

**Sha Tin District Council**  
**Minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of**  
**the Development and Housing Committee in 2021**

**Date** : 18 February 2021 (Thursday)  
**Time** : 10:09 am  
**Venue** : Sha Tin District Office Conference Room 441  
 4/F, Sha Tin Government Offices

<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Time of joining the meeting</u></b>	<b><u>Time of leaving the meeting</u></b>
Mr CHAN Nok-hang (Chairman)	DC Member	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung (Vice-Chairman)	"	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	DC Chairman	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Mr CHAN Pui-ming	DC Member	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Mr CHAN Wan-tung	"	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Mr CHENG Chung-hang	"	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa	"	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong	"	10:31 am	12:05 pm
Mr CHOW Hiu-laam, Felix	"	10:09 am	12:01 pm
Mr CHUNG Lai-him, Johnny	"	10:09 am	11:58 am
Mr HUI Lap-san	"	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Mr HUI Yui-yu	"	10:17 am	11:16 am
Dr LAM Kong-kwan	"	10:15 am	10:47 am
Mr LI Sai-hung	"	10:11 am	12:05 pm
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	"	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Mr LIAO Pak-hong, Ricardo	"	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Mr LO Tak-ming	"	11:11 am	12:05 pm
Mr LO Yuet-chau	"	10:43 am	12:05 pm
Mr LUI Kai-wing	"	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Ms LUK Tsz-tung	"	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Mr MAK Tsz-kin	"	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Mr MAK Yun-pui, Chris	"	10:09 am	11:20 am
Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS	"	10:15 am	10:47 am
Mr SHAM Tsz-kit, Jimmy	"	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Mr SHEK William	"	10:09 am	12:03 pm
Mr SIN Cheuk-nam	"	10:09 am	11:39 am
Mr TING Tsz-yuen	"	10:10 am	11:15 am
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	"	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Ms WONG Man-huen	"	11:11 am	12:05 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun	"	10:09 am	10:32 am
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael	"	10:09 am	12:05 pm
Ms LIU Sin-yi, Angela (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council) 5/ Sha Tin District Office		

**In Attendance**

Mr LAM Fong-tat, James  
Ms CHAN Cheuk-yu, Cherry

Mr MA Cheuk-yui, Trery

Mr YAN Ka-kit, Ric

Ms YICK Hong-nien, Hannah

Ms HO Ka-wai, Rosseter

Ms CHAN Sin-man

Ms NGO Po-ling

Mr LEUNG Chin-hung

**Title**

Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin)1  
Executive Officer I (District Council)2/  
Sha Tin District Office  
Executive Officer (Development)/  
Sha Tin District Office  
Chief Health Inspector (Sha Tin)3/  
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department  
Senior Town Planner/ Sha Tin/  
Planning Department  
Senior Estate Surveyor/SE (Atg)/  
District Lands Office, Sha Tin  
Senior Land Executive/ Project & SD/  
District Lands Office, Sha Tin  
Senior Housing Manager (Tai Po, North & Shatin 1)/  
Housing Department  
Engineer/ New Territories East (Distribution 1)/  
Water Supplies Department

**In Attendance by Invitation**

Mr YUEN Chi-tai, Humphrey

Ms SHUM Pui-yuk, Celia

Ms WONG Lai-kuen, Josephine

Ms LEE Chui-mei

**Title**

Assistant Curator I (Monument Building)2/  
Antiquities and Monuments Office  
Assistant Curator I (Archaeological Preservation)2/  
Antiquities and Monuments Office  
Assistant Curator I (Building Conservation)1/  
Antiquities and Monuments Office  
Assistant Curator I (Building Survey)2/  
Antiquities and Monuments Office

**Absent**

Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung

Mr WONG Ho-fung

Mr WONG Hok-lai, George

Mr YIP Wing

Mr CHENG Tsuk-man

Mr LAI Tsz-yan

Mr LI Chi-wang, Raymond

Ms NG Ting-lam

Mr TSANG Kit

Ms TSANG So-lai

**Title**

DC Member	(Application for leave of absence received)
”	( ” )
DC Vice-Chairman	( ” )
DC Member	( ” )
”	(No application for leave of absence received)
”	( ” )
”	( ” )
”	( ” )
”	( ” )
”	( ” )

**Action**

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

**Application for Leave of Absence**

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

Mr YIP Wing	Sickness
Mr Billy CHAN	Official commitment
Mr George WONG	”
Mr WONG Ho-fung	”

3. Members unanimously approved the applications for leave of absence submitted by the members above.

**Confirmation of the Minutes of the Last Meeting**

Confirmation of the Minutes of the 5th Meeting in 2020  
(DHC Minutes 5/2020)

4. Members unanimously endorsed Mr CHAN Pui-ming's proposed amendment put forward before the meeting and the draft minutes.

