

Sha Tin District Council
Minutes of the 4th Meeting of
the Development and Housing Committee in 2018

Date : 5 July 2018 (Thursday)
Time : 2:30 pm
Venue : Sha Tin District Council Conference Room
 4/F, Sha Tin Government Offices

<u>Present</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Time of joining the meeting</u>	<u>Time of leaving the meeting</u>
Ms PONG Scarlett Oi-lan, BBS, JP (Chairman)	DC Member	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr SIU Hin-hong (Vice-Chairman)	"	2:35 pm	5:07 pm
Mr HO Hau-cheung, SBS, MH	DC Chairman	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas, SBS, JP	DC Vice-Chairman	2:34 pm	3:51 pm
Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	DC Member	2:30 pm	5:06 pm
Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, James	"	2:45 pm	5:06 pm
Ms CHAN Man-kuen	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr CHAN Nok-hang	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr CHENG Tsuk-man	"	2:48 pm	5:07 pm
Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Sunny	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr CHIU Man-leong	"	2:35 pm	5:07 pm
Mr HUI Yui-yu, Rick	"	2:30 pm	3:51 pm
Mr LAI Tsz-yan	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Ms LAM Chung-yan	"	2:34 pm	5:07 pm
Mr LEE Chi-wing, Alvin, MH	"	2:35 pm	5:07 pm
Mr LEUNG Ka-fai, Victor	"	2:34 pm	5:07 pm
Mr LI Sai-hung	"	2:34 pm	5:07 pm
Mr LI Sai-wing	"	2:40 pm	5:07 pm
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr MAK Yun-pui	"	2:30 pm	3:45 pm
Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS	"	2:36 pm	4:04 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr PUN Kwok-shan, MH, JP	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr TING Tsz-yuen	"	2:30 pm	5:06 pm
Mr TONG Hok-leung	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Ms TSANG So-lai	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Ms TUNG Kin-lei	"	2:35 pm	5:07 pm
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr WONG Fu-sang, Tiger	"	2:34 pm	5:07 pm
Mr WONG Hok-lai	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr WONG Ka-wing, MH	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr WONG Yue-hon	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun	"	2:30 pm	3:40 pm
Mr YIU Ka-chun, MH	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Ms YUE Shin-man	"	2:30 pm	3:24 pm
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Ms TSANG Yin-kiu, Ellen (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council) 3 / Sha Tin District Office		

In Attendance

Mr WONG Tin-pui, Simon
Mr YUEN Chun-kit, Derek

Mr LAI Wing-chi, Derek

Ms LAU Yuk-ye, Lydia

Mr LAU Chun-him, Kenny
Mr WOO Tim

Title

Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin)
Senior Executive Officer (District Council) /
Sha Tin District Office
District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Sha Tin) /
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Housing Manager (Tai Po, North and Sha Tin 1) /
Housing Department
Senior Town Planner / Sha Tin / Planning Department
Senior Estate Surveyor / South East (District Lands Office,
Sha Tin) / Lands Department

In Attendance by Invitation

Ms TSO Yu, Mabel

Mr YEUNG Ka-hong, Eric

Mr PANG Chuck-hang

Mr POON Wing-kin, Ricky

Dr LOH Lai-ting, Taron

Mr YU John

Mrs Rebecca LAU

Ms Daisy CHEUNG

Title

Executive Assistant (District Council)3 /
Sha Tin District Office
Assistant Director (Development and Marketing) /
Hong Kong Housing Society
Senior Manager (Planning and Development) /
Hong Kong Housing Society
Chief Inspection Officer /
Sales of First-hand Residential Properties Authority
Senior Medical & Health Officer (Community Liaison)1 /
Department of Health
Executive Officer I (Enforcement)1 / Tobacco Control Office
/ Department of Health
Senior Manager (Property Management) /
Hong Kong Housing Society
Manager (Property Management) /
Hong Kong Housing Society

Absent

Ms WONG Ping-fan, Iris
Mr YIP Wing

Title

DC Member (Application for leave of absence received)
" (")

Action

The Chairman welcomed members and representatives of government departments to the fourth meeting of the Development and Housing Committee (DHC) of the year.

2. The Chairman congratulated Mr Alvin LEE and Mr YIU Ka-chun on being awarded the Medal of Honour and Mr PUN Kwok-shan on being appointed as a Justice of the Peace.

3. The Chairman informed all attendees that some members of the public, being present as observers, were taking photos and making video and audio recordings.

Applications for Leave of Absence

4. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had received applications for leave of absence in writing from the following members:

Ms Iris WONG
Mr YIP Wing

Official commitment
”

5. Members unanimously endorsed the applications for leave of absence submitted by the members above.

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 3 May 2018

6. Members unanimously confirmed the above minutes of the meeting.

Matters Arising

Responses of Government Departments and Relevant Organisations to Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting
(Paper No. DH 28/2018)

7. Members noted the above paper.

Discussion Items

2018-2019 Revised Work Plans of Working Groups under the Committee
(Paper No. DH 29/2018)

8. Members unanimously endorsed the above paper.

Questions

Question to be Raised by Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael on the Proposal on Housing Development on the Periphery of Country Parks
(Paper No. DH 6/2018)

9. The Chairman welcomed Mr Eric YEUNG, Assistant Director (Development and Marketing) and Mr PANG Chuck-hang, Senior Manager (Planning and Development) of the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) to the meeting.

10. The views of Mr Michael YUNG were summarised below:

- (a) he thanked the HKHS for graphically indicating the study area in the Proposal on Housing Development on the Periphery of Country Parks in the annex. He asked if the HKHS would expand the area of study, as the impact of housing development could exceed the existing area;
- (b) he asked about the size of the study area and if the HKHS could detail the whole area;
- (c) he asked whether the report was owned by the HKHS, the Development Bureau (DEVB) or other government departments and if an enquiry should be made to the DEVB or HKHS in the future for obtaining the report;

- (d) the paper pointed out that even though the research report was not an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report, the HKHS would adopt the technical requirements of EIA reports as assessment criteria. He asked whether an EIA report would have to be submitted if it was decided in the future that houses would be built within the study area;
- (e) one of the original purposes of setting up country parks was to protect water resources. He asked if the HKHS had considered relevant factors and how it would study and handle problems related to water conservation;
- (f) he was aware that the HKHS had appointed SMEC Asia Limited as the principle consultancy of the study and 5 other companies to be in charge of other professional aspects. He asked if the HKHS had ensured the above companies had past experiences of similar studies and how it would arrange for public participation;
- (g) as no representatives from the DEVB or the Task Force on Land Supply (Task Force) were present at the meeting, he asked how problems related to the Task Force could be handled;
- (h) although housing development on the periphery of country parks proposed by the Task Force as one of the options was only a preliminary idea, the Government had already commissioned the HKHS to carry out the relevant study. He could not understand the decision; and
- (i) he asked if the PowerPoint presentation would be passed on to the Secretariat to be sent to members for their reference.

