

**Minutes of the 6th Meeting of
the Sha Tin District Council in 2020**

Date : 20 August 2020 (Thursday)
Time : 2:30 pm
Venue : Sha Tin District Council Conference Room
 4/F, Sha Tin Government Offices

<u>Present</u>	<u>Time of joining the meeting</u>	<u>Time of leaving the meeting</u>
Chairman : Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	2:30 pm	6:20 pm
Vice-Chairman : Mr WONG Hok-lai, George	2:30 pm	5:33 pm
Members : Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	2:30 pm	5:25 pm
Mr CHAN Nok-hang	2:30 pm	6:13 pm
Mr CHAN Pui-ming	2:30 pm	6:20 pm
Mr CHAN Wan-tung	2:30 pm	6:20 pm
Mr CHENG Chung-hang	2:38 pm	6:19 pm
Mr CHENG Tsuk-man	2:48 pm	5:20 pm
Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa	2:30 pm	6:20 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong	2:30 pm	5:25 pm
Mr CHOW Hiu-laam, Felix	2:30 pm	6:20 pm
Mr CHUNG Lai-him, Johnny	2:42 pm	6:20 pm
Mr HUI Lap-san	2:42 pm	6:20 pm
Mr HUI Yui-yu	2:30 pm	5:25 pm
Mr LAI Tsz-yan	3:31 pm	5:20 pm
Dr LAM Kong-kwan	2:45 pm	4:01 pm
Mr LI Sai-hung	2:30 pm	5:19 pm
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	2:30 pm	6:20 pm
Mr LO Tak-ming	2:57 pm	5:25 pm
Mr LO Yuet-chau	2:30 pm	6:09 pm
Mr LUI Kai-wing	2:30 pm	5:34 pm
Ms LUK Tsz-tung	2:30 pm	5:30 pm
Mr MAK Tsz-kin	2:30 pm	5:20 pm
Mr MAK Yun-pui, Chris	2:42 pm	5:20 pm
Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS	2:46 pm	6:20 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung	2:30 pm	5:22 pm
Ms NG Ting-lam	2:54 pm	6:20 pm
Mr SHAM Tsz-kit, Jimmy	2:30 pm	6:20 pm
Mr SHEK William	2:30 pm	6:20 pm
Mr SIN Cheuk-nam	2:30 pm	6:20 pm
Mr TING Tsz-yuen	2:30 pm	5:20 pm
Mr TSANG Kit	2:41 pm	5:25 pm
Ms TSANG So-lai	2:48 pm	5:17 pm
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	2:30 pm	6:20 pm
Mr WONG Ho-fung	2:39 pm	5:19 pm
Ms WONG Man-huen	3:23 pm	4:21 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun	2:30 pm	3:39 pm
Mr YEUNG Sze-kin	2:51 pm	6:20 pm

Present

Secretary : Mr YIP Wing
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael
Mr YUEN Chun-kit, Derek

**Time of joining
the meeting**

2:30 pm
2:30 pm
Senior Executive Officer (District Council)/
Sha Tin District Office

**Time of leaving
the meeting**

4:18 pm
6:20 pm

In Attendance

Dr WONG Chin-kiu, Janet, JP
Mr WONG Tin-pui, Simon
Ms WONG Yuen-shan, Candice
Ms CHAN Kam-kuk, Tammy

Mr IP Cheuk-yu

Mr LAI Wing-chi, Derek

Mr CHAN Kai-lam, Allan

Ms LEUNG Yee-lee, Maggie

Mr. MAK Cheuk-kai, Ryan

Mr LEUNG Siu-ming, David
Ms LEUNG So-ping, Selina

Ms CHAN Siu-kin, Ester

Ms WONG Sau-kuen, Joe

Ms WONG Kam-lai

Mr NG Hon-lai, Patrick

Mr HAR Sung-fu, Haven

Ms CHU Kam-seung

Mr WONG Kwok-wai, Wilson
Ms CHU Ha-fan, Jessica

Mr HO Kin-nam, David

Title

District Officer (Sha Tin)
Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin)1
Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin)2
District Commander (Shatin) (Acting)/
Hong Kong Police Force
Police Community Relations Officer (Shatin
District)/ Hong Kong Police Force
District Environmental Hygiene
Superintendent (Sha Tin)/ Food and
Environmental Hygiene Department
Chief Manager/ Management (Tai Po, North,
Sha Tin)/ Housing Department
District Social Welfare Officer (Shatin)/
Social Welfare Department
Senior Architect/ Ho & Partners Architects
Engineers & Development Consultants Limited
Architect (Works)8/ Home Affairs Department
Senior Executive Officer (Planning)21/
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Deputy District Leisure Manager
(District Support) Sha Tin/
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
District Leisure Manager (Sha Tin)/
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Chief Senior School Development Officer
(Shatin)/ Education Bureau
Principal Transport Officer/ New Territories 1/
Transport Department
Senior Engineer/7 (North)/ Civil Engineering
and Development Department
Administration Assistant/ Lands (Acting)
(District Lands Office, Sha Tin)/
Lands Department
District Lands Officer/ Sha Tin
District Planning Officer (Sha Tin, Tai Po and
North)/ Planning Department
Executive Officer I (District Council)1/
Sha Tin District Office

Absent

Mr LI Chi-wang, Raymond
Mr LIAO Pak-hong, Ricardo

(Application for leave of absence received)
(")

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives of government departments to the meeting. Owing to the epidemic situation, the meeting originally scheduled for 23 July this year was postponed to today.

2. The Chairman welcomed Dr Janet WONG, the new District Officer (Sha Tin), Ms Candice WONG, the new Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin)²; Ms WONG Kam-lai, the new Chief Senior School Development Officer (Shatin) of the Education Bureau; Mr Patrick NG, the new Principal Transport Officer/New Territories 1 of the Transport Department and Ms Tammy CHAN, District Commander (Shatin) (Acting) of the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF), who all attended the meeting for the first time.

Application for Leave of Absence

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

Mr Ricardo LIAO	Sickness
Mr Raymond LI	Official commitment

4. The Council unanimously approved the applications for leave of absence submitted by the Members above.

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

- (a) he suggested rearranging the agenda items by dealing with the District Facilities and Improvement Works Proposals first, so as to discuss the funding for extension of the sitting-out area at Ma Kam Street, Ma On Shan; and
- (b) as his question submitted in April was not included in this agenda, he asked the Chairman whether the two questions raised by him were allowed to be handled together at the next meeting.

6. The Chairman said that each Member could only raise one question at the meeting. He suggested that Mr CHAN Pui-ming's second question be handled during resumption of the meeting. If the priority of agenda item 2(c) was to be changed, it had to be approved by at least half of the Members present at this meeting.