Confirmation of the Minutes of the 6th Meeting in 2020  
(DHC Minutes 6/2020)

5. Members unanimously endorsed Mr CHAN Pui-ming's proposed amendment put forward before the meeting and the draft minutes.

**Matters Arising**

Responses of Government Departments and Relevant Organisation to Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting  
(Paper No. DH 1/2021)

6. Members noted the above paper.

**Discussion Item**

Formation of Working Group under the Committee  
(Paper No. DH 2/2021)

7. The Chairman asked members to consider whether they agreed with the proposal made in the paper regarding the formation of the Working Group on Labour Affairs and Land and Economic Development of Sha Tin (standing working group), and the endorsement of its terms of reference.

8. Members unanimously endorsed the formation of the Working Group on Labour Affairs and Land and Economic Development of Sha Tin and its term of reference.

9. The Chairman proposed electing a convenor of the working group in accordance with the following criteria and procedures:

- (a) the convenor of the working group shall be a District Council (DC) Member;

- (b) each candidate shall be nominated by 1 member and seconded by at least 2 other members;
- (c) if there is only 1 candidate, the candidate shall be deemed elected ipso facto;
- (d) if there is more than 1 candidate, a vote will be taken on candidates in sequential order of their nomination by a show of hands among members present, and the candidate who wins an absolute majority of votes is elected; and
- (e) if there is more than 1 candidate, the convenor of the working group may be elected via the Electronic Voting System.

10. Members unanimously endorsed the election of the convenor of the working group in accordance with the above criteria and procedures.

11. The Chairman asked members to nominate candidates as the convenor of Working Group on Labour Affairs and Land and Economic Development of Sha Tin.

12. Mr Chirs MAK nominated Mr Johnny CHUNG as the convenor. Mr Johnny CHUNG withdrew from the election afterwards.

13. Mr YAU Man-chun nominated Ms LUK Tsz-tung as the convenor. Ms LUK Tsz-tung withdrew from the election afterwards.

14. The Chairman asked whether members had other nominations:

<u>Candidate</u>	<u>Nominator</u>	<u>Seconders</u>
Mr Felix CHOW	Mr SIN Cheuk-nam	Ms LUK Tsz-tung Mr Johnny CHUNG

15. As there was only one nomination, Mr Felix CHOW was elected ipso facto as the convenor of the working group.

16. Members unanimously endorsed the term of office of the above working group from 18 February this year to the end of the DHC's term of office on 31 December 2023.

### Motion

Motion by Mr CHUNG Lai-him, Johnny on Requesting Members of Town Planning Board with Potential Conflict of Interest to Withdraw from the Discussion on Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22  
(Paper No. DH 3/2021)

17. Mr Johnny CHUNG read the motion as follow:

- (a) Background: The consultation on the proposed amendments to 'Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22' just came to an end in December 2020. The Town Planning Board (TPB) will discuss the amendments in future meetings. Though the amendments do not involve any private land, the lot in the

amendments is very close to a lot of over 10 hectares on the hill possessed by Sun Hung Kai & Co. Ltd (SHK). The formation works will also include a section of Ma On Shan Tsuen Road whose formation works are originally supposed to be carried out by SHK. A conflict of interest is suspected if members of the TPB with SHK-related potential interests continue to participate in the discussion.

(b) Motion:

“The Development and Housing Committee of the Sha Tin District Council tables the following motion:

1. requesting the following members to withdraw from the discussion about the proposed amendments to ‘Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22’, including but not limited to:
  - NG Wing-mui, Winnie: Shareholder of The Kowloon Motor Bus Co. (1933) Limited under SHK;
  - LIU Ling-hong, Stephen, Vice-Chairman: previously in business relations with SHK; Managing Director of Rider Levett Bucknall Limited which had participated in the construction of Central Plaza (2016) owned by SHK;
  - CHEUNG Kwok-kit: with company in business relations with SHK (2018);
  - WONG Tin-cheung, Conrad: currently in business relations with SHK (2020);
  - WONG Yuen-shan, Stephen: Deputy Executive Director of Our Hong Kong Foundation where KWOK Ping-luen, Raymond, Chairman of SHK, is a Special Counsellor.”

Mr CHENG Chung-hang, Mr Chris MAK and Mr HUI Lap-san seconded the motion.

18. Mr MOK Kam-kwai abstained in the vote on the above motion.

19. Mr Chris MAK requested an open ballot. Four members present at the meeting supported it.

20. The Chairman announced that the above motion was endorsed by 23 votes in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention.

