

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

Date : 25 August 2020 (Tuesday)
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	7:06 pm
Vice-Chairman : Mr WONG Hok-lai, George	2:30 pm	7:06 pm
Members : Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	2:30 pm	3:10 pm
Mr CHAN Nok-hang	2:51 pm	7:06 pm
Mr CHAN Pui-ming	2:30 pm	7:06 pm
Mr CHAN Wan-tung	2:43 pm	7:06 pm
Mr CHENG Chung-hang	2:30 pm	7:06 pm
Mr CHENG Tsuk-man	2:30 pm	4:40 pm
Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa	2:30 pm	7:06 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong	3:19 pm	7:06 pm
Mr CHOW Hiu-laam, Felix	2:30 pm	6:51 pm
Mr CHUNG Lai-him, Johnny	2:30 pm	7:06 pm
Mr HUI Lap-san	2:30 pm	7:06 pm
Mr HUI Yui-yu	2:30 pm	6:32 pm
Mr LAI Tsz-yan	5:20 pm	7:06 pm
Dr LAM Kong-kwan	2:53 pm	7:06 pm
Mr LI Chi-wang, Raymond	3:00 pm	7:06 pm
Mr LI Sai-hung	2:30 pm	6:44 pm
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	2:30 pm	7:06 pm
Mr LIAO Pak-hong, Ricardo	2:30 pm	6:07 pm
Mr LO Tak-ming	2:48 pm	5:37 pm
Mr LO Yuet-chau	2:30 pm	7:06 pm
Mr LUI Kai-wing	2:30 pm	6:51 pm
Ms LUK Tsz-tung	2:30 pm	7:06 pm
Mr MAK Tsz-kin	2:30 pm	6:51 pm
Mr MAK Yun-pui, Chris	3:41 pm	6:19 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung	2:30 pm	5:39 pm
Ms NG Ting-lam	2:30 pm	5:12 pm
Mr SHAM Tsz-kit, Jimmy	2:30 pm	7:06 pm
Mr SHEK William	4:19 pm	7:06 pm
Mr SIN Cheuk-nam	2:30 pm	5:02 pm
Mr TING Tsz-yuen	4:13 pm	5:45 pm
Mr TSANG Kit	3:29 pm	3:30 pm
Ms TSANG So-lai	3:11 pm	6:31 pm
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	2:30 pm	7:06 pm
Mr WONG Ho-fung	2:30 pm	6:49 pm
Ms WONG Man-huen	2:49 pm	6:53 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun	2:50 pm	7:06 pm

Present

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

**Time of joining
the meeting**

3:03 pm
 2:30 pm
 2:30 pm
 Senior Executive Officer (District Council) /
 Sha Tin District Office

**Time of leaving
the meeting**

4:32 pm
 5:06 pm
 7:06 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 LI Fung-yuk

Ms LEUNG Hay-lin, Helen
 Ms LEUNG Yee-lee, Maggie

Mr LEUNG Siu-ming, David
 Mr CHEUNG Hang-yiu, Galax

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

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
 and Sha Tin) / Housing Department
 Senior Housing Manager / Applications 2 /
 Housing Department
 Senior Architect 41 / Housing Department
 District Social Welfare Officer (Shatin) /
 Social Welfare Department
 Architect (Works)8 / Home Affairs Department
 Executive Officer (Planning) 21B /
 Leisure and Cultural Services 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 School Development Officer (Sha Tin) /
 Education Bureau
 Principle Transport Officer / New Territories 1/
 Transport Department
 Senior Engineer / 7 (North) / Civil Engineering
 and Development Department
 Administrative Assistant / Lands (Acting)
 (District Lands Office, Sha Tin) /
 Lands Department
 District Lands Officer / Sha Tin /
 Lands Department
 District Planning Officer / Sha Tin, Tai Po and
 North / Planning Department

In Attendance

Mr HO Kin-nam, David

TitleExecutive Officer I (District Council) 1 /
Sha Tin District Office**Absent**

Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS

(Application for leave of absence received)

Action

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives from government departments to the resumption of the meeting dated 20 August this year to discuss the intake arrangements for Chun Yeung Estate and pending items.

Application for Leave of Absence

2. The Chairman said that the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) Secretariat had received applications for leave of absence in writing from the following Members:

Mr MOK Kam-kwai

Official Commitment

Mr TING Tsz-yuen

”

(Remark: Mr TING Tsz-yuen attended the meeting at 4:13pm.)

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

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

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

- (a) he requested convening a meeting of the Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) as soon as possible;
- (b) he said he had called the District Officer (Sha Tin) (DO/ST) to ask about whether papers had been submitted concerning Discussion Item no. 3(a), as no relevant paper had been available yet. He said that the Food and Health Bureau (FHB) did not provide in its letter the information requested by Members. He wished to know when and how the DO/ST and the Secretariat invited the Department of Health (DH) and the FHB to attend the meeting and submit the papers, and why they were absent from the meeting; and
- (c) he opined that the departments present were not able to answer questions concerning the arrangements for the quarantine centres.

6. Mr Derek YUEN, Senior Executive Officer (District Council) of the Sha Tin District Office (STDO) said that the Secretariat invited the FHB and the DH by email dated 21 August to attend the meeting, and invited them again by email dated 24 August to attend the meeting and submit the papers.

7. Dr Janet WONG, DO/ST said that Mr Derek YUEN yesterday already invited the departments to attend the meeting again and followed up. She also called the FHB and the DH yesterday to enquire about the situation. The FHB already prepared the papers, i.e. the email sent to all Members before the meeting, to report on the latest development of Chun Yeung Estate. Since the FHB was busy organising and preparing for the Universal Community Testing Programme, it was not able to send representatives to the meeting.

8. The Chairman said that he had repeatedly contacted and asked the Secretariat after the last meeting to remind the departments to attend the meeting and submit the papers. The Secretariat had put the replies of the departments on the table.

9. Mr CHAN Pui-ming said that he called the FHB yesterday to ask if it would send any representative to the STDC meeting to explain the situation of Chun Yeung Estate, the health code and the community-wide testing scheme. He asked the Secretariat whether the FHB had given any reply and explanation.

10. Mr Derek YUEN said that he would pass the FHB's replies to Members once received.

11. Mr Michael YUNG proposed that, after the Sha Tin District Councillors' visit of Blocks 4 and 5 of Chun Yeung Estate on 27 August, the FHB arrange for staff of the DH to elaborate on the separation arrangements for Blocks 1 to 3 and Blocks 4 and 5, the assessment criteria or the scientific basis, the disinfection criteria, the handling of refuse and medical waste of the quarantine centres, etc. He hoped the Chairman would liaise with the DO/ST to arrange the itinerary.

12. Dr Janet WONG said that she would relay the opinions to the DH. To her knowledge, access to the site was limited in order to reduce infection risks. She said that the DH would have to evaluate whether the site was suitable for briefing.

[Post-meeting note: Sha Tin District Councillors visited Chun Yeung Estate on 27 August.]

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 20 April 2020

(STDC Minutes 5/2020)

13. The Council endorsed the above minutes unanimously.

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 14 May 2020

(STDC Minutes 6/2020)

14. The Council endorsed the above minutes unanimously.

Discussion Items

Arrangements Concerning the Intake of Chun Yeung Estate and the Requisition of the Estate as a Quarantine Centre

15. The Chairman asked the departmental representative to give a brief introduction to the topic.

16. Mr Allan CHAN, Chief Manager / Management (Tai Po, North and Sha Tin) of the Housing Department (HD) gave a consolidated introduction as follows:

- (a) he said that the paper sent to the STDC dated 18 August already briefly explained the latest arrangements for Chun Yeung Estate. Due to the epidemic, Blocks 1 to 3 were still used as quarantine centres which would probably not be returned to the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA) for refurbishment until the end of the year for intake in the second quarter next year;

[Post-meeting note: The Government already returned Blocks 1 to 3 to the HA in mid-October this year. The HD immediately followed up on the refurbishment and the examination work.]

