

(Revised)
Minutes of the 3rd Meeting in 2017
of the Environment, Housing and Works Committee
of Tai Po District Council

Date: 10 May 2017 (Wednesday)
Time: 2:45 p.m. – 8:43 p.m.
Venue: Conference Room, Tai Po District Council (“TPDC”)

<u>Present</u>	<u>Time of Arrival</u>	<u>Time of Withdrawal</u>
<u>Chairman</u>		
Mr. CHAN Siu-kuen, MH	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
<u>Vice-chairman</u>		
Mr. LI Wah-kwong, Rex	Beginning of the meeting	6:45 p.m.
<u>Members</u>		
Mr. AU Chun-wah	Beginning of the meeting	8:20 p.m.
Mr. CHAN Cho-leung, MH	Beginning of the meeting	4:18 p.m.
Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai	Beginning of the meeting	7:35 p.m.
Mr. KWAN Wing-yip	Beginning of the meeting	6:45 p.m.
Dr. LAU Chee-sing	2:56 p.m.	End of the meeting
Mr. LAU Yung-wai	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. LO Hiu-fung	3:09 p.m.	End of the meeting
Mr. LI Kwok-ying, BBS, MH, JP	2:57 p.m.	5:38 p.m.
Mr. LI Yiu-ban, BBS, MH, JP	Beginning of the meeting	7:29 p.m.
Mr. TAM Wing-fun, Eric	2:57 p.m.	7:57 p.m.
Mr. TANG Ming-tai, Patrick	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Ms. WONG Pik-kiu, BBS, MH, JP	2:57 p.m.	7:07 p.m.
Mr. WOO Kin-man, Clement	2:59 p.m.	End of the meeting
Mr. YAM Kai-bong, Francis	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. YAM Man-chuen	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. YU Chi-wing, Ken	2:57 p.m.	End of the meeting
<u>Co-opted Members</u>		
Dr. YAU Wing-kwong, JP	Beginning of the meeting	7:46 p.m.
Mr. LEE Siu-man	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. KWOK Wing-kin, Steven	Beginning of the meeting	6:45 p.m.

Secretary

Mr. LEUNG Chung-wa, Alvin Executive Officer (District Council) 1, Tai Po District Office (“TPDO”), Home Affairs Department (“HAD”)	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
---	--------------------------	--------------------

In Attendance

Mr. CHENG Chun-ping, JP	TPDC Member
Ms. LUI Siu-chu, Andy, JP	District Officer (Tai Po), TPDO, HAD
Ms. LEE Kai-ying, Iris	Assistant District Officer (Tai Po), TPDO, HAD
Ms. WONG Shuk-han, Diane	Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Food) 2, Food and Health Bureau (“FHB”)
Mr. FUNG Ying-lun, Allen	Political Assistant to Secretary for Development, Development Bureau (“DEVB”)
Ms. CHU Ha-fan, Jessica	District Planning Officer / Sha Tin, Tai Po and North, New Territories District Planning Division, Planning Department (“Plan D”)
Mr. LAU Chi-ting	Senior Town Planner / Tai Po, New Territories District Planning Division, Plan D
Mr. YUNG Pak-yeung	Town Planner / Tai Po 1, New Territories District Planning Division, Plan D
Ms. KONG Sze-nga, Tammy	Town Planner / Country Park Enclaves 2, New Territories District Planning Division, Plan D
Mr. WONG Chin-wo	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional North) 1, Environmental Compliance Division, Environmental Protection Department (“EPD”)
Ms. CHIU TSE Shuk-yin, Winnie	Senior Housing Manager (Tai Po and North), Estate Management Division, Housing Department (“HD”)
Mr. SOONG Ngar-ting, Martin	Senior Structural Engineer / C2, Section C, Existing Buildings Division 1, Buildings Department (“BD”)
Mr. TSANG Chi-wai, Terence	Structural Engineer / C2-3, Section C, Existing Buildings Division 1, BD
Mr. WONG Kwok-leung	Senior Engineer / Project and Tai Po, Transport Department (“TD”)
Ms. CHAM Shuk-wun, Bonnie	Engineer / 49 (New Territory East), New Territories East Development Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (“CEDD”)