Members having voted in favour (23):

Mr TING Tsz-yuen, Mr YAU Man-chun, Mr SHEK William, Mr NG Kam-hung, Mr Jimmy SHAM, Mr LI Sai-hung, Mr Wilson LI, Mr Felix CHOW, Mr Michael YUNG, Mr HUI Lap-san, Mr HUI Yui-yu, Mr CHAN Pui-ming, Mr CHAN Wan-tung, Ms LUK Tsz-tung, Mr MAK Tsz-kin, Mr Chris MAK, Mr CHING Cheung-ying, Mr LUI Kai-wing, Mr Ricardo LIAO, Mr CHENG Chung-hang, Mr Johnny CHUNG, Mr SIN Cheuk-nam, Mr WAI Hing-cheung.

Members having voted against (0)

Members having abstained (1):

Mr MOK Kam-kwai

### Questions

Question to be Raised by Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael on the Development Project of Ma On Shan Village

(Paper No. DH 4/2021)

21. The Chairman welcomed the following to the meeting: Ms Hannah YICK, Senior Town Planner/Shan Tin of the Planning Department (PlanD); Ms Rosseter HO, Senior Estate Surveyor/SE (Atg) and Ms CHAN Sin-man, Senior Land Executive/Project & SD of the District Lands Office, Sha Tin (DLO/ST); Mr Humphrey YUEN, Assistant Curator I (Monument Building)<sup>2</sup>, Ms Celia SHUM, Assistant Curator I (Archaeological Preservation)<sup>2</sup>, Ms Josephine WONG, Assistant Curator I (Building Conservation)<sup>1</sup> and Ms LEE Chui-mei, Assistant Curator I (Building Survey)<sup>2</sup> of the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO).

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

- (a) he wished to know why the Secretariat had not combined his amended questions but instead presented them by way of an annex at the meeting;
- (b) he said he amended the questions because the Sha Tin District Office (STDO) amended the meeting date and the incident of the Bishop Hill service reservoir took place during the period. He then became concerned about the 8 800 buildings recorded by the AMO during its territory-wide survey; and
- (c) he asked how the Secretariat would follow up on the 2 replies to his questions.

23. Ms Angela LIU, Executive Officer (District Council)<sup>5</sup> of the STDO said the AMO provided a written reply at this meeting to Mr Michael YUNG's supplementary questions. Members could ask further questions about the supplementary information if necessary.

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

- (a) the paper regarding the supplementary questions was treated as an annex submitted at the meeting. He wished to know whether the paper would be uploaded to the website of the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) after the meeting, or whether it would be amended accordingly;
- (b) to prevent the impact of work-from-home arrangements for civil servants, he asked the Assistant District Officer (ADO) to urge the department to reply in a timely manner, so that the paper would not have to wait till the meeting to be distributed;
- (c) regarding Question (1), he wished to know about the distribution of 8 800 buildings, not 1 444 buildings, by district;

- (d) he wished to know the exact locations of the 186 buildings in the Sha Tin District yet to be graded as mentioned in the replies to Questions (3) and (4);
- (e) he asked how government departments would conserve historic buildings and facilitate development simultaneously, and what criteria the department had sent to the consulting firm. He wished to know, if the redevelopment worked, whether the pilings would affect the structures of the buildings and how to conserve the historic buildings; and
- (f) he had reviewed over 20 sets of documents concerning 8 plots of land in Ma On Shan proposed for development, but he had not seen opinions from the AMO. He was not sure whether it was because the AMO worked under the Development Bureau (DEVB).

25. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) he wished to know which media organisations were making video recordings in the public gallery;
- (b) he agreed with Mr Michael YUNG that it was not ideal to present replies to supplementary questions by way of an annex at the meeting. Since the relevant information was not available on the website, it would be hard for members of the public watching live to comprehend the discussion of the meeting without the information of the paper. He asked the Secretariat to follow up;
- (c) he said the AMO recorded over 8 800 historic buildings back then and selected 1 444 buildings, but a list concerning the Sha Tin District was not available. Recently, an ancient wall had been torn down at the University of Chicago's Hong Kong campus on Mount Davis. The AMO had failed to inform the university of the historic location, thereby causing damage to the historic structures;
- (d) he opined that it was not fair to the owner who knew nothing about the buildings being involved in a historic area until a historic structure was torn down. He suggested that the AMO upload the information of over 8 000 yet-to-be-graded historic buildings to the website, so that owners would know at the time of transactions that their buildings would probably be graded as historic ones; and
- (e) he wished to know, besides the AMO, whether other departments such as the Buildings Department and the Lands Department had kept a record of historic buildings on each lot, e.g. their designs and materials, so that the relevant departments could be in sync. Otherwise, the grading would just be a guideline. He cited the meeting papers concerning 8 plots of land in Ma On Shan proposed for development as an example. The papers did not mention there were columns of a mineral preparation plant there. He hoped for an institutional improvement.