- (b) the HD issued a letter to all prospective tenants of Chun Yeung Estate on 18 August to explain the use and intake of the estate. Since the earliest move-in date for Blocks 4 and 5 was 28 August, the estate office had issued a move-in letter to the prospective tenants and called to remind them to complete the intake procedure as scheduled. The intake was expected to complete around end of September;

[Post-meeting note: The overall intake of the tenants of Blocks 4 and 5 was completed at the end of September this year.]

- (c) due to the epidemic, the HD processed the intake of 40 to 80 prospective tenants daily in order to reduce crowd gathering. The HD temporarily used care centres for the elderly for contract-signing use, where partitions were set up to separate staff and the prospective tenants and maintain a suitable social distance between them. The HD already provided hand sanitisers and arranged regular cleaning services;
- (d) the DH already assessed the environment of Blocks 4 and 5, opining that installing 2-metre water barriers would effectively separate Blocks 3 and 4 and make the site habitable. The water barriers were considerably sturdy;
- (e) he said that people from Blocks 4 and 5 could go in and out via Wong Chuk Yeung Street which was a separate exit. Residents could also access the podium from the bay of the public transport interchange via the mall's escalator followed by designated access points;
- (f) the HD was currently conducting site visits with shop operators to discuss doing business and opening a shop there;

[Post-meeting note: As at 4 November 2020, there had been 3 shops newly opened at Chun Yeung Shopping Centre to provide services for residents. Besides, the HD had completed tenancy procedures with a number of shops and wet market merchants. Their business would start once their interior decoration was completed.]

- (g) he said that the Transport Department (TD), along with bus companies, was currently arranging road tests for the relevant routes; and

[Post-meeting note: Currently there were routes of New Territories green minibuses (GMB), The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited (KMB) and New

World First Bus providing residents with services at the bay of the public transport interchange at Chun Yeung Estate.]

- (h) he said there were already 2 non-government organisations indicating their plans to move in during the intake period to provide assistance.

[Post-meeting note: Hong Kong PHAB Association and YWCA which carried out the Community Investment & Inclusion Fund had already started providing support services for the new occupiers at Blocks 4 and 5, and set up community networks within the estate.]

17. Mr Derek LAI, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Sha Tin) of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) regarding the handling of waste, the DH categorised the waste generated by all the people quarantined at the Chun Yeung Estate quarantine centre as clinical waste which was handled by a DH-designated clinical waste collection contractor, whereas the waste generated by the staff members at the quarantine centre was general household refuse which was collected by the FEHD; and
- (b) the DH was using waste compression equipment at the central refuse station to process the refuse generated by the staff members. Upon the intake of Blocks 4 and 5, the central refuse station would be returned to the HD, and the waste compression equipment would process the household refuse of Blocks 4 and 5 while the household refuse from Blocks 1 to 3 would be separately collected and processed at another location.

18. Mr Patrick NG, Principle Transport Officer / New Territories 1 of the TD gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) since 21 August, the TD had arranged for the public transport operators concerned to carry out road tests of the relevant routes at the bay of public transport interchange at Chun Yeung Estate; and
- (b) the TD had also liaised and coordinated with the bus franchise and the minibuss franchise to provide suitable public transport services for residents of Chun Yeung Estate.

19. Ms Maggie LEUNG, District Social Welfare Officer (Shatin) of the Social Welfare Department (SWD) said that the SWD had arranged 2 social welfare organisations to provide on-duty social workers to assist prospective tenants in move-in arrangements and give them orientation information kits that introduced the social welfare services in the district.

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

- (a) he wished to know whether the DH would thoroughly sanitise the central refuse station at Block 4 to safeguard the safety and wellbeing of staff members before returning it to the HD;
- (b) he asked which block the security control room of the Chun Yeung Estate office was situated at, and how the security could be monitored if it was not situated at Blocks 4 or 5;

- (c) he asked whether the separate exit the HD had referred to was a fire exit, and how the HD would ensure proper separation from the quarantine centre if the residents needed to use facilities such as the carpark; and
- (d) he asked if the HD had approved the setting up of staff common rooms of 2 bus companies.

21. The views of Mr Felix CHOW were summarised below:

- (a) he was dissatisfied with further delays in the intake of Chun Yeung Estate;
- (b) he regretted that the FHB and the DH did not send representatives to attend the meeting. He said it was stated back then that the quarantine centre would be far away from the residential areas when Chun Yeung Estate was requisitioned. He asked why the quarantine and the intake procedure were now arranged to take place in the same estate;
- (c) he said that some students would face the problem of attending cross-district schools, and he asked what support the Education Bureau (EDB) would offer; and
- (d) he wished to know if the decisions and the arrangements of the FHB and the DH were inappropriate.

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

- (a) he regretted that the FHB and the DH did not send representatives to attend the meeting;
- (b) he asked if staff members of the quarantine centre had stayed in the security control room and the central refuse station, and if the HD had the places cleaned after they were returned;
- (c) he wished to know about the rental status of the shopping mall and how the unloading area was separated from the quarantine centre;
- (d) he said there was a bridge connecting Blocks 1-3 and Blocks 4-5, and wished to know about the arrangements for the access road;
- (e) he pointed out that the bases of the water barriers were rather small which might be easily toppled by wind. He was worried that children might stumble across the quarantine area; and
- (f) both Blocks 1 and 2 of Chun Yeung Estate were provided with social welfare organisations. He wished to know about their setup arrangements.

23. Mr Allan CHAN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he said that the central refuse station located at Block 4 had been used to handle regular waste and it had been thoroughly cleansed before it was returned;

- (b) the access roads at Blocks 4 and 5 were fire escape routes. Since the access to the car park passed through the quarantine centre at Blocks 1 to 3, it was currently closed;
- (c) the security control room was located at Block 4 and was not visited by staff members of the quarantine centre. It was also classified by the DH as a clean zone;
- (d) the HD was currently negotiating with the shop operators of the wet market and conducting site-visits;
- (e) he said that the unloading area was completely separated from the quarantine centre at Blocks 1 to 3;
- (f) he said the water barriers were sturdy and they would be reinforced if necessary; and
- (g) the HD already reminded the bus company to apply to the Independent Checking Unit for approval and the specifications of materials required for setting up a structure such as a staff common room at the bay of the public transport interchange, but the bus company had not been following up actively.

24. Mr Derek LAI said that the refuse station only handled general household waste, the FEHD did not object to sanitising it.

25. Mr Patrick NG said that the HD had already approved the bus company's plan to set up a staff common room at the bay of the public transport interchange at Chun Yeung Estate, and the works section of the HD had also reserved the relevant locations for connecting power supply.

26. Mr Allan CHAN added that the HD, based on the information provided by the FHB, had issued letters to inform the prospective tenants of Blocks 4 and 5 whether their allocated units had ever housed persons of COVID-19 confirmed cases when used for quarantine purpose.

27. Ms Maggie LEUNG said that, since Blocks 1 to 3 had not been returned to the HA, the social welfare facilities to be set up at Blocks 1 to 3 of Chun Yeung Estate, including day care centres / units for the elderly, special child care centres, early education and training centres and small group homes, would not be opened as scheduled.

28. Ms WONG Kam-lai, Chief School Development Officer (Sha Tin) of the EDB gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) from February 2020 till now, the EDB had received a total of some 80 applications for admission to schools in the Sha Tin District in September, and the EDB had processed them completely; and
- (b) upon the Government's announcement about the postponed intake of Blocks 1 to 3, the EDB learned from its record that 18 applicants were affected. The EDB already took the initiative to contact the parents concerned on 19 August about their children's needs for school places and offered assistance to them.