Mr. LO Wai-ki	Engineer / Consultants Management 14, Water Supplies Department (“WSD”)
Mr. CHAN Yiu-wa, Andrew	Chief Health Inspector 1, Tai Po District Environmental Hygiene Office, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (“FEHD”)
Ms. LAU So-mui, Rebecca	Administrative Assistant (Acting), District Lands Office, Tai Po (“TPDLO”), Lands Department (“Lands D”)
Mr. WONG Yiu-ming, Brian	Deputy District Leisure Manager (Tai Po) 2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”)
Mr. CHUNG Chi-kin	Station Sergeant (Acting), Hong Kong Police Force (“HKPF”)
Mr. FUNG Tsz-king	Resident Engineer, Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited
Mr. LEE Yu-sau, Terence	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), TPDO, HAD
Mr. CHAN Lok-him, Dennis	Executive Officer (Development), TPDO, HAD

On Leave

Mr. LI Kam-chung

Absent

Mr. CHAN Tsz-wah

Opening Remarks

The Chairman announced the following:

- (i) As the Social Services Committee (“SSC”) meeting overran, the starting time of this Environment, Housing and Works Committee (“EHWC”) meeting was postponed to 2:45 p.m.
- (ii) Ms. TANG Pui-sze had resigned from the position of Co-opted Member of the EHWC of the TPDC.
- (iii) Mr. CHENG Chun-ping and Ms. LUI Siu-chu, Andy, District Officer (Tai Po) attended this meeting.
- (iv) Mr. HO Yiu-man of the HKPF was unable to attend this meeting due to other commitments, and Mr. CHUNG Chi-kin attended the meeting on his behalf.
- (v) Mr. LI Kam-chung was unable to attend this meeting due to other commitments. He had submitted his notice of absence to the Secretariat prior to the meeting.

Pursuant to Order 51(1) of the TPDC Standing Orders (“Standing Orders”), the EHWC would only give consent to a Member’s application for absence from meeting filed on grounds of sickness (including sickness due to pregnancy), jury service, attendance at another meeting / activity on behalf of the District Council (“DC”), attendance at a Legislative Council (“LegCo”) / Executive Council meeting, confinement or paternity leave. Pursuant to the above requirements, his application was not approved.

I. Confirmation of the minutes of the 2nd meeting of the EHWC in 2017 on 8 March 2017
(TPDC Paper No. EHW 22/2017)

2. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had received proposed amendments to the minutes of the previous meeting from the Plan D (TPDC Paper No. EHW 22/2017 referred). As no other Members at the meeting proposed any amendment, the minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed in accordance with the Plan D’s proposed amendments.

II. Land use reviews – land suitable for housing development in the short to medium term
(TPDC Paper No. EHW 23/2017)

3. The Chairman welcomed Mr. FUNG Ying-lun, Allen, Political Assistant to Secretary for Development of the DEVB; as well as Ms. CHU Ha-fan, Jessica, Mr. LAU Chi-ting and Mr. YUNG Pak-yeung, District Planning Officer / Sha Tin, Tai Po and North, Senior Town Planner and Town Planner respectively of the Plan D to the meeting for the discussion of this item.

4. Mr. Allen FUNG introduced as follows:

- (i) To increase land supply for housing development in the short to medium run, the Government had to make the best use of the existing built-up area in the urban area and the new towns, as well as the area in the vicinity of infrastructure facilities. The DEVB, the Plan D and other departments concerned had been carrying out reviews on various types of land uses and had identified more than 210 sites throughout the territory suitable for housing development in the short to medium run. It included 20 sites in Tai Po District which would be suggested to be rezoned for public and private housing developments, and were estimated to provide about 33 000 residential units. Among these 20 sites, the statutory rezoning procedures of 13 had been completed, which were expected to provide about 15 760 public and private residential units (including 8 040 public and 7 720 private residential units) in total. The Government endeavoured to take forward the rezoning of the remaining seven sites to provide about 17 770 residential units (the ratio between

public and private residential units was about 87:13). This meeting would also discuss the land use planning of the two sites on Pok Yin Road in Area 39 of Tai Po and on Ma Wo Road respectively.

- (ii) When putting forward housing development proposals for short- and medium-term housing sites, the authorities had carried out in-depth consideration. The Plan D and other professional departments had all assessed whether the development proposals were in line with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (“HKPSG”) and whether they would bring about any unacceptable impact on the residents based on their own mechanisms and criteria. In addition, the Government had considered in detail a number of practical planning factors, including the volume of traffic and infrastructure, the provision of community facilities and open space, the development restrictions concerned, the local characteristics and the density of current development, the potential impact on the district, as well as the impact on landscape and air ventilation. The Government would take all of the above factors into consideration and had carried out the necessary technical assessment. If necessary, the Government would take mitigation measures so as to alleviate the potential impact of the development on the district.