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

- (a) he wished to know whether Nos. 31-33 Wu Kai Sha Village First Lane referred to Item 35 in the Table. That item was rated as Grade 3 historic buildings in 2010. There were mixed public opinions in 2011 when the proposed development was about to take place. He asked whether Item 35 had already been demolished. He pointed out that other demolished buildings, e.g. Item 68 in the Sha Tin District recorded in the Table (AMO No. 997), were remarked as demolished. He suggested adding a remark if Item 35 had been demolished;
- (b) he strongly agreed with the reply to Question (7) which said that To Tau Wan Village and the vicinity were of archaeological value. He hoped the AMO and relevant departments would step up environmental conservation. He pointed out that locations such as Starfish Cove and Wu Kai Sha Beach had different environmental conservation issues;
- (c) he thanked Mr Ric YAN of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department for his prompt follow-up action after receiving a case referred by him yesterday regarding garbage removal; and
- (d) he said he could find the information about the 1 444 historic buildings online but nothing about the 8 800 buildings. Of the 186 items concerning the Sha Tin District, the Table only showed 72. He hoped the AMO would provide the above information.

27. The views of the Vice-Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he said the “Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/23” was directly related to Items 31, 56, 57 and 58 in the Appendix. To his understanding, Grade 3 buildings referred to buildings of some merit and preservation in some form would be possible, including demolition and redevelopment. St. Joseph’s Church and Lutheran Yan Kwong Church were 2 different churches in Ma On Shan built around the same time by Ma On Shan miners. He did not understand why the former was categorised as Grade 2 whereas the latter Grade 3. He asked whether the higher grade resulted from management by non-government organisations, and whether Item 57 was rated as Grade 3 because no one took over the management yet;
- (b) he said Grade 3 historic buildings in Hong Kong were at a threshold over the past 10 years. He pointed out that Lutheran Yan Kwong Church in Ma On Shan Village was situated opposite an Evangelical Lutheran Church and had started to fall into disrepair. He was worried that it would not be conserved;
- (c) he said Items 56, 57 and 58 were all among contour lines between 800 and 280 metres. Mines 240ML and 110ML which were conserved had exits in the same area. Items 56, 57 and 58 could entirely be classified as the same location within the area of the said Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/23. He asked how the AMO would conserve the 3 items if they were to be rated as Grade 3 only;



- (d) the grading information of the items above was laid down in 2016. Regarding the amendments to the “Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22”, he wished to know the stance of the AMO. He said Items 58 and 56 were outside the wire mesh of Ma On Shan Village. He was worried that the 2 items would disappear when development took place within the area of the Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/23; and
- (e) as Mr Michael YUNG had mentioned, the AMO worked under the DEVB. He asked if this would affect the work of the AMO and how the STDC could provide assistance.

28. The Chairman said Mr CHAN Pui-ming had asked about the identities of the people making video recordings in the public gallery. The Secretariat responded by saying that only the press was allowed entry to the public gallery due to the pandemic. He wished to know whether the press was required to show their identity cards for entry. He said members had the right to know the identities of the people making video recordings. He said he did not mind their filming, but wanted to know their identities.

29. Mr Michael YUNG opined that those who claimed themselves to be the press were not necessarily the press. He believed that only registered members of the Hong Kong Journalists Association (HKJA) or other relevant associations, or online media, were qualified as the press. He said it would sound strange if someone called themselves the press without indicating which media organisations they were representing. He said the Secretariat once told him the names of the registered press at the Traffic and Transport Committee meeting.

30. Ms Angela LIU said that the public gallery was only open to the press, but not to the public currently due to the pandemic.

31. The views of Mr Chris MAK were summarised below:

- (a) he understood that some of the press might be self-employed without being backed up by any organisation. He asked whether he himself, a journalism major graduate, could send someone to make video recordings and then claim himself to be the press. He said the public gallery was not open to the public during the pandemic, and he asked whether members of the public would be suspected of impersonating the press if they made use of electronic devices and claimed themselves to be the press; and
- (b) he opined that a degree in journalism or qualifications given by certain organisations could verify the identity of the press. He was worried that the Secretariat’s current handling method might make it impossible to locate an appropriate organisation or person to liaise with when necessary in the future.

32. Mr CHAN Pui-ming supported allowing members of the public to be observers and the press to cover the meeting. He said nowadays a number of press conferences and news-reporting occasions required strict definition and verification of the identity of the press, which was different from the STDO’s way of handling it.