7. Mr MAK Tsz-kin asked the Chairman to consider approving the inclusion of the discussion on intake of Chun Yeung Estate and the arrangement of using it as a quarantine centre in the agenda under Order 13(2) of the Sha Tin District Council Standing Orders (Standing Orders).

8. The views of Mr YAU Man-chun were summarised below:

- (a) he asked the District Officer to respond to Members' jointly signed letter regarding Cap. 599C of the Laws of Hong Kong which stipulated that the District Councils were granted exemption and might convene meetings; and

- (b) as the Sha Tin District Office (STDO) did not lend the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) conference room to the Working Group on Public Relations and Publicity (WGPRP) for live streaming of Meet the Public, he felt bewildered.
9. The views of Mr Michael YUNG were summarised below:
- (a) he gave advice on the arrangement of meetings with the Bureau and the Department in the capacity of the Chairman of Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) on Monday;
 - (b) regarding Section 61 of the District Councils Ordinance which covered the local community and people's well-being, he asked the Chairman to consider making use of the meeting time of the TTC next Tuesday to call the resumption of meeting so as to discuss the intake of Chun Yeung Estate and the arrangement of using it as a quarantine centre; and
 - (c) he wished to put forward a provisional motion.
10. The views of Mr Chris MAK were summarised below:
- (a) last week, he requested the STDO to draft the circulation paper of the Working Group on Enhancing the Public Health (WGEPH) in Sha Tin District within two working days. He was dissatisfied that he received the circulation paper just before the meeting;
 - (b) he was worried that the whole project might not be able to be completed by 30 September; and
 - (c) he asked the Chairman to help inquire into the progress of the WGEPH in Sha Tin District, so that the most anti-epidemic supplies could be purchased within the shortest period of time.
11. The Chairman agreed to deal with the provisional motion put forward by Mr Michael YUNG on adjusting the order of the agenda items. He asked Mr YUNG whether he suggested that "Sha Tin District Police Action Plan for 2020" be the last item to be dealt with.
12. Mr Michael YUNG pointed out that according to Order 32(1) of the Standing Orders, the Council might appoint committees for the purpose of carrying out its functions and might delegate any of its functions to any committee. Therefore, he suggested in the provisional motion that "Sha Tin District Police Action Plan for 2020" be arranged to be discussed at the meeting of the District Facilities Management and Security Affairs Committee (DFMSC).
13. Ms Tammy CHAN said that the Police was pleased to attend the STDC full council meeting, but would not attend the DFMSC meeting. She suggested that if the agenda item could not be dealt with at this meeting, it could be postponed to the next meeting.
14. Mr MAK Tsz-kin appealed to Members present to support the provisional motion.

15. Mr YAU Man-chun asked the Chairman to appeal to the Police to attend the DFMSC meeting so that each committee could perform its own duties.

16. Ms Tammy CHAN said that the Police had given a written reply in response to attending the DFMSC meeting. She also said that the Police was willing to briefly introduce the contents of the “Sha Tin District Police Action Plan for 2020”.

17. The Chairman disagreed with the Police’s stance of being unwilling to attend the DFMSC meetings. He hoped that, through the STDO and the DFMSC, the arrangement for the Police to attend the meetings would be followed up.

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

- (a) he stated that the provisional motion was proposed by Mr MAK Tsz-kin. He asked the Police to give a written reply on attendance of the meetings; and
- (b) with reference to the media report, he considered that the provisional motion complied with the updated District Council internal guidelines.

19. Mr MAK Tsz-kin proposed the provisional motion as follows:

“Now, under Order 13(4) of the Sha Tin District Council Standing Orders, “Subject to the consent of the Chairman and over half of the members of the Council present at the meeting, a member may raise a provisional motion related to the agenda in the course of the meeting.”

Background

On 21 January 2020, a 39-year-old male patient who lived in Wuhan travelled from Wuhan to Shenzhenbei by Train No. G1015 and transferred from Shenzhenbei to Hong Kong by Train No. G5607. Upon arrival, the staff of the Department of Health found that he had a fever. He was sent to hospital and was a confirmed case of novel coronavirus infection. Before that, the Government had called those infected with the new virus in Wuhan earlier this year cluster of pneumonia cases in Wuhan (for details, please refer to <https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202001/02/P2020010200773.htm>). Therefore, the virus was commonly called Wuhan Pneumonia.

On 18 August 2020, the Government announced that intake would be arranged for Blocks 4 and 5 of Chun Yeung Estate, that is, Chun Sze House and Chun Wu House, at the end of the month, while Blocks 1 to 3, that is, Chun Yat House, Chun Yi House and Chun Shan House would remain as quarantine centres. For details, please refer to <https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202008/18/P2020081800549.htm>. As there is no precedent for such an arrangement, we are worried that this anti-epidemic arrangement will pose health risk to the potential tenants and renovation workers of Chun Sze House and Chun Wu House. Therefore, we request that a resumption of meeting be held next week and the relevant departments be invited to the District Council to briefly introduce the intake and anti-epidemic arrangements.

As at 19 August 2020, there were 4 587 confirmed cases, among which 282 were from the Sha Tin District. It can be seen that the epidemic situation is very serious. The Government has also introduced the work-from-home measure, and has arranged with the Chairman of the District Council to cut down the District Council meeting schedule to one meeting per week and two hours per meeting. Under this requirement, we have reviewed the agenda of the sixth full council meeting on 20 August 2020, and we consider that it may not be finished within two hours. As such, we propose the following adjustment to the agenda in order to comply with the Sha Tin District Office's anti-epidemic arrangement, and propose that the resumption of meeting be held next week to discuss the intake and quarantine arrangements of Chun Yeung Estate.

Motion

On 23 January 2020, the second Sha Tin District Council full council meeting, under Order 32(1) of the Sha Tin District Council Standing Orders, i.e., "The Council may appoint committees for the purpose of carrying out its functions and may delegate any of its functions to a committee.", appointed the District Facilities Management and Security Affairs Committee to discuss the Sha Tin District Police Action Plan for 2020 at its next meeting, so that the Council could function effectively.

Now, under Order 13(2) of the Sha Tin District Council Standing Orders, "Subject to the consent of more than half of the members of the Council present at the meeting, the Chairman may at the commencement and in the course of the meeting approve the inclusion of an item in the agenda or adjustment of the order of business on the agenda.", the Sha Tin District Council makes the following adjustment and addition:

1. the STDC to Serve as Event Supporter
2. Schedule of Meetings of the STDC for 2021
3. 2020-2021 District Facilities and Improvement Works Proposals
4. Arrangements Concerning the Intake of Chun Yeung Estate and the Requisition of the Estate as a Quarantine Centre
5. 2020-2021 Work Plan of the STDO

The resumption of the Sha Tin District Council full council meeting will be arranged next week to urgently discuss the Arrangements Concerning the Intake of Chun Yeung Estate and the Requisition of the Estate as a Quarantine Centre."