11. The views of Mr Wilson LI were summarised below:

- (a) as the HKHS paid the research fees, it would own the copyright of the report. He asked if the report would be made available to the public after it had been submitted to the Government;
- (b) the Task Force provided a number of other short-to-medium term options, including developing brownfield sites and sites under recreational leases such as the Hong Kong Golf Club at Fanling. He thought these options should be considered first. The 2 pilot areas on the periphery of country parks were both controversial and could exert great ecological impact. He opined that adequate public discussion was a good thing but the HKHS had to handle the relevant study with caution;
- (c) he opined that developing the periphery of country parks would go against the original function and purpose of the parks. As site formation works would be needed, the construction works would be relatively complicated with higher costs. He opined that the study should be handled with caution; and
- (d) he was worried that once the development on the periphery of the parks had been confirmed, the wholeness of the country parks would be compromised

and the consequences would be irrevocable. Not only did he speak against the reclamation works at Ma Liu Shui at a previous District Council (DC) meeting, but also against developing the periphery of country parks now.

12. The views of Mr NG Kam-hung were summarised below:

- (a) he opined that the study area was sizeable, including a mountain of 372 metres high which might be levelled, and that the word “periphery” was misleading;
- (b) he opined that the development on the periphery of country parks in Ma On Shan would affect the entire mountain, including water resources such as rivers. Ma On Shan was once an iron mine of great value and the development could affect historical conservation. He was also worried about the ecological impact on animals and plants and thus asked how the original ecosystem would be preserved;
- (c) he opined that the boundary of the country parks would recede after developing the periphery of the parks. The selected area near Shui Chuen O Estate had lower ecological value due to its vicinity to the estate. He opined that the results of the study might have been different if the development had gone from northeast to southwest, i.e. towards the direction of Ngau Pei Sha Village. He asked why the HKHS chose for the development to go from northwest to southeast;
- (d) he asked whether the HKHS would have development rights if the Government decided to proceed with the development; and
- (e) he was concerned about the public’s right to know.

13. Mr Eric YEUNG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he pointed out that the HKHS was not commissioned but invited by the Government to conduct the study in May 2017;
- (b) the HKHS engaged SMEC Asia Limited through a tendering exercise. The HKHS was responsible for the research fees and possessed the ownership of the report. However, in the process of the study, the relevant information would be made available to the public through public consultation procedures. The HKHS would submit the report to the Government after its completion for the latter to decide how the report or its relevant contents would be released;
- (c) SMEC Asia Limited, as the principle consultancy of the study, would form a team with 5 other professional consulting firms to conduct studies on such aspects as ecology, transportation, planning and landscape, public participation and culture and heritage. None of the consulting firms was provisionally formed for the purpose of this study. For instance, AEC Limited, which was responsible for the ecological study, was established in 1999 and was once commissioned by WWF Hong Kong to conduct an

ecological study on Mai Po. Established in 1977, Urbis Limited had over 100 staff members and had been commissioned by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department to conduct a study on enhancement of the recreation and education potential of country parks. Executive Counsel Limited, which would be responsible for the public participation study, had been commissioned by the Government to conduct a number of public participation projects, such as the Tung Chung New Town Extension Study;

- (d) the HKHS appointed SMEC Asia Limited as a consultancy at the end of April and asked it to submit a preliminary report and a plan for public participation within 3 months by the end of July, which should include channels for public expression in the form of forums, focus groups and websites. Besides, the HKHS and consultancy representatives would attend meetings held by statutory bodies, such as re-visiting the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) for consultation and reporting the progress of the study to the Country and Marine Parks Board;
- (e) as a study was different from a project or a proposed project, it needed not comply with the statutory procedures as stipulated in the EIA Ordinance or apply for an Environmental Permit. But the HKHS still required the consultancies to adopt the technical requirements stipulated in the EIA Ordinance or relevant documents as the assessment criteria and to prepare an EIA report. He believed that if the Government chose to proceed with the development project, it would be required to go through and fulfil applicable statutory procedures and requirements, such as the Town Planning Ordinance, the EIA Ordinance and the Country Parks Ordinance;
- (f) the site of the study covered around 50 hectares, which had been indicated with a red circle in the annex. If the result of the baseline study showed that around 20 hectares of land could be selected for housing development, the consultancies would proceed to the second stage, a detailed study. The HKHS did not have a pre-determined stance on the site selection. The area indicated by the red circle was selected for its basic transport network, infrastructure and its proximity to completed or planned housing developments;
- (g) the HKHS would not interfere with the study conducted by the consultancies and therefore would not advise them on how to select a suitable area of around 20 hectares for housing development. For instance, taking the site selection of Shui Chuen O Estate as an example, as there were transmission networks, stream nets, service reservoirs and hiking trails nearby, the site selected by the relevant consultancies should not extend vertically or horizontally;
- (h) if the study showed that developing the periphery of country parks would affect the historical heritage or the ecology in the district, the consultancies had to provide relevant mitigation measures;
- (i) some members were concerned that developing the periphery of country parks would entail high costs and complicated procedures. He pointed out

that the study would cover relevant issues. If the project was found to be technically not feasible, meaning the site did not possess necessary criteria for housing development, the HKHS would submit the study results to the Government for its decision;