29. The views of Mr MAK Tsz-kin were summarised below:

- (a) he condemned the further postponement of Chun Yeung Estate's intake and the absence of representatives of the FHB and the DH;
- (b) he said that the hotel industry earlier indicated their ability to offer 1 500 rooms for quarantine use which he believed could replace Chun Yeung Estate as the quarantine centre. He asked why the estate was kept being used which had affected the interests of prospective tenants. He hoped the STDO would note the opinions and approach the FHB to enquire about the reasons;
- (c) he said that prospective tenants found it hard to arrange accommodation, and the one-time allowance could not solve their needs;
- (d) he hoped the EDB would offer assistance to the school children of prospective tenants who had to attend cross-district schools;
- (e) he played a voice recording of prospective tenants; and
- (f) he said he would move a provisional motion later on.

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

- (a) he opined that the FHB and the DH should have sent representatives to attend the meeting in order to explain the arrangements for Chun Yeung Estate to allay district councillors' concerns;
- (b) he pointed out that there was only one carriageway between Blocks 3 and 4, and asked how sufficient distancing between the residents and the quarantined could be ensured;
- (c) he pointed out that there were nursing homes and day care centres for the elderly at Block 5 which were close to the quarantine centre, and he asked whether the department would recommend commencing operation of those facilities;
- (d) he opined that the bus company's staff common room was close to the quarantine centre which could pose an infection risk to the staff; and
- (e) he asked the Government to return Chun Yeung Estate to the HD expeditiously and arrange for the tenants to move in.

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

- (a) he said that the STDC had proposed a motion to request that the Government use hotels as quarantine facilities, but the Government did not do so;
- (b) based on the HD's 14-day rent-free period, he asked if the HD would consider making flexible rent-free arrangements and extending the move-in period; and
- (c) he wished to know how many school children had to attend cross-district schools, and he asked if the Government could provide special travel allowances to reduce their expenses in this regard.

32. Mr Allan CHAN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he said that the HD offered a 14-day rent-free period and basically would not extend it for the prospective tenants;

[Post-meeting note: In response to individual cases of prospective tenants, the HD could consider postponing their move-in date.]

- (b) before the intake, the FHB and the DH already assessed the environment and regarded it as suitable for living. Detailed assessment criteria were laid down by the FHB and the DH;
- (c) the department wished to provide assistance to the affected prospective tenants via the Government's Anti-epidemic Fund; and

[Post-meeting note: The HD already informed eligible prospective tenants of Chun Yeung Estate's Blocks 1 to 3 in writing on 28 October of the arrangements for re-granting the \$6,000 ex-gratia allowance which was already paid by cheque mailed in late October 2020.]

- (d) he said that access roads at Blocks 1 to 3 were separated from that at Block 5. Residents and high-risk persons could get in and out via Wong Chuk Yeung Street.

33. Ms WONG Kam-lai gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the EDB already took the initiative to contact affected parents. Some of them decided to let their children keep attending schools in the Sha Tin District; 6 of the applicants wished to transfer their children back to the previous schools. The EDB would provide assistance; and
- (b) she would relay to the relevant departments the issue on travel allowances for cross-district school children.

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

- (a) she said that Chun Yeung Estate was in social concern. She had been informed of relevant issues such as the intake arrangements and the quarantine facilities to ensure the prospective tenants would move in expeditiously. The STDO had also been in discussion with departments such as the HD and the DH, and was concerned about the intake of the estate and the arrangements for the quarantine centre. She said that the quarantine centre was strictly regulated and anti-epidemic measures prudently implemented; and
- (b) after the STDO's discussion with the HD and the DH, a decision of by-phase intake was made. To let the prospective tenants move in in an orderly fashion, the HD would adjust the daily number of intake to accommodate the relevant arrangements and let each department provide appropriate support.

35. The views of Ms WONG Man-huen were summarised below:

- (a) she said that the DC repeatedly invited the DH to discuss anti-epidemic issues, but the DH had not sent any representative to attend the meetings. She asked the DO/ST to relay the opinions to the DH;
- (b) she asked if there was any plan to return Chun Yeung Estate at the time when it was requisitioned;
- (c) she wished to learn from the HD about the scientific basis for the separation arrangements made between the quarantine centre and Blocks 4 and 5;
- (d) she said that the HD had indicated its permission to allocate units of other districts, but some tenants already said they wished to live in Sha Tin. She opined that the relevant measures failed to address the needs; and
- (e) she asked what allowances the SWD would provide for prospective tenants in dire need.

36. Mr NG Kam-hung asked what the Government would do if an outbreak unfortunately broke out after the prospective tenants of Blocks 4 and 5 moved in. He asked the Chairman and the DO/ST to invite representatives of the DH to attend the meeting to answer questions about the arrangements.

37. The views of Mr LUI Kai-wing were summarised below:

- (a) he was dissatisfied that the FHB did not send any representative to attend the meeting, and he asked the DO/ST to help invite the FHB to attend the STDC meeting to answer district councillors' questions about Chun Yeung Estate and anti-epidemic issues;
- (b) he asked what support the EDB would provide for cross-district school children who had paid fees regarding such things as miscellaneous items, uniforms and textbooks to the new school; and
- (c) since the EDB's representative said he could contact the EDB regarding the case, he asked for the contact method.

38. Mr Allan CHAN replied that the FHB's experts regarded the environment of Blocks 4 and 5 as habitable after conducting assessment before the intake.

39. Ms WONG Kam-lai gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) regarding the case mentioned by Mr LUI Kai-wing, she would follow up on the liaison after the meeting in order to provide apt assistance; and

[Post-meeting remarks: Ms WONG Kam-lai contacted Mr LUI Kai-wing after the meeting to follow up on the residents' needs and enquiries regarding school admission.]

- (b) the bureau's telephone number was provided in the school admission form, and district councillors could contact her direct.

40. Ms Maggie LEUNG replied that the SWD had set up a working group on promoting social services in Chun Yeung Estate and contacted social services organisations to provide prospective tenants in financial straits with support, such as supplies and simple renovation.
41. The Chairman asked the DO/ST to relay to the department concerned how the bureau would handle the problem if an outbreak took place in the community after the intake.
42. Dr Janet WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:
- (a) under the current epidemic, the risk of being affected by the epidemic before and after moving into Chun Yeung Estate was more or less the same as that of living in a general community. She said the government departments would handle it based on the established mechanism; and
 - (b) she indicated her understanding, and would relay to the FHB and the DH the opinions of the district councillors. She had called the FHB to invite them to send representatives to attend the meeting, and the bureau had considered doing so, but the representative acquainted with the issue was required to prepare for the community-wide testing scheme. She would try to invite representatives of the FHB and the DH again to attend the meeting.
43. The Chairman said he would, together with the DO/ST, actively arrange to communicate with the FHB and district councillors. He asked what ex-gratia arrangements the HD would make for prospective residents who wished to be allocated units in Sha Tin District's estates.
44. Ms LI Fung-yuk, Senior Housing Manager / Applications 2 of the HD said the HD noted that some prospective tenants wished to be allocated renovated units in the Sha Tin District. The HD would cater for their needs as much as possible.
45. The views of Mr CHENG Chung-hang were summarised below:
- (a) he asked if the Government had learned via surveys when the existing tenancies of prospective tenants of Blocks 1 to 3 would expire and whether they had special needs, in order to provide appropriate support; and
 - (b) he relayed that prospective tenants might be worried about getting infected and the reality not measuring up to their expectations when they chose their units back then. He opined that the rent should be waived before the intake of Chun Yeung Estate was totally completed. He asked if the HD would extend the 14-day rent-free period.
46. The views of Mr CHIU Chu-pong were summarised below:
- (a) he said the housing problem of Hong Kong was serious, and he found the further extension of Chun Yeung Estate's intake disappointing. He opined that a one-off ex-gratia allowance was not able to meet the needs of the prospective tenants. He asked the Government what compensation would be offered to those prospective tenants, and he opined that the Anti-epidemic Fund should be applied to affected prospective tenants;

- (b) he opined that the Government failed to implement effective anti-epidemic measures which resulted in community outbreaks and the need for requisitioning Chun Yeung Estate;
- (c) he disagreed with the DO/ST's saying that the risk of being affected by the epidemic before and after moving into Chun Yeung Estate was more or less the same as that of living in a general community. He opined that the risk should be relatively higher in the vicinity of the quarantine centre; and
- (d) he said that the STDC and the Health and Environment Committee had invited the DH to attend the meetings a number of times, but to no avail.