Mr LUI Kai-wing, Mr Michael YUNG, Ms LUK Tsz-tung, Mr CHAN Pui-ming, Mr CHAN Nok-hang, Mr Felix CHOW, Mr SIN Cheuk-nam, Ms TSANG So-lai, Mr Chris MAK, Mr HUI Lap-san, Mr Billy CHAN, Mr TING Tsz-yuen, Mr CHIU Chu-pong and Mr WONG Ho-fung seconded the motion.

20. The Chairman asked Mr MAK Tsz-kin to clarify that whether item 4 concerning Chun Yeung Estate in his proposed agenda was to be discussed at this meeting or the resumption of meeting scheduled for next Tuesday.

21. Mr Michael YUNG pointed out that if Members agreed with the postponement of the TTC meeting, he suggested swapping item 4 and item 5 so that the Chun Yeung Estate issue would be arranged to be discussed at the resumption of meeting next Tuesday so that the concerned department could make preparation. He asked for an open ballot, and was supported by 4 Members present at the meeting.

22. Mr MAK Tsz-kin accepted Mr Michael YUNG's proposal and amended the provisional motion as follows:

“On 23 January 2020, the second Sha Tin District Council full council meeting, under Order 32(1) of the Sha Tin District Council Standing Orders, i.e., “The Council may appoint committees for the purpose of carrying out its functions and may delegate any of its functions to a committee.”, appointed the District Facilities Management and Security Affairs Committee to discuss the Sha Tin District Police Action Plan for 2020 at its next meeting, so that the Council could function effectively.

Now, under Order 13(2) of the Sha Tin District Council Standing Orders, “Subject to the consent of more than half of the members of the Council present at the meeting, the Chairman may at the commencement and in the course of the meeting approve the inclusion of an item in the agenda or adjustment of the order of business on the agenda.”, the Sha Tin District Council makes the following adjustment and addition:

1. the STDC to Serve as Event Supporter
2. Schedule of Meetings of the STDC for 2021
3. 2020-2021 District Facilities and Improvement Works Proposals
4. 2020-2021 Work Plan of the STDO
5. Arrangements Concerning the Intake of Chun Yeung Estate and the Requisition of the Estate as a Quarantine Centre

The resumption of the Sha Tin District Council full council meeting will be arranged next week to urgently discuss the Arrangements Concerning the Intake of Chun Yeung Estate and the Requisition of the Estate as a Quarantine Centre.”

Mr LUI Kai-wing, Mr Michael YUNG, Ms LUK Tsz-tung, Mr CHAN Pui-ming, Mr CHAN Nok-hang, Mr Felix CHOW, Mr SIN Cheuk-nam, Ms TSANG So-lai, Mr Chris MAK, Mr HUI Lap-san, Mr Billy CHAN, Mr TING Tsz-yuen, Mr CHIU Chu-pong and Mr WONG Ho-fung seconded the motion.

23. The Chairman announced that the above provisional motion was endorsed by 31 affirmative votes, and 4 Members did not press the button to vote.

Affirmative vote (31 Members):

Mr TING Tsz-yuen, Mr YAU Man-chun, Mr SHEK William, Ms NG Ting-lam, Mr NG Kam-hung, Mr Jimmy SHAM, Mr LI Sai-hung, Mr Wilson LI, Mr Felix CHOW, Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Mr MAK Tsz-kin, Mr Chris MAK, Mr SIN Cheuk-nam, Mr Johnny CHUNG, Ms TSANG So-lai, Mr HUI Lap-san, Mr George WONG, Mr WONG Ho-fung, Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa, Mr LO Yuet-chau, Mr CHAN Nok-hang, Mr CHAN Wan-tung, Mr CHAN Pui-ming, Mr YIP Wing, Mr LUI Kai-wing, Mr Michael YUNG, Mr CHENG Chung-hang, Mr CHENG Tsuk-man,

Ms LUK Tsz-tung, Mr LO Tak-ming, Mr WAI Hing-cheung.

Members who did not press the button to vote (4):

Mr TSANG Kit, Mr YEUNG Sze-kin, Mr CHING Cheung-ying, Mr Billy CHAN.

24. Dr Janet WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) currently, as the epidemic situation was still serious, it was a difficult decision for the Government to arrange meetings. The number of Members who had just voted was already over 30. Together with the government representatives in attendance and the reporters present, there were 50 to 60 persons in the conference room. Since some experts had pointed out that virus variation and the risk still existed, the Government suggested that the number of large-scale meetings should be minimised as far as possible. However, the STDO had made a special arrangement to allow the holding of meetings to deal with urgent and important matters;
- (b) through the deployment of manpower, the STDO continued to provide urgent and necessary services, for example, visiting Mei Fung House, Mei Lam Estate and Hin Hing House, Hin Keng Estate on 13 August to provide testing service for the residents of the two buildings; and
- (c) the STDO wished to minimise the number of large-scale meetings as far as possible so as to work together with relevant parties to keep the epidemic situation under control.

25. The Chairman asked the District Officer (Sha Tin) to actively support the launch of work of the WGEPH in Sha Tin District so as to address social urgent needs.

Discussion Items

The STDC to Serve as Event Supporter
(Paper No. STDC 63/2020)

26. The Chairman asked Members to consider whether they endorsed that the STDC was to serve as the event supporter of the following events, and the logo of the STDC was to be displayed in the related publicity activities and on the publicity materials: (i) “Breathe in • Tobacco Out” organised by the Hong Kong Council on Smoking and Health; (ii) “2020 HK Sign Language Day” organised by the Hong Kong Society for the Deaf; (iii) “Fun D Run” organised by the Hang Seng University of Hong Kong; and (iv) “The Hong Kong Pride Parade 2020” organised by the Hong Kong Pride Parade 2020 Organizing Committee. He also asked Members to declare their interest.

27. Mr Jimmy SHAM declared that he was a member of the Hong Kong Pride Parade 2020 Organizing Committee.

28. Mr Derek YUEN, Senior Executive Officer (District Council) of the STDO said that since the Letter of No Objection for “The Hong Kong Pride Parade 2020” was yet to be issued by the HKPF, it was suggested in the paper that the event organiser inform the STDC to serve as the event supporter and to authorise the display of the STDC logo in the related publicity activities and on the publicity materials of the parade, on condition that it presented a valid Letter of No Objection to the STDC and undertook to comply with the requirements and conditions stipulated in the letter. In addition, the event organiser should undertake to adopt anti-epidemic measures under the current health care directives issued by the Department of Health (DH) in the course of the event.