He hoped that Members and residents would support the land rezoning and housing development proposals of Tai Po District.

5. Mr. LAU Chi-ting introduced the paper and the current zoning status of Tai Po District.

6. Mr. LEE Siu-man declared that he was the indigenous resident representative of Tai Po Mei. His comments were as follows:

- (i) Years ago, the Government bought the site on Pok Yin Road in Area 39 from the villagers at a low price for Government, Institution or Community (“GIC”) purposes. However, there were now proposals to rezone the site for private residential development and the difference in value of these two types of sites was enormous. In addition, building residential units there might block the view of Tai Po Mei and Cheung Shue Tan and give rise to the wall effect. The Government should be compassionate about the local resident’s situation and consider the matter carefully.
- (ii) The traffic infrastructure and parking spaces available at present could not meet the demand of the residents, and building new residential units would definitely make the traffic congestion worse.

- (iii) There was a river near Tai Po Mei Hang, and the development concerned might impact the natural environment. The Government should also take this factor into consideration.

7. Mr. LI Yiu-ban's comments and questions were as follows:

- (i) Land planning was a rather complicated issue and the key was whether it was beneficial to society. In addition, consideration should also be given on whether the residents would be affected and whether the traffic infrastructure was sufficient, etc.
- (ii) The Government allowed developers to build residential units on tiny sites, which had indirectly contributed to the prevalence of "nano apartments".
- (iii) Currently, there was about 40% of land designated for country parks and over 20% for Green Belts in Hong Kong respectively, whereas the amount of land that people in Hong Kong could use only accounted for about 7%. It showed that the Government's planning work was not people-oriented.
- (iv) Were there still any sites available for housing development east of Cheung Muk Tau in Ma On Shan and south of Symphony Bay?
- (v) The Government should not increase the supply of residential units by making use of every single space, but should carry out a more long-term planning by identifying sites for large-scale development projects instead. Therefore, he opposed to the paper.

8. Mr. TANG Ming-tai, Patrick enquired whether Plan D had consulted the local residents and stakeholders before consulting the DC. He said that it would be difficult for DC Members to assess whether or how the planning would impact the residents solely based on the drawings. The authorities had to understand the residents' thoughts first before consulting the DC. Otherwise, the discussion would be less effective.

9. Dr. LAU Chee-sing said that he supported the Government in identifying sites in Tai Po to build more residential units, but the Government also had to carry out the necessary assessment and planning in terms of traffic (such as appropriately widening the roads and expanding the transport interchanges etc.). Otherwise, it could only increase the traffic load in Tai Po District and lead to more complaints from the residents. He said that for example, currently there were no parking spaces outside the Tai Po Market MTR Station. He could not understand why the authorities still suggested arranging for shuttle buses to commute between Tai Po Market MTR Station and Shuen Wan where the columbarium was during Ching Ming and Chung Yeung Festivals. He said that the Government should have long-term planning and improve the traffic infrastructure to benefit members of the public.

10. Mr. YU Chi-wing, Ken thanked the departments' efforts in identifying sites for building residential units, but said that the Government should take into consideration the full picture of whether the traffic infrastructure was sufficient. He pointed out that there was an access road on Tat Wan Road connecting with the south bound Tolo Highway towards Kowloon, but there was no connection with the north bound Tolo Highway towards North District. As the Government had proposed to rezone the two sites on Ma Wo Road for housing development, the population in that area would increase. As such, he suggested the Government open a new access road on Tat Wan Road connecting with the north bound Tolo Highway for the convenience of the drivers, and at the same time alleviate the congestion on Tai Po Road – Yuen Chau Tsai.

11. Dr. YAU Wing-kwong was also concerned with the traffic condition in the district. He said that a lot of residential developments had been completed in recent years. If another ten thousand or more residential units were to be built in the area, the traffic load in the area would definitely increase. The Government had to provide sufficient traffic infrastructure to ease the traffic. In addition, he said that the Government should pay more attention to the road development in the rural areas during the process of development and planning.