33. Mr CHIU Chu-pong said the Secretariat should have the names of the media organisations if it had registered them. Though the press did not have a registration system, he asked the Secretariat to weigh in on the registration criteria. The public gallery was closed to the public for now, so he asked whether members of the public would be allowed entry as long as they carried phones and cameras and claimed themselves to be the press.

34. Mr CHENG Chung-hang said he supported everyone to be a journalist, and opined that the press could carry out their monitoring function, but it would be necessary to know their filming purposes and broadcasting platforms. He did not think the press should be required to register with a certain association to become the press. He opined that the STDO was duty-bound to learn about their broadcasting platforms (e.g. whether they belonged to the papers or online media) as well as the websites or Facebook pages of online media organisations, etc. He urged the STDO to verify their information. He was concerned that casually recognising people as the press and letting them enter the public gallery during the pandemic might be a loophole.

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

- (a) he found it surprising that the STDO did not register the information of the media organisations. He opined that it would be difficult to trace in the event of a confirmed case without the basic information;
- (b) he asked if the ADO had anything to add to the Secretariat's reply; and
- (c) he asked when the Secretariat would amend his questions and upload the AMO's replies to the website.

36. Mr Wilson LI supported freedom of the press, and welcomed the press or members of the public to monitor DC Members' work in meetings and in the district. However, he felt astounded that the Secretariat said it did not have the information. He opined that the Secretariat should require basic registration, e.g. names of the media organisations and the journalists. It was mandatory to comply with the personal privacy and confidentiality concerned. He opined that basic registration was a must.

37. Ms Angela LIU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said she did not have in hand the detailed information on the press requested by DC Members, and the Secretariat handled the situation in accordance with the established procedures. It would register the press who wished to take photos, or make video or audio recordings in the public gallery. The information would also be used for anti-pandemic purposes, so that the Secretariat could contact the press when necessary; and
- (b) regarding the AMO's replies given at the meeting, the Secretariat would upload them to the STDC website after the meeting if the Chairman agreed.

38. The Chairman opined that registering the press was not only for anti-pandemic purposes. He was worried that members of the public would enter the public gallery by claiming themselves to be the press, and that the press identity might be abused. He opined that it was necessary for members to know whether the press was professionals, amateurs or other kinds.

39. Mr Chris MAK wished to know the STDO's definition of the press. He supported everyone to be a journalist, but the current arrangements did not allow members of the public to observe meetings, but the press was allowed to make video recordings. He said, for instance, members of the public could call themselves the press by holding their mobile phones without representing any organisation. He considered Facebook a broadcasting platform as well and deemed that the press should provide the names of their broadcasting platforms.

40. Mr CHENG Chung-hang felt disappointed at the Secretariat's saying that the registration was for anti-pandemic purposes. He said the public gallery was currently open to the press for video recording but not to the public. He pointed out that the current definition of the press varied, and opined that it could be relaxed. He did not mind the broadcasting platforms having specific target audience or not. He was disappointed about the STDO not having the relevant information.

41. Mr SIN Cheuk-nam hoped the Secretariat would have a standardised handling method. To his understanding, chairmen of some committees knew the names of the media organisations. He suggested discussing certain rules at the Finance and General Affairs Committee meeting, e.g. submitting verification documents prior to entering the public gallery for news coverage.

42. Mr Jimmy SHAM said that members were willing to be monitored by the press, but wished to know the names of the media organisations. He asked the Secretariat to get the names before meetings, and he stressed that the press, no matter what kind, had news-reporting rights.

43. Mr CHIU Chu-pong wished to know the Secretariat's registration criteria and the names of the media organisations. He said journalists were required to show their press passes when entering the court. He asked if the Secretariat had the same arrangement.

44. Mr Michael YUNG disapproved of the Secretariat replying that it did not have the information in hand. He suggested that the Secretariat and the ADO be given time to prepare, and members' questions be answered by government departments first and then by the Secretariat and the ADO.

45. The Chairman welcomed the press to be present as observers, but wished to know which media organisations they were. He asked departmental representatives to respond to members' questions first.

46. Ms Josephine WONG said the grading of historic buildings was conducted by the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) and an independent Historic Buildings Assessment Panel based on the following 6 criteria: historical interest, architectural merit, group value, social value and local interest, authenticity and rarity.

47. Ms LEE Chui-mei said that the AMO carried out a territory-wide survey of historic buildings from 1996 to 2000, during which some 8 800 buildings were recorded. The survey was more than 20 years old. The AMO had started in late December 2019 to review those 8 800 buildings which were recorded but not yet graded, including site visits and studies. The work was still ongoing at the moment which would be efficiently and effectively completed.