29. Mr Jimmy SHAM said that currently, 12 District Councils were in support of serving as the event supporter of “The Hong Kong Pride Parade 2020”, and requested that the event would be held only after a Letter of No Objection was issued by the Police. He undertook that the parade would comply with the Police’s requirements and the anti-epidemic directives. If no Letter of No Objection was obtained, the public meeting might be changed to an online meeting.

30. Mr NG Kam-hung would like to know whether all event organisers which invited the STDC to serve as the event supporter in the future were required to provide government documents in seeking approval.

31. The Chairman pointed out that in Hong Kong, filing an application with the Police for a parade was required and it had to comply with certain conditions. Therefore, it was necessary for the STDC to ensure the legality of an event if it was to serve as the event supporter, while other DCs also listed the relevant requirements likewise.

32. Mr LO Yuet-chau pointed out that the STDC served as an event supporter of the events organised by the Hong Kong Society for the Deaf, and the Hong Kong Pride Parade 2020 Organizing Committee should be treated equally. As Mr Jimmy SHAM had undertaken to comply with the Police’s requirements, he asked the STDC not to make things difficult for him.

33. Mr Jimmy SHAM said that the requirement in the paper was it was suggested that the event organiser should present a valid Letter of No Objection to the STDC in the future to ensure the legality of the event.

34. The Council endorsed that the STDC would serve as the event supporter of “Breathe in • Tobacco Out”, “2020 HK Sign Language Day”, “Fun D Run” and “The Hong Kong Pride Parade 2020”, and the STDC logo would be displayed in the related publicity activities and on the publicity materials.

35. Mr YAU Man-chun pointed out that the WGPRP under the Finance and General Affairs Committee (FGAC) had endorsed the setting up of the STDC social media channels, such as YouTube or Facebook for live streaming of the STDC and its committee meetings. He asked the Chairman to approve the authorisation of setting up the social media channels at the full council meeting.

36. The Chairman said that as the relevant paper was not available at the moment, he suggested Mr YAU Man-chun submit it to the STDC for handling upon approval by the FGAC at its next meeting. He asked the STDC Secretary and the FGAC Secretary to follow up the issue with Mr YAU Man-chun after the meeting.

37. Mr Michael YUNG suggested that Mr YAU Man-chun put forward a provisional motion to introduce the background of the arrangement of live streaming, so that the STDC could deal with the live streaming matter at the resumption of meeting next Tuesday.

38. Mr CHAN Pui-ming would like to know the urgency of dealing with live streaming of meetings at this meeting, and he asked whether the issue could be settled by circulation.

39. The Chairman asked Mr YAU Man-chun to follow up the matter with the Secretariat after the meeting, and settling the issue by circulation might be considered.

[Post-meeting note: The Chairman of the FGAC included the discussion item of “Assistance Provided to Newly Elected District Council Members and the Secretarial Support Provided by the Sha Tin District Council (STDC)” in the agenda of the FGAC meeting on 15 September 2020, and also included the issue of live streaming in the above agenda.]

Schedule of Meetings of the STDC for 2021
(Paper No. STDC 64/2020)

40. The Chairman pointed out that as there were a lot of agenda items, the TTC Chairman suggested that the starting time of the TTC meeting be adjusted to 10:00 am, and whether the full Council meeting would start from 10:00 am would be subject to the actual circumstances. It usually started at 2:30 pm.

41. Mr Billy CHAN was worried that meetings being adjourned due to a lack of quorum would be more likely to happen if the meeting started at 10:00 am.

42. The Chairman urged Members to attend the meetings on time.

43. The Council unanimously endorsed the “Schedule of Meetings of the STDC for 2021”.

2020-2021 District Facilities and Improvement Works Proposals
(Paper No. STDC 65/2020)

44. Ms Selina LEUNG, Senior Executive Officer (Planning)²¹ of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) briefly introduced the paper, and the main points were as follows:

- (a) the extension project of the sitting-out area at Ma Kam Street, Ma On Shan was proposed by Ms TSANG So-lai in July 2018;
- (b) since the vacant sites on both sides of Ma Kam Street Sitting-out Area, which were enclosed by wire mesh, had adverse impact on the hygiene condition in the vicinity and had caused the mosquito problem, it was proposed that Ma Kam Street Sitting-out Area be extended and improved. The works included the beautification of the landscape of the lot, improvement to the public hygiene condition, optimisation of the use of land, improvement to the public sitting-out facilities, enhancement of road safety so as to prevent residents from being hurt by the sharp ends of the wire mesh when they chased the buses there, and facilitate the disabled

persons' access to or use of Ma Kam Street Sitting-out Area;

- (c) it was estimated that the construction cost was \$19,999,000;
- (d) the project included the existing Ma Kam Street Sitting-out Area (536 square metres), with an area of about 1 800 square metres;
- (e) the project included the removal of wire mesh at Ma Kam Street Sitting-out Area and the vacant sites on its both sides, clearance of weeds and removal of trees, site settlement, ground resurfacing, provision of seats, fitness equipment and children's facilities, provision of signs, maps and tactile guide paths, drinking fountains, wash basins, installation of power supply equipment such as lighting system and service boxes, provision of storm-water drains which would be connected with the existing drainage system, and improvement to the nearby storm-water drains;
- (f) subject to the actual surroundings and technical feasibility, the stripe area beside Ma Kam Street Sitting-out Area near the Ma On Shan Maternal and Child Health Centre would be converted into a barrier-free access for easy access of the disabled and their use of Ma Kam Street Sitting-out Area; and
- (g) the substantial construction cost, works schedule, annual estimated expenditure and recurrent expenditure could be submitted only after the term consultant had conducted the feasibility study and detailed design.

45. The views of Ms TSANG So-lai were summarised below:

- (a) regarding the fact that many residents of the Met. Blossom walked past that road section when going home, she would like to know whether the project would be carried out in phases or at one go; and
- (b) she asked the department to follow up the serious mosquito problem at the site.

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

- (a) he asked whether the number of trees to be removed would be minimised in terms of the design of the works;
- (b) he would like to know how the housing estates in the vicinity would be linked with the bus stations during the works period; and
- (c) he suggested extending the pedestrian way near the Ma On Shan Maternal and Child Health Centre in the vicinity of Ma Kam Street Sitting-out Area for use by the disabled.

47. Mr Chris MAK would like to know when the lawns at Sha On Street and those between Monte Vista and Lee On Estate would be developed into a park and asked about the handling of removal of trees.

48. Mr Wilson LI would like to know how the department would deal with the mosquito problem and the arrangement for the pedestrian way during the construction period.