12. Mr. LO Hiu-fung's comments were as follows:

- (i) At the TPDC meeting on 4 May 2017, Professor CHAN Siu-chee, Sophia, Under Secretary for Food and Health, listened to DC Members' comments regarding the Government's plan to build a columbarium in Shuen Wan, which included studying the feasibility of other locations. However, Members received an EHWC meeting paper on 5 May, and learned that the Plan D had proposed to rezone a site at the southwestern corner of the Shuen Wan Ex-landfill for the construction of a columbarium and garden of remembrance. He queried that the Government had not carefully considered DC Members' comments, nor had it allowed sufficient time for DC Members to consult the residents.
- (ii) He said that he had received letters from the residents of Classical Gardens, Ma Wo Village and Wan Tau Tong Estate, hoping that the authorities would be more open to the locals' comments regarding the development of the Ma Wo Road site, particularly their concern regarding the insufficient traffic and community infrastructure.

13. Mr. YAM Man-chuen's comments were as follows:

- (i) He had already raised the issue of insufficient traffic and community infrastructure in the area during the development of Area 9, but his comments had not been seriously heeded by the Government which continued to build public housing there. It was beyond any doubt that there were insufficient infrastructure facilities in the

area at present. However, the Government still had not carried out any long-term planning for the development of the entire Tai Po District (such as the construction of medical centres, libraries and community integrated services complexes, and the enhancement of traffic infrastructure, etc.), but was busy rezoning sites to build more residential units on a continued basis. During the planning process, besides paying attention to the housing needs of members of the public, the Government also had to thoroughly consider and balance the residents' needs for other infrastructure facilities.

- (ii) He did not understand why the Government only focused on building public housing on the two sites in Area 9 on Tai Po, and the other sites were for private residential development. He enquired the Plan D on the criteria for the allocation of sites for public and private housing.

14. Mr. YAM Kai-bong, Francis' comments were as follows:

- (i) There was insufficient information provided by the Plan D. Apart from the location of the site to be rezoned, there was no information on the area of the site, the number of households, the estimated population, etc. As such, Members were unable to discuss whether the planning was appropriate.
- (ii) Comparing the standards stipulated in the HKPSG with the current supply of facilities in Tai Po District, he pointed out that there was a shortage of general medical clinics, health centres, hospital beds, etc., in the district at present, not to mention the situation in future after the population in Tai Po District had further increased.
- (iii) There was an abundant supply of brownfield sites in Yuen Long and Tuen Mun. The Government should develop these areas first before rezoning other sites.
- (iv) The Plan D had rezoned part of the site of the Science Park for residential development, which was against the Government's vision to encourage innovation and technology in recent years.
- (v) The Government should resolve the problem of insufficient traffic infrastructure in Tai Po and North District so as to meet the demand of Tai Po residents for community facilities first, before considering building residential units in the district.

15. Mr. KWOK Wing-kin's comments and questions were as follows:

- (i) Brownfield sites should be developed before the Green Belts. According to the information collected from civil groups, a 9-hectare brownfield site outside Tung Tsz Road near the Education University of Hong Kong was being used as outdoor

warehouses, and the operation area had been expanding. Did the Plan D have any knowledge on the matter and had any planning been carried out for the site?

- (ii) The Government had been rezoning the Green Belts for housing and other uses in recent years. Was there a change in the positioning and value of the Green Belts from the Plan D's perspective?
- (iii) Private residential units were expensive and not affordable by the general public. As such, the ratio of private housing should be lowered.
- (iv) Sacrificing the Green Belts or the GIC sites to build private housing was absolutely unacceptable.
- (v) The information provided by the Plan D was insufficient, and he hoped that the Plan D could provide more information.

16. Mr. LAU Yung-wai's comments were as follows:

- (i) Before developing the Green Belts, the Plan D should consider if other sites were available.
- (ii) Apart from medical facilities, there was also a shortage of community facilities such as libraries and integrated family services centres in Tai Po District. He was not pleased that the Government had ignored the residents' demand for these infrastructure facilities by rezoning the GIC sites for housing development on a continued basis, and such a practice was extremely irresponsible.
- (iii) The Plan D had only provided some rough data regarding the year when the sites were expected to be ready for development, as well as their location. No other basic information, such as the area of the sites, the number of units and the detailed maps were provided. As such, it was disrespectful to the DC for the Plan D to proceed to submit the planning proposals concerned to the DC for deliberation and hoped to secure Members' support.