48. Ms Hannah YICK said the Government would comprehensively consider the impact of a proposed development on all aspects, including historic buildings. Regarding the amendments to the “Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22”, the area of Items A to H did not involve any graded historic buildings. The Government already consulted the opinions of different professional departments, including the AMO, when considering the amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan. As for the columns of a mineral preparation plant which might be affected in the future due to the expansion of Ma On Shan Tsuen Road, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) would conduct a heritage impact assessment (HIA) based on the AMO’s opinions at the detailed design stage, and would carry out mitigation measures during the works period to minimise the impact on the historic structures.

49. Ms Rosseter HO said the AMO had provided the information on the 1 444 historic buildings to the DLO/ST. The DLO/ST, upon receiving the applications, would review whether they would involve those 1 444 historic buildings. If yes, it would seek the AMO’s opinions.

50. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) he opined that it was rather devious of the PlanD to say that the amendments to the “Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22” were not within a heritage-affected area. He opined that the works together with the actual building area should be taken into consideration;
- (b) he asked, apart from the DLO/ST, whether the Buildings Department had also kept a list of the 1 444 graded buildings. He wished to know whether these departments had kept a list of the 8 800 historic buildings which had been recorded but not yet graded. He asked how the departments without the relevant information would conserve ungraded buildings when they needed to demolish buildings for building houses, bridges and roads; and
- (c) he hoped the department would use the incident of the University of Chicago as a reference. The DLO/ST should give owners information involving monuments in the event of title transfers or tenancy, so that they would have the relevant information before any redevelopment or repairs took place.

51. Mr CHENG Chung-hang opined that the AMO did not illustrate clearly the distinction between Grade 2 and Grade 3 historic buildings. He suggested that the AMO provide some monument grading reports after the meeting to enable members’ better understanding of the grading criteria and the work of the AMO. He said that members were delighted to offer assistance.

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

- (a) he asked whether the AMO had carried out an HIA regarding CE 80/2014 “Site Formation and Infrastructural Works for Eight Housing Sites in Ma On Shan – Feasibility Study” of the CEDD prior to the amendments to the “Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22”. If yes, when the assessment was carried out and what the findings were. He would like to know how to access the report. If no, what the reasons were;
- (b) he pointed out that the CEDD had provided a web link in its reply to Question (A) A. He did not understand why the CEDD had not listed the coordinates direct; and
- (c) he wanted to know what would potentially happen to the proposed development items C, D and E in case of landslides. He recalled mud once crashing from Ma On Shan Tsuen Road to Ma On Shan Road due to heavy rain when typhoon warning signal No. 8 was hoisted. Later, he was informed by the CEDD that a slope nearby had been involved. He asked whether the department had conducted risk assessment for building houses at the mentioned site and whether the building structures would be affected should there be a landslide.

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

- (a) he said that members attached great importance to antiquities and monuments. The 6 criteria put forward by the AMO had a great significance to the world, including the people’s history and legacy of Hong Kong. At present, St Joseph’s Church was rated as Grade 2, and the church on the other side was rated as Grade 3. He urged the AMO to keep up with its efforts in defending antiquities and monuments in Hong Kong; and
- (b) the AMO stated in Question (5) in the Appendix that 3 buildings had been demolished in the Sha Tin District. He wanted to know if they corresponded to the Table as follows, i.e. Nam Ancestral Hall, No. 121 Sheung Wo Che to Item 68; No. 11 Kak Tin Village Third Street to Item 55; and Nos. 31-33 Wu Kai Sha Village First Lane to Item 35. If yes, he did not understand why only some of the items were remarked as demolished.

54. The views of the Vice-Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he would like to know which relevant departments and what questions the DLO/ST would ask in relation to the monuments involved in the amendments to the “Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22”;
- (b) he said the PlanD had claimed that the monuments were not within the area, but certain parts of the area were in fact connected, and the boundary could not be simply drawn with a line or a plastic partition. He found the response of the PlanD strange;

- (c) he opined that the exterior walls of Mines 240ML and 110 ML in Ma On Shan, which were currently rated as Grade 3, should be regarded as the same area. He wanted to know the risk of demolition. The development plan of the current amendments to the “Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22” included the only rather intact iron mines in Hong Kong. He asked how the 3 departments would conserve the historic buildings;
- (d) he asked how the AMO would conserve Items 30, 31, 56, 57 and 58 regarding the amendments to the “Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22”. Having seen the condition of Grade 2 and Grade 3 monuments in the past 10 years, he had reservations about the determination of the AMO to conserve heritage; and
- (e) he pointed out that the AMO had listed 72 items, and 19 of which were reservoirs unrelated to the amendments to the “Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22”.