49. Mr. Ryan MAK, Senior Architect of the Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) in planning the works of different stages, it could be considered that the shortcut should be retained to facilitate residents' access to the housing estates; and
- (b) landscape architects would be commissioned to inspect the health condition of trees, and the principle of minimising the impact on trees would be adopted.

50. Mr David LEUNG, Architect (Works)8 of the Home Affairs Department (HAD) gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he pointed out that there were about 30 trees at the site. To be in line with the overall planning design, the department would strike a balance between tree preservation and construction of park facilities, including the pedestrian way and the barrier free access for the disabled, so as to minimise the impact on trees as far as possible;
- (b) the serious mosquito problem was related to the existing problem of a large amount of weeds and stagnant water at the vacant site next to Ma Kam Street Sitting-out Area. It was expected that upon completion of project items including removal of weeds and paving of the pedestrian way in the future, the mosquito problem would be improved;
- (c) meanwhile, the mosquito problem could be relieved by planting plants with drainage capability;
- (d) regarding the reservation of a temporary pedestrian link leading to the housing estates nearby while the works were in progress, since Sai Sha Road was quite busy and there were a few existing bus stops, it was anticipated that this would pose difficulties to the transportation of materials during the works. If the site of the sitting-out area was to be divided into several zones for implementation of the works, the construction cost might greatly increase. Therefore, the reservation of a temporary pedestrian link under reasonable and practicable circumstances would be considered; and
- (e) since the pedestrian way leading to the Maternal and Child Health Centre had exceeded the site boundary of the sitting-out area, it might not be possible to widen the pedestrian way.

51. The views of Mr CHIU Chu-pong were summarised below:

- (a) he was worried that as the construction cost was nearly \$20 million, the commencement and funding progress of the minor works in other constituencies might be affected;

- (b) he would like to know the annual estimated provision for the district minor works; and
- (c) he asked among the construction cost of about \$20 million, how much the arrangement for tree cutting and the estimated provision for actual handling of trees accounted for.

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

- (a) he pointed out that the trees replanted in the Sha Tin District were usually smaller and vulnerable to typhoons. He would like to know the species of the trees removed and their height, and which trees would be replanted;
- (b) he pointed out that the trees in Hin Tin Playground were the result achieved upon several years' follow-up action taken with the LCSD; and
- (c) he would like to know how the mosquito problem could be alleviated.

53. Mr TING Tsz-yuen pointed out that the mosquito problem had existed at the site for long. Therefore, he agreed with Ms TSANG So-lai's proposal on improvement works. However, he had reservations about the provision of nearly \$20 million for a single project and the estimated construction cost of \$26 million by 2023. He suggested that the department consider minimising the project scale so as to lower the project cost and earmark the funds for other proposals.

54. Mr Billy CHAN said that if over half of the \$20 million was to be spent on tree removal, he had reservations about the project. Moreover, he would like to know the estimated expenditure of each project item, including the tree removal expenses and the arrangements for replanting of trees.

55. Ms Selina LEUNG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the development of the site between Monte Vista and Lee On Estate was not a project prioritised by the STDC at the moment. The LCSD did not have any development plan for the site for the time being, and it would closely monitor and pay attention to the development of the district;
- (b) she stressed that the proposed tree removal and relocation was only part of the whole project. Among an area of 1 800 square metres of the site, 1 300 square metres would be included in the LCSD's sitting-out area. Therefore, formation and ground resurfacing works, provision of seats, fitness equipment and children's facilities were all required to comply with the LCSD's standard for a sitting-out area; and
- (c) she pointed out that regarding the expenditure of about \$18 million in 2020-21 as stated in Annex 3, it was the estimated construction cost of 50 items of district facilities and improvement works which had already been approved. Meanwhile, the concrete construction cost of the extension of Ma Kam Street Sitting-out Area in Ma On Shan, the estimated expenditure and recurrent

expenditure of respective years, would be provided only after the consultant had conducted the feasibility study.

56. Mr David LEUNG responded that at present, there were about 30 trees at the site. It was estimated that the expenditure on handling of trees accounted for around one-fourth or one-fifth of the project expenditure.

57. Mr Simon WONG, Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin)¹ gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) currently, the annual provision for district minor works in the Sha Tin District was maintained at a level of \$21.15 million;
- (b) according to the guideline of the District Minor Works (DMW) programme, the ceiling of each district minor works project was \$30 million, and the over-commitment of the whole project must not exceed 200% of the approved provision of the year; and
- (c) in respect of this project, there had been a detailed discussion at the meeting of the working group and noted that the over-commitment would be close to the ceiling of 200%.

58. Mr David LEUNG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) only the preliminary feasibility study of the project had been carried out so far, and there was no specific design yet;
- (b) the project was expected to be completed in 3 to 4 years;
- (c) upon finalisation, landscape architects and consultants would be commissioned to conduct the detailed study and design before a practical option to handle the existing trees could be worked out;
- (d) since the project included the combination of the sites on both sides and the existing sitting-out area, the conservation value of the tree groups was an important consideration factor;
- (e) the project would proceed with the selection of plants with a view to alleviating the mosquito problem; and
- (f) the design of the sitting-out area aimed at striking a balance between the layout of various facilities, including the barrier free access for the disabled, so as to minimise the impact on the existing trees as far as possible.

59. The Chairman invited the relevant departments to submit the breakdown of expenditure of the project so as to keep the STDC well-informed. He asked members whether they supported the project in principle.

60. Mr CHIU Chu-pong was worried that the departments would submit the breakdown of expenditure only after the funding for the project was approved, and thus affecting the resolution.

61. The Chairman pointed out that the departments would submit the estimates and breakdown of items of the annual project expenses at the DFMSC meeting, and would conduct consultation on the specific design proposals.

62. Mr David LEUNG added that the amount was estimated on the basis of the preliminary study. The major expenditure in the first year was the consultant's fee, which would account for about one-tenth of the total consultant's fee, while the actual construction cost was expected to account for about three-fourths of the total project cost.

63. The Chairman pointed out that as the time limit of the meeting was over, he suggested that the speaking time for individual Members be 1 minute.

64. The views of Mr TING Tsz-yuen were summarised below:

- (a) he stated that Members should have 2 minutes to ask further questions;
- (b) he urged the departments to submit the estimated breakdown of items of the preliminary study; and
- (c) he asked whether the project could be scaled down so as to confine the construction cost to \$15 million or below.

65. Mr Wilson LI said that there was an actual need to landscape and improve the environment of the site, but the current construction cost was too high. He urged the concerned departments to preserve, replant and transplant the trees as far as possible, and enhance the anti-mosquito measures and arrange for the provision of a pedestrian link, etc.

66. Mr LI Sai-hung had reservations about the construction cost of \$20 million. He asked the concerned departments to provide the breakdown of expenditure. He suggested that the trees should be preserved and facilities to be constructed should be kept to the minimum as far as possible so as to minimise the construction cost.