- (j) the Task Force was in the process of conducting a consultation on the 18 land supply options. He believed that the Task Force listed the periphery of country parks as one of the site options for housing development because it hoped the public would comprehensively consider the options;
- (k) the HKHS understood the urgency of solving the land supply problem and the different views held by members of the public towards developing the periphery of country parks. The HKHS would not make any assumption on the outcome of the consultation at present and the study did not have any pre-established position on housing development. The aim of the study was to provide objective and scientific data for the public's and the Government's further consideration. If the conclusion of the Task Force's report did not support housing development in the periphery of country parks, the HKHS and the Government would discuss again whether the study should be continued;
- (l) regarding using the relevant site for housing development in the future, the HKHS had not discussed or reached any agreement with the Government;
- (m) the HKHS highly valued the public's right to know. Although the study was not required to comply with the established procedures as stipulated in the EIA Ordinance and conduct public discussion, the HKHS requested that the consulting firms proceed in accordance with such procedures and disclose important information to the public ;
- (n) he pointed out that the Task Force proposed 2 options in relation to development of country parks. One of them was the HKHS's study on the 2 selected sites in the periphery of country parks for medium-to-long term development, and the other a conceptual option of exploring the possibilities of developing other country parks. The current study did not cover the latter option. He added that, regarding possible long-term development of country parks and members' opinions, including the priority development of brownfield sites, the Task Force was in the process of conducting consultations on different land supply options. Members could convey their opinions to the Task Force. However, the HKHS would not comment on the matter at present; and
- (o) he would pass the PowerPoint presentation used at the meeting to the Secretariat, so that it could send it to members for their reference.

14. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) if members had questions for or opinions regarding the Task Force, they could submit them to the Task Force directly before 26 September, via the email address on page 5 of the paper;

- (b) members had expressed a lot of opinions at the meeting. She hoped that the HKHS would listen to them and include them in the study report; and
- (c) she asked the Secretariat to send the PowerPoint presentation to members for their reference.

15. Members noted the above paper.

Question to be Raised by Mr LAI Tsz-yan on the Public Open Space of Private Housing Estates
(Paper No. DH 23/2018)

16. The Chairman welcomed Mr WOO Tim, Senior Estate Surveyor / South East (District Lands Office, Sha Tin) (DLO/ST) of the Lands Department (LandsD) and Mr Ricky POON, Chief Inspection Officer of the Sales of First-hand Residential Properties Authority to the meeting.

17. The views of Mr LAI Tsz-yan were summarised below:

- (a) the written reply from the LandsD pointed out that the plan to build a church and a care and attention home for the elderly was not implemented in the end. However, as the design of public spaces using footbridges and pedestrian walkways had been retained, he asked if the relevant terms were unrelated to the plan of building community facilities. If the design was in line with the planning concepts, he wanted to learn about such concepts and what the initial design concepts were based on;
- (b) he opined that the relevant terms might be more effective if implemented in other estates in the Sha Tin District, such as those in Sha Tin town centre that were connected to shopping centres and had higher people flows. On the contrary, there were only a few kindergartens, tutorial centres and churches in the vicinity of the estates in the Yi Shing Square area, resulting in a relatively low people flow. Such terms would bring about security risks and incur maintenance cost for the residents of the estates;
- (c) he said that, under normal circumstances, the LandsD would not consider waiving the relevant terms and asked if it implied that application for a waiver was possible under specific circumstances. It had been reported that the LandsD had studied waiving the relevant terms and that the Owners' Corporation (OC) of Metro Harbour View had applied before. He enquired about the result of the LandsD's study, and the relevant terms, standards and procedures if application for a waiver was allowed; and
- (d) he said the Sales of First-hand Residential Properties Authority was established on 29 April 2013, while Yi Shing Square was built in the 1980s. Considering residents who had been living in the area since 30 years ago might not understand the implications of the relevant terms, he enquired if any regulations stipulated that terms could be applied with retrospective effect from 30 years ago.

18. The Chairman asked if the DLO/ST had any precedent for granting the relevant waiver.

19. Mr WOO Tim gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the request for public walkways was stated in the land leases of 9 estates in the vicinity of Yi Shing Square. As the neighbouring estates were developed some years ago, the LandsD needed time to collect the background information on why the request was included. He would provide the relevant information after the meeting;
- (b) the DLO/ST generally did not consider applications for a waiver. However, under special circumstances, such applications might be considered from an understanding perspective and in accordance with relevant principles. For instance, the request for a waiver had to be legally appropriate, submitted by all owners or the OC and in line with the terms and conditions set by the DLO/ST, including payment of relevant fees. Also, a waiver application was required to be supported by the STDC and Area Committees, as it was necessary for them to understand that such public walkways would not be opened to the public; and
- (c) he said the DLO/ST had received waiver applications, but none of them was successful.

DLO/ST

20. Members noted the above paper.

Question to be Raised by Mr WONG Yue-hon on the Penalty for Violation of Rules of Public Housing Estates

(Paper No. DH 30/2018)

21. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Ms Lydia LAU, Housing Manager (Tai Po, North and Sha Tin 1) of the Housing Department (HD); Mr Derek LAI, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Sha Tin) of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD); Dr Taron LOH, Senior Medical and Health Officer (Community Liaison)¹ and Mr YU John, Executive Officer I (Enforcement)¹ of the Tobacco Control Office (TCO) of the Department of Health; Mrs Rebecca LAU, Senior Manager (Property Management) and Ms Daisy CHEUNG, Manager (Property Management) of the HKHS.

22. The views of Mr WONG Yue-hon were summarised below:

- (a) he said the law enforcement officers included the Mobile Operations Unit (MOU). Under the current establishment, there were 2 teams with a total of 28 officers in the MOU and 5 teams with a total of 13 officers in the task force. A total of 31 public housing estates in the Sha Tin District and the Sai Kung District were related to the HD. He asked if the current manpower was sufficient for dealing with all the relevant public housing estates;
- (b) he opined that illegal parking was common within the housing estates. Since Housing Officers, Housing Managers and Assistant Housing Managers would not be at work during weekends or public holidays, he asked how

illegal parking could be handled when the law enforcement officers of the HD were not stationed in the housing estates. He opined that the situation was common in all the housing estates in the district;