55. Ms Josephine WONG said that the demolished historic buildings listed in the Appendix could correspond to the Table as follows, i.e. Nos. 31-33 Wu Kai Sha Village First Lane to Item 35; No. 11 Kak Tin Village Third Street to Item 55; and Nam Ancestral Hall, No. 121 Sheung Wo Che to Item 68. Among which, No. 121 Sheung Wo Che had originally been proposed to be a Grade 3 historic building. However, it was found upon site inspection that the building had already been demolished. Therefore, the AAB would not conduct further grading assessment.

56. Ms Rosseter HO said that the DLO/ST would see whether the areas in question involved monuments upon receipt of applications. If yes, the AMO would be consulted, and their professional advice would be relayed to the applicants for follow-up actions. The DLO/ST would also pass the applicants’ response to the relevant departments for consideration.

57. Ms Hannah YICK said that in the feasibility study on housing development in Ma On Shan, the CEDD had carried out a preliminary HIA of the historic buildings near the amendments to the “Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22”. The PlanD had also passed the information to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for consideration. Members could refer to Paper No. 4/20 of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee of the TPB dated 21 August 2020, in which the impacts on heritage sites brought by housing development were mentioned, including the possibly affected columns of the mineral preparation plant due to the widening of Ma On Shan Tsuen Road. It was also mentioned that the CEDD would conduct a detailed HIA during the detailed design stage.

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

- (a) he learned that the CEDD was responsible for the HIA. He did not understand why there was no reply when the AMO was asked if it had carried out the assessment;
- (b) he cited the incident of falling asbestos sheets where the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) and the DLO/ST were willing to provide assistance. However, he had put in tremendous efforts in successfully inviting representatives of the AMO to the site for an inspection of the internal structure;

- (c) he opined that the detailed assessment mentioned by the PlanD just now should not wait until the stage of detailed design. He said that the development might also entail site formation and affect the antiquities and monuments. He was of the view that the department at present had not submitted the information to the TPB for its full consideration whether the development would exert an irreversible influence on the historic buildings of the mining industry in Hong Kong, which made it difficult for him to support the development; and
- (d) he added that if the AMO was not able to respond at the meeting, it should attend the next one.

59. The views of the Vice-Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) regarding the public consultation on the amendments to the “Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22”, a total of 5 699 representations were received with 90% objection. The common concern was that the ungraded buildings or those with a lower grade required conservation through joint cooperation among different departments with the TPB, instead of the AMO alone. As shown in the incident of the University of Chicago Hong Kong Campus, the potential changes to Ma On Shan Iron Mines could be imagined. He said that the AMO sent 4 representatives from different fields to attend the current meeting. Although they should have sufficient representation, they did not make explicit their stances; and
- (b) he asked whether the AMO would adopt the same criteria if members of the public still attached great importance to the heritage and monuments upon conclusion of the second-round consultation. There were currently very few heritage sites granted the highest grade. He was worried that once the works commenced, the facilities of the mines of over 50 years such as the cable car metal frame, the mineral preparation plant and its pond would be affected. He said that the second-round consultation would come to an end soon, and urged members to express their views.

60. Mr Wilson LI agreed with the Vice-Chairman. He opposed the housing development plan of Ma On Shan Village. The Table provided by the AMO showed that Items 35, 55 and 68 had already been demolished. However, if Item 55, 11 Kak Tin Village Third Street, had been demolished, a remark should have been included for easy reference. Similarly, the same applied to Item 35. He hoped that the AMO’s Table could be clearer to avoid unnecessary and fruitless site visits.

61. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) he was aware of the incident mentioned by Mr Michael YUNG previously. The asbestos sheets of the rooftop of St. Joseph’s Church in Ma On Shan Village spalled because of a typhoon. At the time, the Environmental Protection Department, the ArchSD and the DLO/ST were willing to assist with the repairs, but they had to invite the AMO through the DEVB to send staff to the scene for investigation. He asked the AMO how those ungraded buildings would be handled; and

- (b) he wished to know information on the ungraded buildings, and whether they were within the scope of the amendments to the “Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22”. He asked whether the relevant information would be given to the TPB. Regarding some historic sites discovered by green groups, he asked whether the AMO would proactively go to Ma On Shan Village for grading. He hoped that the AMO would be receptive to opinions and improve its workflow.