17. Mr. AU Chun-wah's comments were as follows:

- (i) The content of the HKPSG was not practical and out-dated, and the standards stipulated did not meet the genuine needs of society. In addition, he was not pleased that the Government enforced the HKPSG on a selective basis. For example, when Members informed the Government of the shortage of parking spaces in the district, the departments concerned would reply that the Government could only provide the number of parking spaces stipulated in the HKPSG and would not consider the actual situation to provide more. On the other hand, the Government was unable to comply with the HKPSG's requirements to provide sufficient community facilities for Tai Po District. The Government should first

increase the infrastructure facilities in the district, before considering increasing the supply of land for housing development.

- (ii) The middle and lower class had the highest demand for housing. However, most of the new private residential developments in Tai Po District were low density and high-end private residences, which could hardly meet the overall demand for residential units.
- (iii) As regards traffic, Tolo Highway was known for its heavy traffic and frequent congestion and when the situation became serious, it could even paralyse the traffic inside Tai Po District. Had the Plan D considered constructing another trunk road connecting Tai Po with Kowloon, so as to divert some of the traffic on Tolo Highway?

18. Mr. WOO Kin-man, Clement declared that he was living in the Ting Kok Road area. Paraphrasing the “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030”, he said that the Government had not carried out any long-term planning for the north-south traffic in the New Territories. He quoted Ting Kok Road as an example and pointed out that although the traffic in the area had become heavier due to population growth, the TD, claiming that the traffic flow at present had not reached the upper limit of the road, was happy to maintain status quo and had not carried out the corresponding planning work in advance. He stressed that while he supported the Government to increase the supply of public and private residential units, the prerequisite was that the Government had to provide sufficient infrastructure facilities for members of the public.

19. Ms. WONG Pik-kiu's comments were as follows:

- (i) The indigenous residents of Tai Po had always been supportive of the Government in resuming land for housing development. She also strongly supported the Government's efforts to identify land to resolve the housing problem at present. However, she hoped that the Government would listen more to the comments of local residents in the course of planning. For example, she said that when the Government planned to develop Po Heung Estate years ago, the TPDC had mentioned the shortage of traffic infrastructure and other facilities in the district. While the TPDC supported the planning concerned eventually, it had to endure a lot of pressure from the area as well as the LegCo.
- (ii) The paper provided by the Plan D was way too general.
- (iii) Could the Government overcome all the difficulties to build residential units at To Yuen Tung on Ma Wo Road, east of Cheung Muk Tau in Ma On Shan, as well as south of Symphony Bay?

- (iv) The Plan D had to consult the district first before consulting the DC, so as to fully understand the stakeholders' comments.

20. Mr. KWAN Wing-yip's comments and questions were as follows:

- (i) The population of Northeast New Territories had been growing rapidly and Tai Po, North District and Sha Tin had all been using the same highway to reach the urban area, thus creating an enormous burden on the trunk road. However, there had been no signs that the Government had carried out any proper planning to cater for future development.
- (ii) The Government should review its policies on population, the one-way permit quota system and the approval authority, etc. Otherwise, the housing shortage problem in Hong Kong would only deteriorate in the long run.
- (iii) In recent years, a number of Mainland developers had purchased land in Hong Kong, which had substantially increased the price of land and residential units to beyond the purchasing power of Hong Kong people. As most of the sites for housing development in Tai Po at present were for private housing development, would the Government in future launch the "Hong Kong property for Hong Kong people" measure or policies on restricting foreign capitals to purchase land so as to prevent the problem from deteriorating?
- (iv) The Government had rezoned some of the sites designated for public housing previously for private housing development. It had led to the imbalance between public and private housing development and had indirectly contributed to the high property prices at present.

21. Mr. Allen FUNG's response was as follows:

- (i) After the outbreak of the severe acute respiratory syndrome ("SARS"), land planning in Hong Kong had slowed down in accordance with the housing market situation, as well as land and housing development. It had led to the shortage of land and housing supply afterwards. As of now, the Government had to tackle the problem through multiple channels. On one hand, it had to rezone sites for housing development in the medium- to short-run. On the other, it had to carry out long-term planning, such as the development of the Hung Shui Kiu and North East New Territories New Development Areas ("NDAs"), as well as increase the housing supply in the long-term planning and strategic growth areas, such as the East Lantau Metropolis and New Territories North, through various channels.
- (ii) Traffic and community infrastructure were issues of common concern for all the districts. The DEVB would forward the district's appeals to the departments concerned, such as the Transport and Housing Bureau.