- (c) he said that traffic congestion was serious in Wo Che Estate at weekends, with traffic queues extending to Fung Wo Estate and even Wo Che Street. Due to traffic congestion, the trip from Fung Shun Street to Wo Che Car Park often took at least 15 minutes, albeit the short distance. He asked the HD for a solution to this long-standing problem;
- (d) he pointed out that, for those housing estates whose estate management had been outsourced to contractors, no Housing Officer or Housing Manager was on duty even on weekdays. He then asked who would be responsible for law enforcement in such housing estates and how the HD would handle law-breaking members of the public who would not budge even after being advised by security guards;
- (e) he said smoking was common within the housing estates but no enforcement actions had been taken upon the receipt of complaints. The outdoor areas within the housing estates were not designated as statutory no smoking areas and thus the TCO could not carry out law enforcement actions there. He asked the HD about its tobacco control efforts. He wanted to know whether the HD had prosecuted individuals smoking in outdoor areas and asked the HD to provide last year's prosecution figures;
- (f) regarding municipal solid waste charging, the FEHD envisaged hiring more staff for its implementation while the HD had no such plans. He wanted to know the HD's views on the matter;
- (g) the shopping centres and car parks of some housing estates had been sold to the Link Asset Management Limited (the Link). If improvements to road designs were made to improve and ease the traffic flow whereas the Link refused to enhance facilities accordingly, he asked what actions would be taken;
- (h) public housing tenants would be allotted penalty points if they smoked in the public areas of the housing estates they lived in. He asked if penalty points would be allotted if they smoked in other housing estates. He was worried that it would encourage public housing tenants to smoke in other housing estates and hoped that the HD could plug the loophole; and
- (i) he said that the security guards were responsible and would advise drivers of illegally parked vehicles to leave. However, restricted by regulations, security guards could not impound vehicles when drivers were present. He wanted to know how the management office would handle situations where drivers were advised and still refused to leave and whether it would issue summonses.

23. The views of Mr LI Sai-hung were summarised below:

- (a) he wanted to know the HD's prosecution figures so as to understand the effectiveness of the Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement (Marking Scheme);
- (b) in the past, vehicles illegally parked in housing estates would be impounded. However, such vehicles had not been impounded or given a fixed penalty recently. For instance, he once saw a vehicle parked illegally for a long period of time, but the HD simply issued a number of fixed penalty notices in response. He opined that the action might not be effective in alleviating illegal parking. The situation was serious; an illegally parked vehicle once blocked an ambulance from entering a lay-by. The patient therefore had to be transferred onto the ambulance when it was still on the traffic lane. He opined that the HD should step up its efforts by issuing summonses;
- (c) he said there was a case of throwing objects from height in Sun Wai House High Block of Sun Chui Estate. A resident contacted him for assistance. The resident's father had already been admitted to an elderly home, but the HD staff alleged that his domestic helper threw diapers from their unit and hoarded diapers at home. He found this far-fetched. Besides, there had also been a number of cases of throwing cigarette butts from height in the housing estate, causing objects to catch fire. Such behaviours could have caused deaths or injuries. One of the tenants had requested his assistance for 7 times. He had given his opinions to the HD, but to no avail. He opined that the HD did not take his advice or follow up on the incident. He also pointed out that the effectiveness of the task force was limited, as it was only deployed during office hours. He wanted to know whether the cameras used to assist with prosecution were fixed or moving. Based on his previous communications with the HD and to his understanding, the HD would not monitor the situation of objects being thrown from height with surveillance cameras for privacy concerns and the lack of suitable locations for installation; and
- (d) he pointed out that some units piled with rubbish emitted stench and caused pest infestation, which affected the neighbouring units. Although the affected tenants had sought assistance from social workers of the Social Welfare Department or elderly centres in contacting the relevant tenants, the rubbish hoarders were unwilling to communicate. He asked if the Marking Scheme could address the problem of rubbish hoarding in units.

24. The views of Mr Sunny CHIU were summarised below:

- (a) he wanted to know the prosecution figures of the MOU and the task force of the HD so as to understand their effectiveness;
- (b) he asked the HD how it handled tenants of estates under the Tenant Purchase Scheme (TPS estates) that had committed misdeeds, such as littering, allowing animals under charge to foul public places with faeces and smoking a cigarette in estate common areas. Most of the common areas of the TPS

estates were managed by private corporations. He wanted to know whether the HD had the power to handle tenants smoking in an area, such as the garden, managed by the private corporations. Also, he wanted to know if the TCO could take law enforcement actions within the boundaries of private housing estates, such as to issue summonses to those smoking in non-smoking areas of such estates, or if the estate concerned should issue a lawyer's letter to sue the offender. He also wanted to know whether the HD had a responsibility to monitor tenants that fouled public areas, such as corridors and lobbies. He opined that the unclear delineation of responsibility regarding the TPS estates had long been condemned;

- (c) when tenants of the TPS estates committed misdeeds, he asked if the MOU and the task force could take enforcement actions in the estates concerned; or rather, the TPS estates did not fall within the purview of the MOU and the task force;
- (d) regarding illegal parking, he knew a number of housing estates had already outsourced law enforcement to contractors. He asked how long an illegally parked vehicle usually waited until it got impounded. Regarding the fixed penalty, he asked if \$320 was the uniform rate of fine for all estates in the territory, or that the rates differed under the management of different contractors or according to the control on roads;
- (e) he asked about the penalty for water dripping from air-conditioners and whether law enforcement action would be taken by the task force or the FEHD. He knew that there was an FEHD unit responsible for the problem. However, as far as he knew, water dripping from air-conditioners was covered in the Marking Scheme;
- (f) as the HD was supportive of the municipal solid waste charging scheme and domestic waste was mostly food waste, he opined that the HD should step up its efforts in promoting the recycling of food waste;
- (g) even if the outdoor areas within public or private housing estates were designated as non-smoking areas, the TCO could not carry out law enforcement actions. He asked if the TCO would consider proposing a law amendment;
- (h) he suggested that the HD consider amending the relevant regulations by including a cross-estate law enforcement arrangement to plug the loophole of tenants committing misdeeds in other estates and evading penalty points; and
- (i) he asked the HD to give a written reply to his questions.