47. The Chairman asked Members to note that Mr TING Tsz-yuen was present at the meeting. Members unanimously agreed to cancel Mr TING's leave application.

48. The views of Mr CHAN Wan-tung were summarised below:

- (a) he opined that there was no need for the DO/ST to explain for the government departments. He said district councillors were concerned about the follow-up support, e.g. subsidies and discretionary arrangements, provided for the prospective tenants;
- (b) he relayed that some prospective tenants dared not move in as they were worried about getting infected. He asked what discretionary arrangements would be provided for this kind of prospective tenants, and whether the rent-free period would be extended till Chun Yeung Estate's intake was totally completed; and
- (c) he asked the department to elaborate on the sanitisation arrangements to be made before the intake so that the residents could rest assured.

49. Mr Allan CHAN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he said that Blocks 4 and 5 of Chun Yeung Estate were regarded as habitable after the DH's assessment, so the rent-free period would be the same as that of general public housing estates;
- (b) he said there were over 10 booths of renovation contractors at Blocks 4 and 5 of Chun Yeung Estate to provide renovation services for the prospective tenants; and
- (c) the department temporarily used the premises proposed for the elderly homes to process contract-signing during the intake. There were partitions separating staff from the prospective tenants, and people at the venue were required to keep an appropriate social distance. Hand rub was provided and the venue was regularly sanitised. Besides, the department had the lobby cleaned and implemented anti-epidemic measures according to the guidelines. The access roads at Blocks 4 and 5 would be sanitised more often so that passers-by could rest assured.

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

- (a) she noted the attendance of the FHB's representatives at past meetings. Regarding this meeting, she understood that the department had seriously been looking for a representative suitable for attending the meeting. The STDO would

relay the opinions and concerns of the district councillors to the departments concerned and wait for their responses; and

- (b) she clarified that every community posed an infection risk. Regarding the infection risk among residential estates, there was no substantial data.

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

- (a) he opined that it was necessary for the Government to elaborate on the anti-epidemic measures so as to boost the prospective tenants' confidence in moving in; and
- (b) he asked the department to understand the needs of the prospective tenants and provide them with support or compensation.

52. The views of Mr Raymond LI were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out the Government had said that Chun Yeung Estate was to be requisitioned as a quarantine centre because of its remoteness from the residential area, but intake arrangements were currently being made. He wished to learn about the assessment criteria and data as well as the anti-epidemic and sanitisation measures to be carried out after the intake. He believed only providing relevant information could make people feel assured; and
- (b) he said the STDC had repeatedly invited departments such as the DH to attend the meetings, but they said they were not able to send representatives because they were currently focusing wholeheartedly on fighting the epidemic. He found the reason inappropriate because district councillors and all departments were busy fighting the epidemic just the same.

53. The views of Mr WONG Ho-fung were summarised below:

- (a) he said the FHB had not sent representatives to the meetings since February, apart from the discussion about requisitioning Chun Yeung Estate;
- (b) he said that it was not right for the Government not to provide any compensation measures for the prospective tenants; and
- (c) he hoped the Government would close the border expeditiously.

54. Mr Allan CHAN said the documents previously sent to the STDC and the prospective tenants mentioned that support was available for the prospective tenants via the Anti-epidemic Fund.

55. The Chairman said that there was no department present at the meeting which could respond to the issue on the locations selected to be quarantine centres and the arrangements for Chun Yeung Estate to be used as a quarantine centre while simultaneously processing intake. Hence, he asked the DO/ST to relay district councillors' opinions to the FHB and to request for replies via meetings or other methods.

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

- (a) he opined that the Chun Yeung Estate incident reflected the Government's feeble anti-epidemic efforts;
- (b) he opined that the Government's contradictory policies were shown in further delays in Chun Yeung Estate's intake and simultaneously using it as a quarantine centre and processing intake;
- (c) he said the hotel industry previously indicated their ability to provide 1 500 rooms for quarantine use, but the Government had not made any arrangements; and
- (d) he opined that the Government intended to monitor people via health codes and the community-wide testing, and the arrangements for phased intake of Chun Yeung Estate would cause discontent and social instability.

57. The views of Mr MAK Tsz-kin were summarised below:

- (a) he asked the HD if they would arrange other temporary housing in addition to Po Tin Interim Housing for the prospective tenants to apply for. He opined that Po Tin was rather remote and hoped the HD would explore other arrangements;
- (b) he pointed out that there were still some 200 remaining vacant units in Blocks 4 and 5 available for the prospective tenants of Blocks 1 to 3 to apply for. He asked the HD to inform the prospective tenants of the arrangements expeditiously;
- (c) he asked if the HD could arrange express teams to process the prospective tenants' applications and prioritise their allocation to other housing estates in Sha Tin or other urban areas;
- (d) he opined that the waste disposed of by the staff of the quarantine centre posed a certain extent of risk. He asked if the FEHD would change the relevant arrangements to safeguard the health of the residents of Blocks 4 and 5; and
- (e) he opined that the staff of the quarantine centre and the prospective tenants sharing the same public transport would increase infection risks. He asked the STDO to enquire of the FHB if vehicles would be specially arranged for transporting the staff of the quarantine centre.

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

- (a) he wished to know if the HD would disinfect the central refuse station thoroughly before the cleaning workers entered it;
- (b) he wished to know if the staff of the quarantine centre had ever used the estate office located at Block 4, and whether it had been thoroughly disinfecting before it was returned to the HD;
- (c) the TD said the HD had approved the bus company's plan to set up a staff common room, and he asked if the China Light and Power Company Limited (CLP) would provide power on the first day of operation; and

- (d) he said the residents in the district felt worried and stressed about the operation of the quarantine centre, but the departments concerned had not sent representatives to the meetings to explain to them. He suggested that the Chairman lodge a complaint at the Office of the Ombudsman as to whether it was inappropriate of the bureaux and the departments concerned to have been absent from the meetings.

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

- (a) since the departments had yet to provide the data concerning anti-epidemic cleaning, he disagreed with the saying that infection risks of Blocks 4 and 5 at Chun Yeung Estate were the same as other communities in general. He hoped the departments would provide the data after the meeting; and
- (b) he wished to know about the communication mechanism between the STDO and the FHB and the Centre for Health Protection. He asked if more support could be provided for district councillors during the epidemic.

60. Mr Allan CHAN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the department could arrange thorough disinfection of the central refuse station so as to let the cleaning workers rest assured;
- (b) the Civil Aid Service used the estate office at Block 4 as a control point where no person under quarantine had entered. The management office had cleaned the place before moving in; and
- (c) the department would contact the CLP to provide power for the staff common room of the bus company.

61. Ms LI Fung-yuk gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said only Po Tin Interim Housing could be arranged for the moment, and the department would expeditiously arrange housing for the residents in dire need;
- (b) currently, the department was actively preparing for the intake of Blocks 4 and 5. After consolidating the number of remaining allottable units in Blocks 4 and 5, letters would be sent expeditiously, based on the order of applications of the prospective tenants of Blocks 1 to 3, to ask for their preferences for moving into Blocks 4 or 5; and
- (c) in case of prospective tenants who wished to be allotted other housing units, the department would handle their applications according to resources and their requests.

