supplemented that the paper mentioned by the Member was not a discussion paper for the meeting but a paper submitted by EPD to Members through SKDC Secretariat. The document title was “Project Profile under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap. 499) for public inspection – Development of Tai Sheung Tok Transfer Station” (translation).

266. There being no amendment or objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the motion was carried. Given that various government departments were involved in the matter, the Chairman suggested and Members agreed that the matter would be referred to the full council of SKDC for follow-up work. If Members had any comment, they could reflect their views to EPD through the existing channels.

(B) Request various departments to give a breakdown of data and statistics of Tseung Kwan O and the rural areas of Sai Kung (within Q01 to Q05 constituency areas) in the papers to be submitted and to formulate and adopt different policies in planning the development of the areas so as to address different needs in the district (SKDC(HPDC) Paper No. 69/20)

267. Ms LEUNG Hin-yan moved another extempore motion, the wording of which was “Request various departments to give a breakdown of data and statistics of Tseung Kwan O and the rural areas of Sai Kung (within Q01 to Q05 constituency areas) in the papers to be submitted and to formulate and adopt different policies in planning the development of the areas so as to address different needs in the district”. The motion was seconded by Messrs CHAN Wai-lit, Kenneth YIP, Ryan LEE, CHENG Chung-man, YU Tsun-ning, Ms Debby CHAN, Messrs LEE Ka-yui, LAI Wai-tong and LUI Man-kwong.

268. In accordance with Order 13(2) of SKDC Standing Orders, the Chairman invited Members to vote on whether the above extempore motion should be included in the agenda of the meeting. With the agreement of over half of the Members present at the meeting, the Chairman declared that the extempore motion was included in the agenda.

269. There being no amendment or objection from Members, the Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

VI. Date of Next Meeting

270. The Chairman declared that the next meeting of HPDC would be held on 21 July 2020 (Tuesday) at 9:30 a.m. The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Sai Kung District Council Secretariat
June 2020