25. Ms Lydia LAU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the task force of the HD was responsible for enforcing certain parts of the regulations and was usually deployed by the divisions. When without special duty arrangements, the task force would patrol and carry out their duties in different estates according to a specific timetable. If problems or

needs arose in particular estates, the task force would increase the frequency of duties in such estates;

- (b) regarding illegal parking, the contractors of security services were responsible for carrying out road-related actions within the estates, including advising and evicting drivers of illegally parked vehicles and impounding the vehicles concerned. The security staff were authorised by the HD to carry out the relevant duties. They would advise and evict the drivers of illegally parked vehicles if the vehicles could not be impounded because the drivers were present, and they would seek police assistance if necessary;
- (c) she pointed out that, if necessary, Housing Officers and the task force would carry out their duties and prosecute drivers of illegally parked vehicles outside office hours, including Saturdays and Sundays and evenings;
- (d) she noted that Wo Che Estate had a problem of illegal parking. A huge number of non-residents shopped and used the facilities such as the shopping centre, market and “dai pai dong” (i.e. on-street cooked food stalls) in Wo Che Estate at the same time. These people usually parked their vehicles in the hourly car park. However, as the roads in the housing estate were designed around 39 years ago, their capacity was limited and it took too long for vehicles to enter the car park. To avoid congestion, the HD had obtained approval from the Transport Department to improve traffic signs to ease the traffic and would consider formulating measures to curb illegal parking. The HD and the Link had also studied the possibility of reducing the time needed for vehicles to enter the car park so as to shorten the queue;
- (e) regarding illegal smoking, the TCO staff could take actions to drive away, allot penalty points or prosecute offenders according to the actual situations. As she did not have the relevant prosecution figures with her, she would provide the supplementary information after the meeting;
- (f) regarding throwing objects from height, besides deploying the Special Operation Teams, the HD would also install surveillance cameras at the black spots for monitoring and creating a deterrent effect on the one hand, and to effectively trace and prosecute tenants committing the misdeed on the other hand. As the number of surveillance cameras was limited at present, the HD was studying the possibility of installing more of them. Also, each on-duty Special Operation Team was equipped with a mobile camera;
- (g) regarding the case of throwing objects from height in Sun Wai House High Block of Sun Chui Estate mentioned by Mr LI Sai-hung, the tenants concerned might have been misunderstood. She apologised for that and said she would look into the matter;
- (h) regarding illegal smoking, under the existing Marking Scheme, tenants would not be allotted penalty points if they were found smoking in other housing estates. However, the HD staff would advise such persons to leave or issue fixed penalty notices;

- (i) she would provide supplementary information after the meeting regarding the handling method of public housing tenants smoking in public areas of TPS estates and the task force's scope of enforcement in TPS estates;
- (j) under the Marking Scheme, water dripping from air-conditioners was listed as Misdeed B13 and would incur 5 penalty points;
- (k) for properties divested to the Link, the HD would negotiate with the Link, which was one of the owners, in the hope of finding an effective solution. However, if the Link did not give its consensus in the end, it would be difficult for the HD to implement the proposals concerned;
- (l) the HD would fully support the Government in promoting the municipal solid waste charging scheme. However, the HD had to first learn about how the regulations would be enforced before deciding how enforcement actions should be taken in the front line or other aspects. She had not received any further information yet; and
- (m) regarding the problem of rubbish hoarding in units, as many tenants had been living in the estates for a long time, the HD would handle the cases in a relatively mild manner based on discretionary considerations. As for Misdeed C11 listed in the Marking Scheme regarding tenants accumulating a large quantity of refuse or waste inside leased premises, creating offensive smell and hygienic nuisance, and refusing to cooperate, estate offices would allot 7 penalty points to them.

26. Mr Derek LAI gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) if anyone committed a misdeed in the public areas of the TPS estates, the FEHD would handle the case according to the practice of private housing estates, i.e. the management office would be required to handle it;
- (b) regarding cases of water dripping from air-conditioners, the FEHD would investigate the cases and take enforcement actions according to relevant ordinances, depending on whether the units were sold or leased; and
- (c) the HD was generally responsible for taking enforcement actions regarding violations of the Public Cleansing and Prevention of Nuisances Regulation within public housing estates.

27. Mr YU John gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) according to the Smoking (Public Health) Ordinance (Cap. 371), indoor areas in public places, including indoor areas in public housing estates such as restaurants, shopping malls, lift lobbies of buildings and staircases, were designated as statutory no smoking areas. The TCO would take enforcement actions in housing estates upon receipt of complaints. Besides, the TCO was also responsible for patrolling and prosecuting offenders at bus terminals in housing estates and public transport interchange, which were also designated as statutory no smoking areas;

- (b) since the outdoor areas in housing estates were not statutory no smoking areas, the TCO could not take enforcement actions there and relevant problems were handled by the HD; and
- (c) regarding private housing estates, indoor areas were statutory no smoking areas and would be handled the same way as other public places, i.e. the TCO would patrol the areas and prosecute offenders accordingly. The TCO could not take law enforcement actions in outdoor areas, such as gardens and leisure spaces, as they were not statutory no smoking areas. However, many OCs would lay down regulations to limit smoking areas in estates. Regarding legislative amendments, the Department of Health had nothing to add.

28. The Chairman asked the HD to provide supplementary information such as the relevant prosecution figures after the meeting.

HD

29. Members noted the above paper.

Question to be Raised by Mr CHAN Nok-hang on Rent Increase of Car Parks under the Link REIT for Consecutive Years
(Paper No. DH 32/2018)

30. The Chairman welcomed Ms Lydia LAU to the meeting.

31. The views of Mr CHAN Nok-hang were summarised below:

- (a) the Chief Executive once said that nothing could be done about the Link which was such a giant. He felt that there was even less DC Members could do in face of the problem of the Link; however, he still tried his best to speak for the public. He was disappointed at the absence of representatives of the Transport and Housing Bureau, the Link and the Competition Commission (the Commission) at the meeting;
- (b) the document mentioned that the Link was not in breach of the covenant made with the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). He wanted to know what covenant was being referred to. He also asked if the HD would take the initiative in tightening regulation of the Link, as the latter had been increasing car park rents for consecutive years which further aggravated car owners' burdens;
- (c) he asked whether the DLO/ST would take the initiative to check if the Link was complying with the lease provisions, and what actions would be taken if the Link was not compliant with the land lease;
- (d) the Link claimed that the car parks under its management remained competitive when compared with other car parks in the district. However, he opined that the Link only compared its car parks with several shopping mall car parks. Regarding the Link's investment of over \$600 million to enhance car park services and facilities, he asked if it would consider allocating a portion of the investment to subsidise car owners to alleviate

their burden of the increasing rent;

- (e) he hoped that the Chairman would write a letter to the Link in the capacity of the Chairman of the DHC to request a written reply on the above issue; and
- (f) he requested that the Commission provide a written reply on whether the Link's decision to increase rents for consecutive years involved predatory pricing.