67. Mr CHAN Wan-tung would like to know whether an application for the project funds had to be made year by year within a period of 5 years, or whether the construction cost of \$20 million would be approved in the form of block grant at this meeting.

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

- (a) regarding Members' enquiry about the block grant of \$20 million, he pointed out that according to the working group's discussion about the project at its meeting, the preliminary estimate of the provision included expenses in various years, such as removal of trees, site formation, procurement of equipment, supervision of works, consultant's fee, etc.;

- (b) he pointed out that as the concerned departments had not provided the breakdown of expenditure, it was difficult for Members to get hold of all expenditure items by referring to one paper only and make a decision;
- (c) he cited the sitting-out area project in Area 90B, Hang Ming Street, Ma On Shan as an example, saying that its estimated cost was also nearly \$20 million; and
- (d) he said that the commencement of the district improvement works should be subject to the needs of the local residents and whether residents' representatives thought that the works were necessary.

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

- (a) he would like to know how the department could replant trees with a height of 10 metres;
- (b) he was worried that upon removal of the large trees and replanting of smaller trees, the original tree shading at Ma Kam Street would disappear; and
- (c) regarding the estimated project cost of \$20 million, he considered that the department should submit more information and further discussions had to be carried out before a decision on approving the funds could be made.

70. Mr CHIU Chu-pong added that at the DFMSC meeting, he requested the concerned department to provide the distribution ratio of the expenditure of \$20 million, but the department had not provided any further information. If a vote was to be conducted at this meeting, he would cast a dissenting vote.

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

- (a) he agreed with the approach of the project;
- (b) he asked Members to refer to Paper No. DFS 22/2020, which stated that there was an outstanding provision amounting over \$2.9 million for the district minor works this year. Currently, funds were needed for conducting the feasibility study of the project. He believed that the expenditure of the feasibility study would not be high, and asked the departments to briefly introduce the estimated expenditure in the next 3 years, so as to alleviate Members' concerns; and
- (c) regarding the estimated project expenditure of 2022-23 being \$26 million, which would exceed the ceiling of the annual provision, he would like to know whether the STDO would increase the provision for the STDC in respect of the project expenditure or the population in the constituencies.

72. Mr David LEUNG pointed out that it was only a preliminary feasibility study at the moment, and the project had not been finalised yet. He stressed that the paper did not require approval of the provision of \$20 million at one go. The specific details of the project, including the construction cost of individual parts, annual estimated expenditure in respect of the practical design, as well as the proportion of the recurrent expenditure would be submitted to Members

for reference after the first phase of the feasibility study was completed and the project was finalised.

73. Mr Simon WONG said that currently, the amount of provision for the DMW programme of the Sha Tin District was maintained at the level of \$21 million per year. The cashflow after two years would be subject to factors such as the works progress by then. If the extension of Ma Kam Street Sitting-out Area was approved, a considerable part of the cashflow of the provision would be involved. Therefore, an accurate projection of the cashflow in 2023 could not be provided at the current stage.

74. The Chairman asked Members whether they agreed to approve the funding application for the preliminary feasibility study of the project.

75. Mr CHIU Chu-pong was discontented with the department's response.

76. Mr CHAN Wan-tung opined that the department should respond to the request for saving and cutting down of expenses, and should provide more details of the estimated expenditure to facilitate Members' discussion and their making of a decision on the preliminary study.

77. Mr TING Tsz-yuen was worried that the approval of the project estimate of \$20 million would have an impact on other projects proposed by the DFMSC. He requested the department to respond to the feasibility of the proposal to scale down the project to \$15 million put forward by him earlier. He also urged the department to provide more information so that a resolution could be made at the next meeting.

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

- (a) regarding some Members' misunderstanding of the provision for the project, he considered that this was because the department had not prepared the paper and briefing in detail;
- (b) he asked whether the STDO and the consultant could provide the estimated expenditure of the project in each financial year at the next meeting;
- (c) he suggested that during the tender procedure, some items such as the elderly fitness equipment should be identified as options for Members to consider whether the construction cost could be saved; and
- (d) he said that for example, at present, if people wanted to buy electrical appliances from a shop, they were usually informed of the approximate price first and then paid by instalments. He pointed out that if the confirmed project and other projects were completed and payment was to be made, and it was found that the proportion of over-commitment dropped, the resolution for other projects could be made at the working group and it could be discussed at the DFMSC meeting before a funding application was lodged with the Council.

79. The Chairman asked Members whether they agreed to carry on the discussion on the funding for the preliminary feasibility study and the estimated expenditure of the whole project at about \$20 million.

80. Mr CHAN Pui-ming suggested that the department provide more information at the resumption of meeting scheduled for next Tuesday for Members' consideration and discussion.

81. Mr MOK Kam-kwai pointed out that the department had already stated that the appropriation took up about 10% of the project expenditure in the first year.

82. Mr David LEUNG responded that it was estimated that the expenditure of the feasibility study would not exceed \$1 million. He expected that upon completion of the feasibility study and design, the construction cost would drop.

83. The Chairman said that the department did not express clearly in respect of the arrangement of resources.

84. Mr LI Sai-hung opined that as further information on the preservation of those 30 trees at the site or arrangement of the project was not yet available, it would be difficult for Members to reach a resolution.

85. Mr Simon WONG said that according to the established procedure, a feasibility study was required for the district minor works. The consultants would submit the results of the feasibility studies to the relevant working groups and the DFMSC for discussion and approval. Since the amount of the project exceeded \$3 million, it had to be submitted to the Council for approval. Upon completion of the feasibility study, whether the remaining part of the project would commence was subject to the decision of the relevant working group, the DFMSC and the Council. Since the project was expected to commence by then, the over-commitment would include the estimates of the whole project.

86. Mr CHAN Wan-tung would like to know the details of the project before he could decide whether he would render support.

87. The Chairman said that the STDO had explained the substantial expenses of the project. It would be submitted to the Council for discussion by then.

88. Mr Jimmy SHAM pointed out that the residents in Ma On Shan hoped that the site would be changed into a park. He hoped that the Council would support the funding for preliminary studies. He asked the concerned departments to, after study, inform the Council of the expense of each project and the future maintenance cost involved.

89. The Chairman stressed that the STDC, including the DFMSC, still had the right to discuss and scrutinise the projects.