62. Ms Josephine WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that regarding the information in relation to the Appendix and the Table, the AMO would provide supplementary information after the meeting and pass it to the Secretariat to upload to the website;
- (b) she added that the grading system of the AMO was of administrative nature to determine the heritage value and conservation need of historic buildings in Hong Kong. The grading would not affect the buildings’ titles, rights to manage, rights to use, and rights to develop;
- (c) upon receipt of development proposals, the AMO would give technical advice from the perspective of heritage conservation. The report of HIA mentioned by the PlanD previously was submitted by the department responsible for works development. Generally speaking, reports of HIA would be submitted to the AAB for consideration. Both the AMO and the AAB would give advice; and
- (d) the Government had an internal mechanism in place to monitor the situations of graded historic buildings. The AMO would give technical advice from the perspective of heritage conservation upon receipt of referrals from departments such as the Buildings Department, the LandsD, the PlanD and the TPB. The AMO would also review the current situations of graded buildings through usual duties such as site inspections.

(Post-meeting note: On 19 February 2021, the Secretariat received the supplementary information on the Appendix and the Table provided by the AMO, and uploaded it to the STDC website.)

63. Mr Michael YUNG said that an HIA was mentioned in Paper No. 4/20 of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee of the TPB, but he was not able to find the separate HIA. The AMO mentioned just now that it had conducted the relevant HIA. He wanted to know how to access the document. As there was no representative of the CEDD present at the meeting, he hoped that the PlanD would respond.

64. Ms Hannah YICK said that members should ask the CEDD about the paper.

65. Members noted the above paper.



Question to be Raised by Mr WONG Hok-lai, George on the Works of Mei Tin Estate Phase 4 and Tsuen Nam Road  
(Paper No. DH 5/2021)

66. The Chairman said Mr George WONG had applied prior to the meeting for postponing his question to the next meeting for discussion. He agreed to the arrangement.

**Information Paper**

Population of Public Housing Estates and Private Sector Participation Scheme Courts in Sha Tin  
(Paper No. DH 6/2021)

67. Members noted the above paper.

68. Ms Angela LIU said that regarding the arrangements for observing the STDC meetings, members could refer to Order 50 of the Sha Tin District Council Standing Orders (the Standing Orders), which stated that the meetings “shall be open to the public (including the media)”. The information registered by the Secretariat would also be applicable to anti-pandemic purposes to facilitate contacts with the persons concerned when necessary.

69. Mr Wilson LI said that members welcomed media reporting, but he had reservations about the Secretariat’s response that the registration was for anti-pandemic purposes. He opined that simple registration, including the names of media organisations and visitors, was a basic administrative procedure.

70. Mr Ricardo LIAO added that members should have the right to know the identity of the press. Members needed to know whether they were filmed and by whom, and to protect themselves against any breach of personal information. He said that information on journalists would also be obtained in government departments’ press conferences. He disagreed that the registration was for anti-pandemic purposes.

71. Ms WONG Man-huen said that she was a former journalist. She recalled the first STDC full council meeting in 2020 when journalists had to register in the lobby on that day. As there were too many people in the public gallery, some journalists were allowed entry only with members’ assistance. As far as she was aware, media registration was required for any government press conferences. The police had earlier revised the Police General Orders which stated that only sizeable organisations could participate in press conferences. She asked the STDO whether registration or verification of journalists was deemed unnecessary.

72. Mr CHENG Chung-hang was dissatisfied that the Secretariat had not enquired about the identities of the journalists immediately. He considered that had to do with the guideline. If the public gallery was open to the press only during the pandemic, the identities of the journalists should be enquired about.

73. Mr CHIU Chu-pong said that the Secretariat could choose not to disclose the identities of the persons concerned. However, he wished to know whether they had registered and were required to produce their work permits. If no, he hoped that persons who were not able to produce proofs would not be denied entry in the future.

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

- (a) he said that the STDC Secretariat did not handle the media registration in accordance with Order 15(3) of the Standing Orders: “In the course of a meeting of the Council, all persons attending or observing the meeting at the place of the meeting shall switch off all devices which may emit sound and shall not use any telecommunications devices for conversation. Council members and members of the public (except the press) intending to carry sound or video recorders into the conference room shall notify the Secretariat of the Council in writing before the meeting, so that the Secretariat could inform the Chairman and Council members”. According to the Chairman’s brief, where applicable, the Secretariat had to point out that some reporters, being present as observers in the public gallery, were taking photographs, or making video or audio recordings; and
- (b) he was of the view that the crux of the problem lied in how the Secretariat defined the identity of the press. According to what Ms WONG Man-huen said, he learned that a work permit stating the names of the person and the organisation as well as the method of identity verification would be issued by the employing organisation. Anyone not representing any organisation, or freelancers, could produce other proofs such as a HKJA card.

75. Ms Angela LIU said that members’ opinions would be relayed to the Secretariat.

**Date of Next Meeting**

76. The date and time of the next meeting was to be confirmed.

77. The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 pm.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat  
STDC 13/15/50

April 2021