The
Commission

32. The views of Mr PUN Kwok-shan were summarised below:

- (a) the Link had never sent any representative to answer questions at the STDC meetings. He opined that it should be censured. Regarding the Links' reply that it had invested over \$600 million to enhance car park services and facilities, he opined that there was not much of a difference, except that the facilities appeared more dilapidated. The ground surface had also become rugged after prolonged use and water would accumulate. He asked about the areas that the Link spent the increased rent income on, so that he could explain to car owners accordingly;
- (b) regarding car parks owned by the Link, public vehicles and emergency vehicles, including fire engines and ambulances, could only enter after the driver pressed a button to communicate with control room staff. It was a very out-dated practice. He wished that the Link could refer to the practice of other cities, such as adopting the license plate recognition system, so that such vehicles would not be held up and rescue work could commence as soon as possible;
- (c) he asked if the lease conditions and covenants were different for each housing estate and property that were divested to the Link; and
- (d) Lung Hang Estate currently had 2 gates: one for the housing estate and one for the hourly car park. He opined that it would be more ideal to have only 1 gate, so that vehicles would not be slowed down from passing through 2 gates within a short distance.

33. The views of Mr LI Sai-hung were summarised below:

- (a) he opined that the Government should send a representative to attend the meeting and that the HKHA's past decision to divest properties was not well thought out. Back then the Chief Executive and the Bureau Secretary suspended the sale of public housing units and sold assets such as car parks to the Link. All sorts of problems were gradually surfacing at present, but the Government refused to consider repurchasing the shares of the Link, claiming that it was not in the public interest; and
- (b) he thought that the Link was profit-minded and the increasing rent was not the only problem of the car parks. In order to allow more vehicles to use the car park on an hourly basis, the Link converted some monthly parking spaces to unfixed "floating" ones, depriving the original users of their rights, so that

monthly tenants could hardly find parking spaces in the evenings, on days that the shopping centres were busier or during typhoons.

34. Ms Lydia LAU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she opined that the right to use and the classification of units should be largely similar in shopping centres of different public housing estates. However, lease requirements were different for different estates according to actual circumstances. As she did not currently possess detailed information on the covenant made between the Link and the HKHA, she would provide it after the meeting; and
- (b) the HD would tighten its regulation based on the covenant made with the HKHA at the time of the divestment. She would also relay members' opinions to her superiors.

HD

35. Mr WOO Tim responded that the regulations in the land lease concerning parking spaces mainly required that a certain number of parking spaces be provided for different vehicle types, and did not set a limit on the parking rent. The DLO/ST would follow up on complaints concerning parking spaces.

36. The Chairman said that as the HD would not be able to answer some of the questions, she would ask the Link to give a written reply on the above questions.

The Link

37. Mr CHAN Nok-hang proposed the provisional motion as follows:

“The Development and Housing Committee of the Sha Tin District Council censures the Link for disregarding the rent affordability to vehicle owners by increasing the rent of all car parks under its management in the public housing estates in the Sha Tin District for consecutive years. The Committee therefore strongly demands the Link to freeze the rent for at least three years for all car parks under its management in the public housing estates in the Sha Tin District.

Also, as the Link has control over the basic necessities of life of most residents in public housing estates, the Committee requests the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region to tighten regulation of the Link, and to repurchase the shares of the Link for the sake of public interest to prevent further exploitation of public housing estates residents.”

Mr Billy CHAN seconded the motion.

38. The views of Mr WONG Yue-hon were summarised below:

- (a) he asked if the request to freeze the rent of car parks in all public housing estates in the Sha Tin District under the Link was reasonable;
- (b) he supported the Government in repurchasing the shares of the Link; however, he wondered at what level the repurchase price would be considered reasonable. For instance, it might be reasonable to repurchase the shares of the Link for over \$100 billion, but it might not be appropriate if the price was above the market price. He would not support repurchasing

the shares of the Link with public funds at an unreasonable price, as it would not be worth the money; and

- (c) he suggested that the motion be revised to "...to repurchase the shares of the Link at a reasonable market price" and that the mover of the motion, Mr CHAN Nok-hang, provide a reference price.

39. Mr CHAN Nok-hang opined that the DC was able to request enterprises to promote measures beneficial to the public and responded by asking Mr WONG Yue-hon about his definition of a reasonable repurchase price.

40. The views of Mr Michael YUNG were summarised below:

- (a) he opined that members might not have the professional knowledge to assess the value of the Link and therefore it would be inappropriate to hastily set a price standard or to override the professional judgment of surveyors. He suggested revising the motion to "...suggests that the Government consider adopting methods such as repurchasing the shares of the Link...";
- (b) he opined that a freeze on the rent of car parks under the Link in all public housing estates in the Sha Tin District might not be in line with the principles of demand and supply. He pointed out that some high-end residential properties in the district were only equipped with very few parking spaces in order to comply with the latest planning standards and guidelines, resulting in a particularly significant increase in the rent of nearby car parks. He opined that the DLO/ST should study ways for visitors to use the car parks in compliance with the land leases of properties under the Link. He also asked whether it was a breach of regulations or illegal to allow non-visitors of the housing estates to use the car parks, since the Government's original intent was to make a certain proportion of the parking spaces available to the tenants. He hoped that the mover would consider including such situations in the motion; and
- (c) he suggested that Mr CHAN Nok-hang invite Mr WONG Yue-hon to second the motion.

41. The views of Mr Alvin LEE were summarised below:

- (a) he asked why the motion only covered the Sha Tin District and suggested that it would be more reasonable to revise the motion to "...to freeze...in all the public housing estates in Hong Kong including the Sha Tin District"; and
- (b) he opined that the repurchase of the shares of the Link might not be an effective measure to handle the problem of car park management that members had mentioned, or might not be directly related to management issues.