62. Mr Patrick NG said that the department would liaise and follow up with the Centre for Health Protection regarding the transport arrangements for the staff members of the quarantine centre, and would urge the bus company and the GMB operators concerned to step up their cleaning and disinfection efforts.

63. Mr Allan CHAN said that the DH had thoroughly disinfected the units before returning them to the HD, and the department would also disinfect the central refuse station. The estate office had been cleaned on a large-scale before the management office moved in.

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

- (a) he opined that the STDC and the Government failed to establish a mutually trusting relation;
- (b) he reminded Members to fill in the reply slip of the circular so as to commence the procurement of anti-epidemic supplies expeditiously; and
- (c) he opined that the DO/ST should coordinate departments regarding their attendance at the meetings, and hoped that the Government would step up its anti-epidemic efforts.

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

- (a) he was discontented about the quarantine and the intake taking place simultaneously. He pointed out that residents would have to pass through Blocks 1 and 3 to reach Blocks 4 and 5 after the bus station came into operation, where they might run into the people under quarantine. He asked if protective gear would be provided so that residents would move in with peace of mind;
- (b) he asked the TD to add information on the arrangements for the staff common room of the bus company; and
- (c) he asked if more information on the quarantine centre could be provided.

66. Mr CHENG Chung-hang said that the department had forced the prospective tenants to pay the rent. He suggested extending the rent-free period to the end of the period when Chun Yeung Estate was requisitioned as the quarantine centre plus another 14 days.

67. Mr Allan CHAN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he said that the mall and the public transport interchange were not on the same level as Blocks 1 to 3, and they were completely separate. The mall exit was separated by 2-metre water barriers from Blocks 1 to 3. He said a site visit could be conducted on 27th this month, and the department could provide photos of the relevant locations for Members' reference. What the department previously provided was a concept image which made it hard to tell the height differences;
- (b) Blocks 4 and 5 had been assessed by the DH as habitable, same as other public housing units in general; hence, the same arrangements were made; and
- (c) the department would consider individual cases of prospective tenants who needed rent assistance.

68. The Chairman hoped that the prospective tenants in need would be provided with assistance as much as possible under the relevant mechanism.

69. The views of Mr LUI Kai-wing were summarised below:
- (a) he was concerned about the hygiene problems of GMB Route Nos. 811A and 60K because some citizens had spotted trash left in the compartment. He asked the TD to urge the contractors to pay heed to the compartment hygiene; and
 - (b) he asked if the TD could provide the implementation schedule of KMB Route Nos. 285 and 88X.
70. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:
- (a) he said there were day care centres / units for the elderly at Block 5, and he wished to know more about the arrangements. Since the infection rate and the death rate of the elderly were relatively higher, he was concerned it would be risky for the elderly centres and the quarantine centre to be operated simultaneously; and
 - (b) he asked if the department had been notified by the prospective tenants of any change of number of family members, and what arrangements it would make.
71. The views of Mr CHIU Chu-pong were summarised below:
- (a) he opined that the Government should properly handle livelihood issues;
 - (b) he opined that the department should not address the rent-free period as usual under the special circumstances where Chun Yeung Estate was requisitioned as the quarantine centre due to the epidemic. He opined that the Anti-epidemic Fund should be directly given back to citizens;
 - (c) he suggested that Chun Yeung Estate be replaced by hotels as the quarantine centre or temporary accommodation; and
 - (d) he requested extending the rent-free period of Blocks 4 and 5, and providing cash allowance for the prospective tenants of Blocks 1 to 3 until the intake was fully completed.
72. Mr Patrick NG gave a consolidated response as follows:
- (a) he would ask the GMB operators to pay heed to the compartment hygiene and remind their drivers to dispose of the trash within the compartment; and
 - (b) KMB Route No. 285 would provide a connecting service between Chun Yeung Estate and Fo Tan MTR Station during peak hours. The bus company would commence the service as soon as possible subject to the intake status of the estate and arrangements for the staff common room. The diversion arrangements for KMB Route No. 88X would be discussed at the TTC.
73. Ms Maggie LEUNG said that the department had reserved premises at Block 5 for setting up day care centres / units for the elderly. It usually took 9 to 12 months for public tendering to select operators and for renovation by the operators; hence, the centres / units would not commence operation within a short period of time.

74. Ms LI Fung-yuk said the department often received applications for change of number of family members. It would review the change of number, and would allot another suitable unit within Chun Yeung Estate subject to the allotment order and the relevant eligibility.

75. The Chairman asked the DO/ST to note and relay Members' wishes for the Anti-epidemic Fund to provide ex gratia arrangements for the prospective tenants of Chun Yeung Estate.

76. The views of Mr HUI Yui-yu were summarised below:

- (a) he wished to know why Chun Yeung Estate was a better choice than hotels as a quarantine centre, and asked the DH to explain but it did not send any representative to the meeting. He opined that the arrangements would deprive the prospective tenants of their benefits;
- (b) he opined that it was necessary to understand the prospective tenants' needs via conducting a survey so as to provide suitable support. He asked whether the HD had given out any questionnaire; and
- (c) he opined that the HD should establish a mechanism to support the prospective tenants in need.

77. The views of Mr Johnny CHUNG were summarised below:

- (a) he asked whether the HD or the HA was responsible for relaxing the rent-free period, and whether either of them had discussed it;
- (b) he asked the HA whether it had charged the Government for rent for borrowing Chun Yeung Estate to be the quarantine centre, and he opined that it was necessary for the HA to handle the rent issues fairly; and
- (c) he wished to know who would pay for the expenses incurred, e.g. cleaning and disinfection fees, after the HD took over Chun Yeung Estate.

78. Mr Allan CHAN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he clarified that there was no rent waiver but only assistance;
- (b) the department would relay the prospective tenants' needs to the Anti-epidemic Fund; and

[Post-meeting note: The HD already issued a letter on 28 October 2020 to the eligible prospective tenants of Blocks 1 to 3 regarding the re-granting of a \$6,000 ex gratia allowance. The allowance was already granted via cheques by post in late October.]

- (c) he said policies involving public housing rent would have to be endorsed by the HA.

79. The Chairman asked Mr Allan CHAN to relay Members' opinions to the department and reply afterwards.

80. Mr Allan CHAN added that, to his knowledge, the Government did not pay any rent for using Chun Yeung Estate as a quarantine centre. The expenses incurred by the quarantine centre, e.g. disinfection expenses, would be paid by the Government.

81. The Chairman said he, together with the DO/ST, would relay opinions regarding the said issue to the FHB and the DH in the hopes that the FHB would send representatives to attend meetings and enhance communication with the STDC. He asked the HD to provide information later on regarding the questions it could not respond to right now. Besides, he hoped the TD would arrange the bus routes for the residents as soon as possible, and hoped the EDB would understand the requests made by parents concerning the schooling of their children.

82. The Chairman agreed to address the provisional motion proposed by Mr MAK Tsz-kin, and asked whether Members would agree.

83. Members agreed to address the provisional motion proposed by Mr MAK Tsz-kin.

84. Mr MAK Tsz-kin proposed the following provisional motion:

“Background:

The Government announced on 18 August 2020 that the intake procedure of Blocks 4 and 5 of Chun Yeung Estate, i.e. Chun Sze House and Chun Wu House, would be arranged at the end of the month whereas Blocks 1 to 3, i.e. Chun Yat House, Chun Yi House and Chun San House, would remain as a quarantine centre. The decision was unprecedented and had not been extensively consulted at the Sha Tin District Council (STDC).

Blocks 1 to 3 of Chun Yeung Estate were scheduled for intake in October this year. The Government broke its promises repeatedly by breaching the intake undertaking and even violating the principle of ‘keeping the quarantine centre remote from residential areas’. It did not even announce the details about ex gratia arrangements and support, ignoring the plights of the grass-roots.