22. Ms. Jessica CHU's response was as follows:

- (i) The Plan D had proposed changing the use of the site at the southwestern corner of the Shuen Wan Ex-landfill before the TPDC meeting on 4 May 2017, and submitted the discussion paper to the TPDC Secretariat on 2 May 2017. She clarified that the Plan D did not put forward the revised proposal after the TPDC meeting.
- (ii) As regards Members' claim that there was insufficient information in the discussion paper, she said that the major purpose of the discussion paper was to give an overview of the housing development sites in Tai Po District, including the location of the 13 that had been rezoned and others with potential for development. The information contained in the paper was preliminary, and details like the area of the sites and their development feasibility could only be released to the EHWC after the Plan D had completed the in-depth studies. By then, the Plan D would consult the DC again.
- (iii) Planning for traffic infrastructure was very important. The Plan D would first assess the impact of the construction sites' area and development on the traffic in the vicinity, then put forward suitable proposals or mitigation measures and report to the DC.
- (iv) Of the seven "Rezoning to be initiated" items in Annex 3 of TPDC Paper No. EHW 23/2017, five were public housing projects. The Plan D hoped that it could meet the housing demand of members of the public.
- (v) The Plan D would put forward a proposed amendment in the next agenda item, so as to help promote the construction of a medical centre in Tai Po District. Regarding the medical facilities in New Territories East on the whole, the Prince of Wales Hospital would be rebuilt, Yan On Hospital expanded, and the hospital for the Faculty of Medicine of The Chinese University of Hong Kong ("CUHK") was in the preparation stage. It was believed that more hospital beds would be available by then to cater for the medical needs of members of the public.
- (vi) Planning might actually affect the residents. The Plan D was pleased to continue with its consultation and listen to the residents' views.
- (vii) A lot of DCs had commented on the HKPSG. The Plan D headquarters would review these comments and revise accordingly if necessary.

23. Mr. LI Yiu-ban's comments were as follows:

- (i) As long as the locations proposed by the Government were suitable, and the living environment and infrastructure of the area could be improved, residents would support the planning concerned. The Government had to provide incentives to

secure the support of the stakeholders. For example, he said that if the Government was going to build water and electricity supply facilities in Ping Chau to help improve the quality of lives of the residents there, he believed that they would also welcome the Government's idea of developing housing on the island.

- (ii) The Government should not build residential units in areas where there was shortage of resources or insufficient infrastructure facilities. Otherwise, it would only accentuate the competition of resources and be difficult to secure the support from society.

24. Mr. CHENG Chun-ping said that Members had already raised numerous concerns regarding traffic, medical healthcare, community infrastructure facilities, etc. He believed that the Plan D would definitely consult the district before finalising the housing development plans concerned, and provide the EHWC with more supplementary information.

25. The Chairman summarised as follows:

- (i) The Plan D should consult and respect the local stakeholders, the Tai Po Rural Committee ("TPRC") and the Sai Kung North Rural Committee ("SKNRC"), and should refrain from approving the planning proposals concerned in a hurry.
- (ii) There was definitely a shortage of traffic infrastructure in the district, and he did not understand why the Plan D did not consider constructing a railway station in Pak Shek Kok.
- (iii) The residents had said that the Plan D had neither carried out any consultation with regard to the planning of Kon Hang in Tai Po Kau near Cheung Shue Tan Road, nor provided any reasonable compensation. He asked the Plan D to follow up on the matter.
- (iv) Construction of public housing required a comprehensive infrastructure such as schools, bus terminus, markets, etc.
- (v) The locations of To Yuen Tung on Ma Wo Road, east of Cheung Muk Tau in Ma On Shan and south of Symphony Bay were not suitable.
- (vi) The DEVB and the Plan D should consider carrying out local consultation again and then continue with the discussion at the EHWC meetings.

III. Proposed amendments to the approved Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TP/26

(TPDC Paper No. EHW 24/2017)

26. The Chairman welcomed Ms. WONG Shuk-han, Diane, Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Food) 2 of the FHB; as well as Ms. Jessica CHU, Mr. LAU Chi-ting and Mr.

YUNG Pak-yeung, District Planning Officer / Sha Tin, Tai Po and North, Senior Town Planner and Town Planner respectively of the Plan D to the meeting for the discussion of this item.