42. Mr LI Sai-hung opined that the Government's then decision to sell properties to the Link did not benefit members of the public. He also thought that the repurchase of the shares of the Link was like a dream and therefore it was pointless to discuss whether it was feasible or what the suitable price should be.

43. The views of Mr HO Hau-cheung were summarised below:

- (a) from the perspective of people's livelihood, the first half of the motion conveyed that Sha Tin residents, especially car owners, were bearing a heavy burden and therefore were opposed to the discretionary rent increases by the Link. He opined that this part of the motion was acceptable, but whether it was feasible was another question;
- (b) the latter part of the motion was highly controversial in society. The fact that the Link became what it was at present was a historical problem. It was one of the 3 gigantic obstacles that the current Government faced, leaving the Government and Members at their wit's end. It was, therefore, controversial whether the repurchase of the shares of the Link would be beneficial to members of the public. He thought it would be more reasonable to revise the motion to "...and not to repurchase the shares of the Link for the sake of public interest..." ; and
- (c) he opined that members unanimously agreed to work against the Link, as it exploited the residents and did harm to the territory. However, members should carefully consider how to handle the matter. To insist on repurchasing properties from the Link could deal a heavy blow to or impose an onerous burden on the people of Hong Kong. Without adequate discussion on the matter or proof that the repurchase would be an effective strategy against the Link, he suggested that the mover of the motion only retain some of the requests, including a freeze on the rent and tightened regulation of the Link using all possible means, so that the motion would be easier for the DHC to handle.

44. Ms CHAN Man-kuen said she would not endorse the provisional motion combining the freeze on car park rent and the repurchase of the shares of the Link. She opined that to proceed with the repurchase presently would only give the Link an opportunity to make a huge profit, and therefore she disagreed with wasting such public funds and thought the discussion about a reasonable price unnecessary at present. The repurchase was still highly controversial and might not solve the problem. It was doubtful whether the service quality would improve, in the event that the HD outsourced the management services of repurchased properties afterwards. She therefore disagreed with repurchasing the shares of the Link when it was still a controversial issue and hoped the mover would amend the motion accordingly.

45. The views of Mr WONG Hok-lai were summarised below:

- (a) he opined that the freeze on car park rent mentioned in the question was limited to the Sha Tin District, instead of covering the other 17 districts, because the question was about the management of the car parks in the district. Also, as each of the 17 districts had its own DC and the relevant Members should be concerned with the management of the car parks in their

districts, he opined that the motion was not problematic;

- (b) regarding the repurchase of the shares of the Link, he in principle supported the repurchase at a reasonable price, and agreed that it should not proceed with an excessively high price; and
- (c) he said that the DC was only an advisory body and its motions often did not receive responses from government departments or relevant organisations, and not much could be done about it. However, he opined that motions should be supported if they could represent public opinion and express the DC's stance.

46. The views of Ms LAM Chung-yan were summarised below:

- (a) the first paragraph of the motion expressed dissatisfaction with the rent increases of the car parks. She asked why the mover of the motion specified a freeze of 3 years minimum, instead of a longer or yearly freeze, and therefore opined that the year could be omitted in the motion;
- (b) some car owners thought that it would be more ideal and reasonable to adjust the car park rent based on inflation. Besides, she opined that the Link should inform the public of the reason for the rent increases and how the income would be used to justify such increases. She hoped that the mover of the motion would consider asking the Link to adopt other measures to maintain its car park rent at a reasonable level;
- (c) she opined that a consensus in society on a reasonable repurchase price might be necessary and disagreed with hastily putting forward a motion, as more time was needed for consultation and discussion on whether the repurchase would benefit public interest before a consensus could be reached. She opined that the repurchase was not necessarily a reasonable method and thus it should not be insisted on; and
- (d) she thought that there was nothing the Government could do to monitor the Link and suggested the mover of the motion to provide substantive advice for the Government to tighten regulation.

47. The views of Mr Tiger WONG were summarised below:

- (a) he supported the freeze on the car park rent for a minimum of 3 years, as the Link previously increased the car park rent by more than 10%, i.e. the rent for a fixed parking space increased from some \$2,000 to over \$3,000;
- (b) he opined that repurchasing the shares of the Link was a business issue and it might not be suitable for members to request the Government to do that with public funds on behalf of the public, or else the same might be applicable to many other public utility companies, such as bus companies. It could not be guaranteed that the rent would not go up under the HD's management after the repurchase. Not increasing the rent simply meant the cost would be subsidised by public funds; and

- (c) he opined that the market had an adjustment mechanism in accordance with the supply-demand relationship. If the number of users of car parks decreased, the rent would naturally fall back. During previous economic downturns, the number of car park users decreased and the monthly rent fell back to some \$1,000. He therefore opined that the repurchase of the shares of the Link should be carefully considered.

48. Mr Billy CHAN opined that the aim of the motion was to express dissatisfaction towards the Link. Even though the value of the Link had increased more than tenfold since its initial public offering and the repurchase of its shares could be difficult, he opined that members should speak for the public and take the initiative to find a solution, instead of adopting a passive attitude. He also said that the current car park rent had more than doubled when compared with that of some 10 years ago, rendering parking spaces unaffordable to the general public. He hoped that the motion could create a deterrent effect. He was considering revising certain terms and hoped members would endorse the motion.

49. Mr PUN Kwok-shan believed that most of the members present did not support the Link, as it kept increasing the rent, divesting properties, etc. However, the repurchase of the shares of the Link was not a political but an economic issue that had not been thoroughly discussed by the public. Also, as members were not economists, they could not determine a reasonable repurchase price so as to safeguard public interest as much as possible. He opined that careful consideration should be given before proposing a radical motion out of a bout of passion, as the Link might profit again from the repurchase now and the STDC might be blamed in the future for colluding with it. He hoped that if a consensus had not yet been reached within the DHC, the mover could revise the motion so that it would be passed.

50. Mr James CHAN opined that there was no need to determine a reasonable price, as such a price should be agreed upon by the buyer and the seller. He also opined that the Link only had business considerations with its sole aim to maximise its profits, which explained why it sent no representative to the DHC meeting. However, if the repurchase was successful and the HD was in charge of management again, members could at least meet with representatives of the HD at meetings.