The STDC’s motion includes:

1. strongly condemning the Government for repeatedly breaking its promises and betraying the trust of the people, and condemning the Department of Health (DH) and the Food and Health Bureau (FHB) for not sending representatives to the STDC’s meetings over and over;
2. demanding that facilities remote from residential areas (e.g. barracks) be prioritised to be used as a quarantine centre, and that the use of Blocks 1 to 3 of Chun Yeung Estate (i.e. Chun Yat House, Chun Yi House and Chun San House) be terminated comprehensively so as to speed up the renovation for the affected tenants to move in expeditiously;
3. demanding that the relevant departments provide residents of Chun Yeung Estate with support, including helping their children transfer schools, providing temporary housing and granting monthly allowances, till the intake is fully completed;
4. demanding that the Housing Department (HD) and the FHB clearly explain the intake arrangements, including the anti-epidemic measures, auxiliary transport facilities, shopping malls and social services facilities;

5. giving assistance in prioritising allocation of other public housing units to the prospective tenants in need and refraining from counting such an allocation as an offer;
6. demanding that the HD grant at least 1-year rent-free period to all the residents of Chun Yeung Estate upon intake.”

Mr George WONG, Mr CHAN Nok-hang, Mr CHAN Pui-ming, Mr CHAN Wan-tung, Mr CHENG Chung-hang, Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa, Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Mr Felix CHOW, Mr Johnny CHUNG, Mr HUI Lap-san, Mr HUI Yui-yu, Mr LAI Tsz-yan, Mr Raymond LI, Mr LI Sai-hung, Mr Wilson LI, Mr Ricardo LIAO, Mr LO Tak-ming, Mr LO Yuet-chau, Mr LUI Kai-wing, Ms LUK Tsz-tung, Mr Chris MAK, Mr NG Kam-hung, Ms NG Ting-lam, Mr Jimmy SHAM, Mr SHEK William, Mr SIN Cheuk-nam, Ms TSANG So-lai, Mr WAI Hing-cheung, Mr WONG Ho-fung, Ms WONG Man-huen, Mr YAU Man-chun, Mr YEUNG Sze-kin, Mr YIP Wing and Mr Michael YUNG seconded the motion.

85. The Council unanimously endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 84.
86. The Chairman hoped the relevant departments would respect the STDC’s views and would respond to them accordingly.
87. Mr Michael YUNG asked whether the Chairman would lodge a complaint at the Office of the Ombudsman about maladministration if the FHB and the DH still refused to send representatives to the meetings.
88. The Chairman said he would, together with the DO/ST, first demand that the relevant departments respond to the STDC’s requests, and then report later on.

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

89. Mr David LEUNG, Architect (Works)8 of the Home Affairs Department (HAD) briefly introduced the content of the paper. The main points were as follows:

- (a) the extension works of Ma Kam Street Sitting-out Area, Ma On Shan, was still at the stage of preliminary feasibility study, so the amount reported today was just a rough estimate which might be changed or adjusted due to a number of reasons along different stages of the works. The HAD would report it later on; and
- (b) the contract of the works cost \$14.7 million; expenses of other works \$3.499 million; and the reserve \$1.8 million. He said that the costs stipulated in the contract included the works estimate, the works commencement fees, the works reserve and the expenses reserved for price adjustments. Other expenses included consultation fees of a team of architectural consultants, consultation fees of quantity surveying, fees of site supervision, fees of permanent water and power connections and fees of advance works. The reserve fund constituted about 10% of the whole works project.

90. The Chairman said the discussion item was supplementary information following Members’ questions in the previous meeting. \$20 million was just an estimate of the works. The project would submit an individual application to the STDC when the works practically commenced and the arrangements made.

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

- (a) he said Members already asked for a comprehensive estimate in the previous meeting as well as estimates of the amount of time needed and the expenses at each stage. In this connection, he asked whether the unavailability of the relevant information was due to the fact that no consultancy had been selected. He opined that the department should provide an estimate of the annual expenses of the works and the estimated amount of time required by each works procedure; and
- (b) he suggested returning the works to the purview of the Working Group on District Facilities and Improvement Works (WGDFIW) because the persons in charge had failed to respond to Members' requests and questions.

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

- (a) he said the paper shown today failed to facilitate the discussion about the works;
- (b) he asked if drinking fountains were a necessary facility in the park; if not, whether considerations would be taken to save the relevant expenses; and
- (c) he asked whether the estimate of the works was the highest; for instance, whether the high estimate was due to assumptions such as all trees would be removed and the space would be fully utilised for development.

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

- (a) he said spending \$20 million to build a park was not a big deal from the Government's perspective, but Members were concerned about how the approved fund was used, what facilities would be built and why the relevant expenses were incurred;
- (b) he said the works' actual expenses at the end might be less or more than the estimate. He was concerned that \$20 million might not be enough to complete the whole project, so he asked the department to provide a clearer estimate; and
- (c) he agreed on building the park because he hoped the site would be properly used and managed.

94. Mr HUI Yui-yu said that Members demanded that the department conduct a thorough study, but it had yet been able to put forward a detailed proposal due to a lack of funding for the preliminary study. He opined that Members were concerned about the necessity of having such a park and the allocation of resources, and that the overly high costs would deter Members. He suggested that the stakeholders discuss with the Members concerned their ideal park. Upon the completion of the first stage of the proposal, a significant impact would not result even if the following stages were not to be completed. He believed that such a proposal would have a better chance of being endorsed.

95. Mr David LEUNG said that the works would take 6 financial years from 2020-2021 to 2025-2026 over 6 phases. In the first financial year, a feasibility study constituting about 0.5% of the expenses of the whole project would be conducted; the following financial year thereafter would see preliminary designs, consultations and detailed designs, which would constitute about 3.5% of the estimate of the whole project; the third financial year would conduct detailed

designs, invite tenders and carry out the works, which would constitute about 6% of the total expenses; the fourth financial year would carry out the works which would constitute about 52% to 57% of the total expenses; the fifth financial year would be works implementation and post-completion constituting about 22% to 27% of the total expenses; and the sixth financial year would be post-completion constituting about 6% to 10% of the total expenses.

96. Ms Joe WONG, District Leisure Manager (Sha Tin) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) said that the department hoped to at best provide drinking fountains and hand-washing facilities at the newly built venue, in particular the children's playground, as resources allowed.

97. The Chairman opined that the data mentioned by Mr David LEUNG should be documented for Members' easy and clear reference and understanding. He asked the attendees to make good use of the time at the meeting.

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

- (a) he opined that the contents of the papers were repetitive;
- (b) he said that Members expressed their wishes to be informed of the breakdown of the relevant expenses at the last meeting. The considerable financial commitment might hinder the handling of other district minor works programmes;
- (c) he did not understand why the department could only break down the expenses into 3 items, and he asked which category tree removal should belong to; and
- (d) he said that Members were duty-bound to monitor the Government's use of public money, and opined that the existing breakdown should be returned and re-discussed due to a lack of sufficient details.

99. The Chairman said the paper had been discussed at the meeting of the District Facilities Management and Security Affairs Committee (DFMSC), and it was submitted to the STDC after elaboration, introduction and explanation on the project. It requested the committee members to consider endorsing the feasibility study of the project. He asked Members to express their views concisely.

100. Mr CHENG Chung-hang said he did not understand why the department could only provide the expenses of 3 items, opined that the paper was below par, and asked the department to provide a breakdown and project information in more detail.

101. Mr Ricardo LIAO opined that the project should be discussed by the working group concerned. He was disappointed at the contents of the paper and the department's failure to provide a breakdown of the items, and opined that the paper did not provide substantial contents. He asked what the items under the estimated expenses during the project implementation period would be and how the estimate was made. He opined that public money should be prudently used.