27. Mr. LAU Chi-ting introduced the paper and briefly introduced the proposed amendments as follows:

- (i) **Item A** – To rezone the site on Pok Yin Road near Tsiu Hang in Area 39 of Tai Po from a GIC zone to a Residential (Group B) 9 zone, and specify the total gross floor area (“GFA”) and building height restriction of the Residential (Group B) 9 zone.
- (ii) **Item B** – To rezone the site on Yau King Lane near Tsiu Hang in Area 39 of Tai Po from a Residential (Group C) zone to a Residential (Group C) 10 zone, and specify the plot ratio and building height restriction of the Residential (Group C) 10 zone.
- (iii) **Item C** – To rezone the site at the southwestern corner of the Shuen Wan Ex-landfill from an Other Specified Uses (Golf Course) zone to an Other Specified Uses (Columbarium and Garden of Remembrance) zone, and specify the building height restriction of the Other Specified Uses zone.
- (iv) **Item D** – To change the building height restriction of the GIC site on On Pong Road by relaxing it from three storeys to eight storeys.
- (v) **Item E** – To rezone the site on Ma Wo Road from a Green Belt to a Residential (Group B) 10 zone, and specify the total GFA and building height restriction of the Residential (Group B) 10 zone.

28. Members’ comments and questions regarding Item A were as follows:

- (i) Mr. LEE Siu-man said that constructing a 50-metre high building at this site would block the views of the neighbouring buildings and create a wall effect. He said that the Government should carefully consider the item’s impact on the surrounding environment and the residents. He continued that while both Items A and B would increase the population in Area 39, the traffic infrastructure in the neighbourhood was insufficient (like the lack of railway services).
- (ii) The Chairman said that the Plan D should once again consult the TPRC, as well as the resident representatives and owners’ corporations concerned with regard to the planning proposal concerned. In addition, he pointed out that Pak Shek Kok was close to the CUHK, the Science Park and a number of residential developments, and the residents had suggested setting up a railway station there. He hoped that the Government would consider the suggestion concerned.
- (iii) Dr. YAU Wing-kwong said that he was a resident of Cheung Shue Tan Village. He pointed out that Cheung Shue Tan Village was situated in a Village Type Development zone and the buildings there were only three-storey high. If the

Government built a row of dozen-storey hall buildings between Cheung Shue Tan Village and Tolo Highway (i.e. the site on Yau King Lane and Pok Yin Road), it would not only affect the views of Cheung Shue Tan Village, but also create a wall effect. He noted that there were a river and five ancestral halls in Cheung Shue Tan Village. In the course of development, the Government should avoid affecting the ecology of the river, but take into account the tradition and cultural heritage of the village. In addition, he also pointed out that the area available for building houses in the Village Type Development zone had been reduced due to the construction of roads, and the residents were requesting the Government to expand the area of the Village Type Development zone concerned. He opined that the Government at present proposing to build a private housing development there was similar to granting sites to the villagers to build village houses as far as the nature and scale were concerned. It would be more cost-effective for the Government to pool its resources to build large-scale residential development in other suitable locations.

- (iv) Mr. LAU Yung-wai said that while there was a shortage of housing in Hong Kong, it was not a reason for the Government to develop low-density private residences. He pointed out that the total GFA of Tai Po Centre was less than 60 000 square metres, but its total number of residential units exceeded 4 000. Meanwhile, Item A had a total GFA of more than 80 000 square metres, but was only expected to provide about 1 150 residential units. He opined that building these luxury homes could in no way benefit the people in Hong Kong. He added that the Government's planning at present was slanted towards building public housing or high-end private residences, and had totally ignored the housing needs of the sandwich class.

29. Members' comments regarding Item B were as follows:

- (i) The Chairman said that the Plan D had revised the plot ratio and building height restriction of Item B as requested by the residents of Deerhill Bay, and he did not have strong views regarding this planning proposal. He asked the Plan D to inform the owners' corporations of Deerhill Bay and the nearby residential estates of the amendment concerned.
- (ii) Mr. Clement WOO declared that he had property on Yau King Lane. He pointed out that Yau King Lane was a two-lane two-way road, and the developments in Items A and B were expected to build 2 000 residential units. He was concerned if the two planning proposals would have any impact on the traffic of the surrounding area.