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

- (a) he pointed out that the project had been discussed by the Working Group and the DFMSC earlier. He did not see why Members had not raised any enquiries until now; and

- (b) he asked the HAD to provide detailed information to Members, including the estimated expenditure of the projects in respective financial years and the optional expenses from a tendering point of view for their consideration.
- 91. The Chairman asked the architects of the LCSD and the HAD to refer to Members' views raised earlier as far as possible when dealing with the project in the future.
- 92. Mr Chris MAK stated that if voting was to be conducted, he requested an open ballot.
- 93. Mr Michael YUNG was not in favour of a never-ending discussion. He asked the HAD whether more information could be provided next Tuesday to address Members' concerns.
- 94. Mr David LEUNG said that the detailed expenditure could not be provided until the preliminary feasible study of the first stage was completed.
- 95. The Chairman suggested that the agenda item would be dealt with after the concerned department had submitted the revised funding application and the information on the works proposals.

Information Items

2020-2021 Work Plan of the STDO (Paper No. STDC 61/2020)

- 96. Dr Janet WONG said that the content of the work plan was already listed in Paper No. STDC 61/2020 for Members' information to control the meeting time. Meanwhile, she was pleased to answer Members' questions.
- 97. The Chairman suggested that Members asked questions in one round in order to save time.
- 98. The views of Mr Michael YUNG were summarised below:
 - (a) he disagreed that the Chairman cancelled the 2-minute follow-up question-and-answer session;
 - (b) he was disappointed that Members were not invited to join the Sha Tin District-led Actions Scheme and the meeting time was limited;
 - (c) he asked why the Police could refuse to discuss the "Sha Tin District Police Action Plan for 2020" at the DFMSC meeting;
 - (d) he pointed out that starting from this term, Members were not appointed to the Area Committees (AC), Sha Tin District Fight Crime Committee (DFCC), Sha Tin District Fire Safety Committee (DFSC) and Sha Tin District National Education Committee (NEC) under the STDO. He did not know how to give advice;

- (e) as arts and culture promotion, Sha Tin Festive Lighting and Dynamic Community all needed the STDC funding, but Members were not present at the said committees, he considered that the operation of the committees might not be effectively monitored; and
 - (f) he asked the STDO to open more quotas so that Members from the constituencies which covered the rural areas could take part in the Rural Public Works Programme and give advice.
99. The views of Mr YEUNG Sze-kin were summarised below:
- (a) he agreed with Mr Michael YUNG's views;
 - (b) he disagreed that local personalities instead of Members joined the ACs for the community network construction; and
 - (c) in respect of the fact that currently, Members were unable to join the DFCC, DFSC, arts and culture promotion, Sha Tin Festive Lighting, etc., he asked the District Officer to consider Members' opinions.
100. The views of Mr SIN Cheuk-nam were summarised below:
- (a) he would like to know the reason why no Members were appointed to the ACs, DFCC and DFSC, etc. to take part in the community network construction; and
 - (b) he asked the STDO whether it was aware of what kind of support the owners needed in respect of building management, whether it had reviewed the power and execution of the Building Management Ordinance (Cap.344), whether it carried on the promotion of the mediation service for building management launched by the HAD in 2017. He also asked for the provision of the statistics in relation to the programme since its launch, including the successful mediation cases.
101. The views of Mr CHAN Nok-hang were summarised below:
- (a) in respect of the assistance to the STDC, he considered that it took a longer time to process the Operating Expenses Reimbursement (OER) at present than the previous terms; and
 - (b) as Members were not appointed to the ACs, DFCC, DFSC, NEC, Sha Tin Arts and Culture Promotion Committee, etc., he opined that the Government adopted a non-cooperative attitude, and he did not know how to give advice.
102. Dr Janet WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:
- (a) members were appointed to the committees on the basis of "the merit of individuals concerned", and thus people other than the STDC Members were widely accepted to take part in community services;

- (b) regarding building management, she was studying with her colleagues how to enhance the services and support for building management;
- (c) regarding the choice of words in the paper, the staff made reference to the past practice, and therefore the phrase “as usual” was used. She said that the STDO would try to be innovative and include the content of the items that Members took part in;
- (d) Mr YUNG attended the Sha Tin District Management Committee meetings in the capacity of the Chairman of the TTC. She had explained that the Sha Tin District-led Actions Scheme had been implemented for a certain period of time, and more consultations and studies had to be conducted at the early commencement stage. Currently, it was at the execution and implementation stage, and thus there was a smaller need to have discussion with Members on various items. If a new item was to be implemented, the STDO would inform the STDC when appropriate; and
- (e) the STDO was working out other new items, and would invite Members to take part in them as it saw fit.

103. Mr CHAN Nok-hang did not see why the ACs consisted of STDC Members in the past, but the practice was different for this term.

104. The views of Mr SHEK William were summarised below:

- (a) he disagreed that the appointment to the ACs was “to choose the right person for the right job”;
- (b) he opined that not appointing Members to the ACs would minimise their participation in various platforms;
- (c) he pointed out that if a decision was reached on Festive Lighting, and upon individual discussions by the DFCC and DFSC, a funding application was lodged with the STDC, it seemed that the STDC was regarded as an automatic teller machine;
- (d) regarding the fact that the STDO was still clearing the illegal bicycle parking cases, he considered that Members should discuss how to enhance enforcement; and
- (e) he asked the District Officer to consider allowing Members to join the relevant committees.

105. The views of Mr CHENG Chung-hang were summarised below:

- (a) he would like to know the appointment criteria of the relevant committees;

- (b) he pointed out that Mr Chris MAK was a social worker. He would like to know why no Members in attendance were invited to join the Sha Tin District Youth Programme Committee; and
- (c) regarding the fact that the ACs consisted of local personalities only but no Members, he asked about the recognition of the committees and the appointment criteria.

106. Mr Jonny CHUNG pointed out that no STDC Members were appointed to the relevant committees. He would like to know whether the membership lists of the ACs were approved by the HAD.

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

- (a) he opined that the Government had not considered the motion on epidemic prevention put forward by the Council on 23 January this year;
- (b) according to the webpage of the HAD, apart from the district minor works and building management, the duties included maintaining the safety standards for guesthouses and apartments. He pointed out that the paper did not mention the duties of patrolling the unlicensed guesthouses and apartments in the Sha Tin District;
- (c) it was not mentioned in the paper how to help the new arrivals from the Mainland and the minorities, such as organising Cantonese courses and help them seek employment; and
- (d) he was discontented that no Members were appointed to the relevant committees.