102. Mr WONG Ho-fung said there were a lot of idle sites in Tai Wai and Ma On Shan and he hoped the Government would identify those sites for development and management. He pointed out that the over-commitment of the project constitute a substantial percentage, and opined that the Government, instead of the STDC, should bear the expenses. He said it would be hard to approve the project at the moment due to a lack of a detailed breakdown of the items.

103. Mr CHIU Chu-pong said it would be necessary to refer to the project duration and the percentage of the expenses mentioned in the department's response. Some Members were concerned about the expenses of tree removal. He pointed out that there were already some benches and shelters at the Ma Kam Street Sitting-out Area, and asked if it would be possible to just carry out land formation works, establish fitness facilities, etc. instead of building a large-scale park. He opined that it was necessary to put the expenses into good use, otherwise he would object to all relevant items. Besides, he was discontented that the department had not provided detailed information.

104. Mr Raymond LI said that he, as the convenor of the WGDFIW, was willing to assist in approving the project at the working group's meeting. He said that the documented information was sloppily prepared without detailed expenses which made it difficult for Members to decide whether to support the project or not. He said it was necessary to know the project details and the proposed facilities, and opined that the department's response should be documented for Members' reference.

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

- (a) she said the project was within her constituency and was proposed by her. She opined that the department had not documented the expenses in detail, and she hoped it would provide supplementary information;
- (b) she said residents in the district were looking forward to having the park. It was currently divided into 3 sections with a passage in the middle flanked by barbed-wire fenced derelict land overgrown with weeds and plagued by mosquitoes, affecting the residents in the vicinity and those travelling to the health centre; and
- (c) she proposed only handling the 2 barbed-wire fenced areas if there was concern about the overly high estimate of the large-scale project, and asked if the estimate of the expenses could be reduced so as to balance different needs by reducing the scale of the project.

106. Mr Wilson LI said the residents in the vicinity hoped for improvements to be carried out to the site. He suggested reducing the scale of the project in case of insufficient resources and keeping the trees there as much as possible or conducting tree-grafting to landscape the areas. He suggested re-engaging the relevant working group to discuss the project, due to insufficient information provided in the paper.

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

- (a) he asked the Secretariat to provide the minutes of the DFMSC's meeting dated 24 June 2020 expeditiously for Members' reference;
- (b) he hoped the DFMSC would take over the project and decide whether it should be passed on to the relevant working group;
- (c) he suggested that the department refer to the STDC's previous papers, e.g. STDC 68/2015 which detailed the breakdown of yearly expenses and the actual expenses of the relevant works project; and

- (d) he asked the Secretariat how many works proposals had actual papers available for the relevant working group's approval and for Members to consider whether to adjust the works proposals approved this year.

[Post-meeting note: The draft of the minutes of the DFMSC's fourth meeting in 2020 dated 24 June 2020 was issued to the members on 16 September 2020.]

108. Ms Selina LEUNG, Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 21 of the LCSD gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that district minor works proposals were required to go through project initiation and approval by the STDC before a feasibility study could be conducted, and then the Work Section of the HAD would go through the preliminary process such as ground investigation and tree studies to further understand the site's geography and limitations in order to decide on the facilities to be set up and provide more detailed information; and
- (b) she said, based on previous experiences, it was difficult for the Works Group to provide more details at the current stage when the feasibility study had yet to be conducted. The LCSD took follow-up action with the Works Group immediately after receiving the works proposal, and had spent some time on conducting a preliminary study. The department would need more time to discuss with the proponent the scope of works and to start the research anew if the works proposal was to be passed to the relevant working group for review again. It expected that re-submission to the working group in a short period of time would be infeasible.

109. The Chairman said the item had been approved by the relevant working group and the DFMSC. It could be passed to the DFMSC and the relevant working group for review again if Members opined that the proposal would not be endorsed assuredly today.

110. Ms TSANG So-lai said the project was previously approved by the relevant working group and the DFMSC. She suggested that the feasibility study put forward 2 options, i.e. the original proposal and the one with works carried out within the barbed-wire fenced areas, for Members' consideration.

111. Mr CHIU Chu-pong said members of the DFMSC had already had ample discussion and requested more information from the relevant departments for Members' consideration, but the HAD had yet to provide sufficient information which made it impossible for Members to reach a decision at the DC meeting.

112. Mr Raymond LI said repeated requests for the departments to submit more information had been made at the meetings of the relevant working group and the DFMSC, but the departments had yet to provide it for Members' consideration. He said that Members were not trying to veto the funding, but were hoping to know more information. He did not oppose passing the item to the relevant working group for review again if the procedure allowed, and he suggested that Members interested in it join the working group to understand how the departments would explain the project.

113. Mr Michael YUNG suggested requesting the departments to provide a breakdown of the expenses of the original proposal, or scale down the size of the project. He suggested that Members refrain from making a decision today or the department withdraw the item, so that the department could submit more information at the next meeting of the working group, during

which a discussion with the proponent about the estimated expenses of a scaled down project could take place. He opined that, due to the involvement of 2 proposals' estimates, the HAD might need to set up a new item because the consultation fees might vary. He opined that the relevant HAD officers should follow up on this or have the person-in-charge replaced, and he demanded that Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin)(1) assist in following up on this.

114. The Chairman asked whether the relevant departments would agree on shelving the item and making amendments before re-submitting it to the relevant working group and the DFMSC for consideration.

115. Ms Selina LEUNG said she had no comment on the said arrangements.

116. The Chairman said the conference room would be cleaned at 6:30pm today and air-conditioning would be supplied till 7pm. He suggested handling information items first and deciding on how to handle the remaining 2 questions based on the circumstances later on. He asked if Members agreed to such arrangements.

117. The Council agreed on the arrangements unanimously.

Information Items

Reports of Committees under the STDC

Traffic and Transport Committee

(Paper Nos. STDC 67/2020)

(Paper Nos. STDC 68/2020)

District Facilities Management and Security Affairs Committee

(Paper No. STDC 69/2020)

Development and Housing Committee

(Paper Nos. STDC 70/2020)

(Paper Nos. STDC 70A/2020)

(Paper Nos. STDC 70B/2020)

118. Mr Michael YUNG asked when the Planning Department (PlanD) would submit the proposed amendments to the approved Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22 to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for public consultation to collect opinions.

119. Ms Jessica CHU, District Planning Officer / Sha Tin, Tai Po and North of the PlanD said that the proposed amendments to the approved Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan was submitted to the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the TPB for consideration on 21 August 2020. Since the RNTPC asked the department for supplementary information on one of the amendments, it still had not completed the review process. The amendments, if accepted by the TPC in the end, could be exhibited for public inspection according to Section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. Members of the public could submit written representations to the TPB within the 2-month exhibition period.

120. The Chairman asked the PlanD to inform the STDC of the above matter in due course.

[Post-meeting note: The RNTPC further considered the proposed amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan on 18 September 2020. After deliberation, it agreed on the proposed amendments

which were exhibited on 16 October 2020 for public inspection for 2 months according to Section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. The TPB Secretariat already issued a legal notice concerning the Outline Zoning Plan to Members by post and/or email on 16 October this year, and notified them of the arrangements for representations.]

121. Mr CHAN Pui-ming said that a provisional motion was endorsed at a meeting of the Development and Housing Committee to request Senior Transport Officer /Tai Po of the TD to elaborate to the STDC on the traffic planning for the area of Shap Sze Heung and Sai Kung North. Though that area was not within the Sha Tin District, the proposed vehicular route would pass through Sha Tin which would cause an actual impact on the traffic in the Sha Tin District. He asked if the said Senior Transport Officer would attend the STDC meeting again to elaborate on it.

122. Mr Patrick NG, Principle Transport Officer / New Territories 1 of the TD said he had noted the questions and would follow up with the departments concerned.

Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee

(Paper Nos. STDC 71/2020)

(Paper Nos. STDC 72/2020)

Health and Environment Committee

(Paper No. STDC 73/2020)

Education and Welfare Committee

(Paper No. STDC 74/2020)

Finance and General Affairs Committee

(Paper No. STDC 75/2020)

123. The Council noted the 11 reports.

Financial Account of the STDC (as at 30 June 2020)

(Paper No. STDC 76/2020)

124. The Council noted the paper.

Questions

Question to be Raised by Mr CHAN Pui-ming on the Assistance Provided to Newly Elected District Council Members and the Secretarial Support Provided by the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) Secretariat

(Paper No. STDC 28/2020(Amended))

125. The Chairman said that, due to time constraints, only 3 Members at most in addition to the questioner would be allowed to ask further questions.

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

- (a) he said the STDO organised a briefing session for newly elected DC members on 23 December 2019. At that time, Members asked if there would be a policy of providing DC members with containers as their ward offices. The then DO/ST said nay, a response different from the written one DC members received in March

2020. He asked if the STDC of this term could apply for setting up containers as their ward offices; and

- (b) he said the amount of hiring contact staff under STDC funding had already reached its maximum. As the population of the Sha Tin District grew, the number of DC members might increase in the next term. He was worried that the administration might not be sufficiently supported if the DC funding did not increase.

127. Mr Raymond LI said the issue had been raised at the beginning of the term. It was not solved when the former DO/ST was in office. He hoped the present DO/ST would follow up on issues such as setting up DC members' ward offices and the Secretariat's staff resources. He asked if the STDO had provided apt support for the Secretariat, e.g. raising the funding to hire more staff members so as to reduce the pressure on the Secretariat and DC members. Also, he asked if the STDO had relayed DC members' opinions voiced on different occasions to the HAD.

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

- (a) he suggested considering re-opening the exit leading to the Secretariat and the STDC Chairman's room for DC members' easy access to the Secretariat area to handle relevant work;
- (b) he demanded that the STDO provide access cards for their easy access to the door leading to the washrooms. Some DC members might take the elevator from the car park to the fourth floor, but they could not enter the conference room from there;
- (c) he asked if the CCTV previously installed at the conference room could broadcast live, and he opined they should discuss whether it was necessary to install the CCTV; and
- (d) he opined that the DO/ST, as Electoral Officer of the Legislative Council election, had no right to disqualify candidates.

129. The Chairman hoped that the STDO would communicate with Members through other relevant mechanisms apart from responding to their questions today, and that the Finance and General Affairs Committee or the relevant working group would follow up further.

130. Dr Janet WONG said the currently vacant posts would be filled first regarding the manpower arrangements for the Secretariat. She said an Executive Officer I had been unable to return to work due to sickness, and hence a special request had been made to the HAD for expediting the posting of a replacement to report for duty on 10 August 2020 in order to alleviate the manpower pressure and enhance work efficiency. Besides, she said the staff members responsible for the election were not from the Secretariat.

131. Mr Simon WONG, Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin) (1) said the letter to STDC members dated 4 March 2020 mentioned the setting up of container-offices in the Sha Tin District. Regarding the setting up of DC members' ward offices that involved renting vacant government land or premises, there were existing procedures to deal with the applications, and the District Lands Office / Sha Tin (DLO/ST) also mentioned in its reply that the government would handle those applications based on applicable procedures. To his understanding, the DLO/ST would process those applications according to the established procedure; and it would

ask the STDO to conduct district consultation if necessary and consult the relevant bureau for its policy support. However, the bureau did not have any policy support for container-offices. The STDO would be willing to pass DC members' enquiries or cases to the relevant bureau for consideration.

132. Mr Wilson WONG, District Lands Officer / Sha Tin of the Lands Department (LandsD) said that the tenancy agreement would be granted to the applicants direct if DC members were interested in renting government land by way of short-term tenancy to set up ward offices. According to the existing procedures, the applications were required to obtain the relevant bureau's support before they could be further processed.

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

- (a) he asked whether the HAD or the Home Affairs Bureau would support DC members in applying to the LandsD for setting up ward offices on government land in the Sha Tin District;
- (b) he asked whether the CCTV in the conference room was operating right now and whether it could go live;
- (c) he asked about the arrangements for access to DC members' common room and the washrooms; and
- (d) he asked why the Secretariats of other districts had still not replied on the questions submitted as early as March 2020 about the expenses of hiring DC contract staff.

134. The views of Dr Janet WONG were summarised below:

- (a) it was beyond her purview regarding the responses of the Secretariats of other districts;
- (b) she said it would be necessary to study with the Architectural Services Department the installation of the equipment for the Secretariat's accessibility arrangements;
- (c) she said the access arrangements for the washrooms were made according to the whole building of the Sha Tin Government Offices, and the fourth floor was shared by other government departments; and
- (d) she said the CCTV could not be used to broadcast live because it could not capture faces clearly. She said the facilities installed in the conference room were all legal, reasonable and in compliance with the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance.

135. The Chairman hoped the STDO could have further exchange, communication and responses on the relevant issues.

Question to be Raised by Mr LO Yuet-chau on Law and Order in the Vicinity of Chui Yan Street (Paper No. STDC 66/2020)

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

- (a) he said he raised the question at the STDC because the police did not send any representative to the DFMSC meetings;

- (b) he said the police's response was short, and he wished to know where the police appealed to members of the public to provide information;
- (c) he said there were 2 police officers stationed at Citimark when the crime happened, and 100 metres from them was where the mobile phone robbery took place in which 2 members of the public were beaten and injured. He was discontented that the police still had not arrested the robbers;
- (d) he asked why there were 2 uniformed officers always stationed at Ngau Pei Sha Street; and
- (e) he pointed out that the crime scene was in the vicinity of Siu Lek Yuen Operational Base, but there were still 2 police officers permanently stationed there. He asked if the police were overstaffed.

137. Mr YAU Man-chun said there had been people gathering to gamble at the park on the ground floor of Ming Yiu Lau, Jat Min Chuen over the past several months, but the police never took action at the scene after a case was report every time. He suggested that the police send police officers to station at the said location due to its grave gambling problem. He speculated that those people had moved from Shing Mun River Promenade Garden No. 1 to the said location, and he was concerned that the gambling scale would grow gradually. He asked why the police had not been able to ticket those people. He had written a letter to the police regarding the issue, hoping they would follow up.

138. Mr CHIU Chu-pong said that the police would not have to deal with the problems of social order at the DC meeting if they had been willing to attend the DFMSC meetings to answer members' questions about the problems. He said the gambling problem was gravely serious at Pok Hong Estate. He repeatedly wrote to Tin Sum Police Station over the past 6 months to ask for follow-up actions, but the police only gave warnings at the scene without ticketing those people. He deemed the police to be unfairly taking enforcement action.

139. Ms Tammy CHAN, District Commander (Shatin) (Acting) of the Hong Kong Police Force gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said the police would deploy manpower subject to the action when handling cases. Regarding the case dated 22 June at Chui Yan Street, Emergency Unit New Territories South and Shatin District police officers swiftly arrived at the scene trying to arrest the suspect(s) in a chase. The case was still under investigation. Members would be notified if more information arose in the future;
- (b) regarding the gambling problem at housing estates in the district, she said the police had studied the installation of CCTV with the HD as well as fitful patrolling and removal of the relevant miscellaneous objects with the departments and the estate management companies concerned. She said some persons were found to have violated the "crowd ban" on the 2 patrols at Shing Mun River Promenade Garden No. 1 yesterday and they were ticketed; and
- (c) she said the police arrested the relevant persons at Pok Hong Estate in June, and the police would keep patrolling and taking action to combat the gambling problem.

140. The Chairman urged the police to re-consider sending representatives to attend the DFMSC meetings, and hoped DO/ST would facilitate coordination accordingly.

Date of Next Meeting

141. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 2:30 pm on 6 October 2020 (Tuesday).

142. The meeting was adjourned at 7:06 pm on 25 August 2020.

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

November 2020