51. The views of Mr LI Sai-wing were summarised below:

- (a) regarding the first half of the motion on the rent of all car parks in the public housing estates, he shared a similar view with the mover of the motion. He presented a petition to the Head Office of the Link in April 2018 to demand a freeze on the car park rent in the public housing estates; and
- (b) some members were worried that the repurchase of the shares of the Link would indirectly benefit the Link even further. He stressed that society had not yet reached any sort of consensus on the repurchase and hoped that, even if members agreed with the principles of the motion, the mover could consider other members' opinions and revise the wording of the motion.

52. The Chairman adjourned the meeting for 3 minutes.

53. Mr CHAN Nok-hang amended the provisional motion as follows:

“The Development and Housing Committee of the Sha Tin District Council censures the Link for disregarding the rent affordability to vehicle owners by increasing the rent of all car parks in the public housing estates in Hong Kong under its management for consecutive years, including those in the Sha Tin District. The Committee therefore strongly demands the Link to freeze the rent for at least three years for all car parks in the public housing estates in Hong Kong under its management, including those in the Sha Tin District.

Also, as the Link has control over the basic necessities of life of most residents in public housing estates, the Committee requests the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region to adopt any feasible measure to tighten regulation of the Link. In the long run, in order to safeguard public interest, the Government can consider the possibility of repurchasing the shares of the Link at a reasonable prevailing market price to prevent further exploitation of public housing estates residents.”

Mr Billy CHAN seconded the motion.

54. Ms CHAN Man-kuen pointed out that the latter part of the motion requested the Government to repurchase the shares of the Link. She asked if a consensus on this had been reached among members. If the mover, Mr CHAN Nok-hang, insisted on including the repurchase request in the motion, she would not support it; if he refused to delete such a request, she might propose an amendment.

55. Mr LAI Tsz-yan suggested revising the request for freezing the rent for at least 3 years to “never increase the rent”.

56. Mr WONG Yue-hon said that the Audit Commission criticised from time to time that the rental income of government properties’ was relatively low and asked why such properties were not let at market prices. He therefore opined that determining the rent with reference to the market price after the repurchase might not solve the problem of yearly rent increases. He therefore suggested revising the motion to “the Government can consider reasonable measures (including repurchasing the shares of the Link) ...”.

57. Mr SIU Hin-hong opined that it was contradictory for the Government to repurchase properties it had sold to the Link. He did not think the repurchase was feasible and pointed out that, as Hong Kong was a free economy, the rent problem could only be handled through supply and demand. For instance, government car parks could be built near car parks owned by the Link to increase competition, thereby adjusting the market price. He opined that the Link was only accountable to shareholders, not members or the public.

58. Mr CHAN Nok-hang said that although the repurchase of the shares of the Link was only one of the feasible measures, it was impossible to include every possible solution in the motion due to limited space. He opined that the majority of the public thought the repurchase option should be adopted and therefore the Government should examine its feasibility. He revised “consider” to “study” in the provisional motion and the revised version was as follows:

“The Development and Housing Committee of the Sha Tin District Council censures the Link for disregarding the rent affordability to vehicle owners by increasing the rent of all car parks in the public housing estates in Hong Kong under its management for consecutive years, including those in the Sha Tin District. The Committee therefore strongly demands the Link to freeze the rent for at least three years for all car parks in the public housing estates in Hong Kong under its management, including those in the Sha Tin District.

Also, as the Link has control over the basic necessities of life of most residents in public housing estates, the Committee requests the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region to adopt any feasible measure to tighten regulation of the Link. In the long run, in order to safeguard public interest, the Government can study the possibility of repurchasing the shares of the Link at a reasonable prevailing market price to prevent further exploitation of public housing estates residents.”

Mr Billy CHAN seconded the motion.

59. The Chairman asked members if they agreed to pass the provisional motion in paragraph 58.

60. Mr Billy CHAN requested that an open ballot be conducted and it was supported by 4 members present.

61. Mr Alvin LEE suggested revising “the Government can study the possibility of repurchasing the shares of the Link at a reasonable prevailing market price” to “the Government can study the feasibility of repurchasing the shares of the Link at a reasonable prevailing market price”.

62. Mr LI Sai-wing suggested revising “the Government can study the possibility of repurchasing the shares of the Link at a reasonable prevailing market price” to “the Government can study the feasibility of repurchasing the shares of the Link at a reasonable prevailing market price or other more effective measures”.

63. Mr CHAN Nok-hang opined that it was unsuitable to revise the motion after the voting procedure had started.

64. Ms LAM Chung-yan said she would like to propose an amendment to the motion.

65. The Chairman said that members could not propose amendments to the motion after the voting procedure had started but opined that it was acceptable for members to express their views.

66. The Chairman announced that the provisional motion in paragraph 58 was passed with 27 votes in favour, 4 against and 0 abstention.

Members that voted in favour (27):

Mr TING Tsz-yuen, Mr Tiger WONG, Mr NG Kam-hung, Mr LI Sai-wing, Mr LI Sai-hung, Mr Wilson LI, Mr CHIU Man-leong, Ms LAM Chung-yan, Mr YIU Ka-chun, Mr TONG Hok-leung, Mr Michael YUNG, Mr Victor LEUNG, Mr Billy CHAN, Mr James CHAN, Ms CHAN Man-kuen, Mr CHAN Nok-hang, Ms TSANG So-lai, Mr CHING Cheung-ying, Mr WONG Yue-hon, Mr WONG Ka-wing, Mr WONG Hok-lai, Ms

TUNG Kin-lei, Ms Sunny CHIU, Mr PUN Kwok-shan, Mr WAI Hing-cheung, Mr CHENG Tsuk-man, Mr LAI Tsz-yan.

Members that voted against (4):

Mr HO Hau-cheung, Mr Alvin LEE, Mr SIU Hin-hon, Ms Scarlett PONG.

67. Members noted the above paper.

Information Item

Report of Working Group

(Paper No. DH 33/2018)

68. Members noted the above paper.

Information Paper

Population of Public Housing Estates and Private Sector Participation Scheme Courts in Sha Tin

(Paper No. DH 34/2018)

69. Members noted the above paper.

Date of Next Meeting

70. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 2:30 pm on 6 September 2018 (Thursday).

71. The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 pm.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat
STDC 13/15/30 Pt X

August 2018