108. Dr Janet WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she was glad that Members put emphasis on and wished to join the ACs. She would reflect the relevant views when opportunities arose in the future;
- (b) as she had mentioned before, members were appointed on the basis of “the merit of individuals concerned”. At present, different people were included so that services could be provided to the community in a more comprehensive manner as a whole. STDC Members could still serve the public, and there were not conflicts between the two;
- (c) as Mr MOK Kam-kwai and Dr LAM Kong-kwan were not appointed either, it could be seen that the rule applied to everyone;
- (d) members of the ACs were appointed by the Director of Home Affairs. They were appointed in their personal capacity instead of the capacity of Members;
- (e) she said that in view of space constraints, a paper could not cover all duties of the STDO. She said that for example, the Liaison Officer, at Mr CHAN Pui-ming’s request, accompanied him to conduct a site visit last week. This reflected that

the STDO staff actively co-operate with Members to facilitate their work; and

- (f) she welcomed Members to put forward proposals, and pointed out that the STDO responded to not only Members' views but also public concerns, as the Government aimed at serving the public.

109. The Chairman asked the District Officer to note Members' views on the appointment of members to the ACs.

110. The views of Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa were summarised below:

- (a) he was dissatisfied that Chun Yeung Estate was suddenly requisitioned as a quarantine centre without any consultation with Members;
- (b) he considered that the composition of the ACs only reflected the voice of one-sided stance;
- (c) he asked the STDO whether it had made co-ordination in respect of the Police's attendance of the DFMSC meetings;
- (d) he opined that if Members were not included in the relevant committees, they would not be able to have a thorough understanding of the contents of discussion and play the monitoring role effectively; and
- (e) regarding the clearance of illegally parked bicycles twice a month in the Sha Tin District, he considered that it was not efficient enough.

111. The views of Mr Jimmy SHAM were summarised below:

- (a) he considered that the content of the paper was similar to that of the plan last year;
- (b) it was mentioned in the paper that the STDO "co-ordinates various government departments to engage in the relief and follow-up work in case of a major incident or disaster". He pointed out that in the epidemic situation, various businesses, especially the catering industry, was seriously hit, and it was expected that the unemployment rate would go up. He considered it as a major social problem; and
- (c) he asked the STDO why the work plan did not include the co-ordination of anti-epidemic work of various government departments against the novel coronavirus and the measures to relieve people's hardship.

112. The views of Mr YEUNG Sze-kin were summarised below:

- (a) he said that he did not intend to join the ACs. However, he was not happy about not being invited to join; and
- (b) he urged the Secretary for Home Affairs to bring tranquillity back to society, serve the public as usual and remain steadfast to his duties in a fair and just manner.

113. The views of Mr LO Yuet-chau were summarised below:

- (a) he said that he was very interested in the NEC, and wished to assist the resident of the Sha Tin District in knowing more about the nation. However, he was not invited to join;
- (b) he was disappointed that the HAD did not invite STDC Members to join the ACs; and
- (c) he opined that Members would not be able to inquire of the STDO about the work at district level and express their views.

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

- (a) he agreed with most of Mr Michael YUNG's views;
- (b) he disagreed with the District Officer's saying that the appointment was "to choose the right person for the right job";
- (c) he pointed out that Members were representatives who represented people's demands; and
- (d) he opined that Members were not appointed to the ACs meant that the Government did not respect the mainstream public opinion and what it did was unfair.

115. Mr Johnny CHUNG was disappointed that the Sha Tin District-led Actions Scheme did not mention that he reflected in April that the abandoned motorcycles in the district needed to be handled by inter-departmental action.

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

- (a) some Members had applied for the OER for the expenses in July, including the rent and wages of staff, but the expenses had not been reimbursed yet. He would like to know if the reason was related to the HAD's saying that some Members' Offices had been used as a polling station of primary election;
- (b) in its reply on 15 July, the STDO stated that as the supplementary question that he raised did not involve issues at the district level, it would not be discussed at the STDC meeting. However, he received a reply from the Administration Wing and the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau dated 10 August and a reply from the Security Bureau dated 6 August in respect of the imprisoned persons and detainees from his Member's mailbox. He asked why the relevant policy bureaux were willing to give him a reply, but the STDO did not agree to include the supplementary question that he raised; and
- (c) he would like to know the STDO's criteria for handling Members' questions.

117. Dr Janet WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) regarding Members' views on the appointment of members to the ACs, since members had already been appointed for this term, room for co-operation could be studied in the future;
- (b) since anti-epidemic and epidemic prevention exercises involved all people in Hong Kong, the exercises were led by the Food and Health Bureau and the DH, and the STDO would co-operate with them on the exercise;
- (c) she drew Members' attention to Paper No. STDC 77/2020 Progress Report on Improvement to Public Hygiene in the Sha Tin District. It had clearly given an account of the work of the STDO, such as enhancement of cleaning of hygiene blackspots in the urban areas, procurement and distribution of more anti-epidemic supplies, clean-up of major problematic backlanes and enhancement of cleaning of hygiene blackspots in villages. The STDO would issue papers to inform Members and consult them in respect of specific issues if necessary;
- (d) regarding the problem of abandoned motorcycles mentioned by Mr Johnny CHUNG, the STDO had upgraded it to the bureau level. Inter-departmental discussion would be held, and the issue would be seriously followed up and handled; and
- (e) regarding the OER, the Secretariat would follow the guidelines and see if Members' Offices had been used as a polling station of primary election before processing the reimbursement. The Secretariat would inform the concerned Members when appropriate.

118. The Chairman opined that the standard on the handling of the setting up of committees' terms of reference, establishment of working groups and questions raised on the agenda was different from that of last term. He asked the District Officer to reflect the views.

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

- (a) he would like to know how the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department classified various types of waste in Chun Yeung Estate, the intake arrangement made by the Housing Department (HD), and how the DH monitored the quarantine and intake of residents; and
- (b) he asked about the criteria adopted by the STDO to refuse to include his supplementary questions.

120. Dr Janet WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) all questions were handled under the requirements of the District Councils Ordinance; and

- (b) she pointed out that Members' questions could be referred to the relevant policy bureaux and departments for reply and enquiry about the relevant information, and it might not be appropriate to raise those questions through the DC platform. That was the difference in operation.

121. Mr CHAN Pui-ming said that regarding the questions that the STDO refused to include in the agenda, most of them had already been raised by him when he worked as a DC Member assistant. He did not see why they complied with the District Councils Ordinance at that time.

122. The Chairman asked the District Officer to compare the questions raised by Mr CHAN Pui-ming with the questions raised in the past and conduct a review.

123. The Council noted the above paper.

Sha Tin District Police Action Plan for 2020
(Paper No. STDC 60/2020)

124. The Chairman said that he would arrange the agenda items of the resumption of meeting on 25 August with the Secretary, including the intake of Chun Yeung Estate, progress reports of 7 committees, Sha Tin District Police Action Plan and questions. He hoped that the STDO would invite the concerned officials of the DH and HD to explain the intake arrangement of Chun Yeung Estate.

Date and Time of Next Meeting

125. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 2:30 pm on 25 August 2020 (Tuesday).

126. The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 pm.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat
STDC 13/15/15/1

November 2020