30. Members' comments and questions regarding Item C were as follows:

- (i) Mr. Patrick TANG said that building a columbarium at the Shuen Wan Ex-landfill would create psychological impact on the residents nearby, and he had already received opposing views from the residents. He said that while there was a shortage of niches in Hong Kong, the site in Tai Po could only provide about 15 000 units, which was not a huge number. He suggested the Government carry out longer-term planning by building a large-scale columbarium housing about 200 000 to 300 000 units in Ping Shan Chai or Sha Lo Tung, so as to meet the needs of society. However, the infrastructure facilities (including road network) of the area had to be improved beforehand.
- (ii) Mr. CHENG Chun-ping said that the site in Shuen Wan was not suitable for building a columbarium. He said that it was a recreation site, and making use of such a big site to provide a small number of niches was not cost-effective either.
- (iii) Dr. LAU Chee-sing pointed out that the DC Members made a lot of comments regarding the site in Shuen Wan at the TPDC meeting not long ago, and some DC Members also suggested building an even bigger columbarium in Ping Shan Chai or Sha Lo Tung as an alternative. However, the Plan D's report did not reflect these comments. He said that the site in Shuen Wan would hamper the future development of the Tai Po Waterfront Park bicycle track, and he opined that the Government should reserve a room of 50 metres along the coast for extending the bicycle track in future. He added that rezoning a number of sites in Tai Po for housing development would substantially increase the population in the district, but the Government had never made any suggestions on ways to improve the traffic infrastructure. He hoped that the Plan D could provide Members with a traffic assessment report for each of the items. He believed that the proposal regarding the site in Shuen Wan was controversial. The Government should consider withdrawing Item C first and carry out further discussion in future.
- (iv) Mr. Clement WOO supported the Government's construction of a columbarium in Tai Po District. However, he pointed out that as the site in Shuen Wan had an area of 1.72 hectares but could provide only 15 000 units (i.e. each unit occupying about 1.1 square metres), it was not cost-effective at all. He said that it might be more suitable to build it in Ping Shan Chai or Sha Lo Tung.
- (v) Ms. WONG Pik-kiu said that a fishing area had just been constructed near the site in Shuen Wan, and a lot of residents did exercises there every day. As such, it was not suitable to build the columbarium there. She said that the Government could not pick the ex-landfill as the site just because it wanted to build columbaria in all the districts quickly. In addition, she pointed out that the letter from the Under Secretary for Food and Health dated 9 May 2017 had not fully reflected the TPDC's views, and the statement in the letter that "the TPDC had reservations regarding the site in Shuen Wan, but did not object to the Government to continue with the

various follow-up work regarding the site” was incorrect. She opined that at that time, the Chairman only suggested the authorities study where there were other more suitable sites apart from the one in Shuen Wan for building the columbarium. She said that a Member suggested the Government build it in Ping Shan Chai or Sha Lo Tung, showing that the TPDC was willing to collaborate. She found it unreasonable for the Government not to consider building the columbarium in Ping Shan Chai or Sha Lo Tung on the grounds of insufficient infrastructure facilities. She said that she would not support Item C.

- (vi) Mr. LO Hiu-fung said that at the TPDC meeting on 4 May 2017, the FHB said that it would study whether the sites suggested by DC Members were suitable for building the columbarium. However, the Plan D now proposed rezoning a site in Shuen Wan for the columbarium, showing that there was a lack of co-ordination between the departments. He said that a number of Members opposed to the site in Shuen Wan, and he hoped that the Plan D would carefully consider Members’ comments.
- (vii) Mr. Ken YU criticised the Government for never listening to DC Members’ comments. He said that there were other sites in Tai Po District that could build a columbarium with more units. As such, he opposed to the Plan D’s proposal to build a columbarium at the Shuen Wan Ex-landfill and asked the FHB to choose another site.
- (viii) The Chairman said that Members generally opposed to the building of a columbarium in Shuen Wan. He suggested the Plan D withdraw the site first. He added that it was not cost-effective to build 15 600 niches at the waterfront area of the site in Shuen Wan. He suggested the Government study building an even bigger columbarium at another site.

31. Members’ comments regarding Item D were as follows:

- (i) Mr. AU Chun-wah supported relaxing the building height restriction from three storeys to eight storeys. He suggested building a small- to medium-sized complex with libraries, study rooms, social welfare facilities, government offices (such as the service units of the Social Welfare Department), medical healthcare institutions, facilities for the elderly people and children, etc., so as to cater for the population growth in Tai Po North. He pointed out that On Pong Road was an excellent location and hence the proposed facilities should be multifarious. If only a medical healthcare centre was to be built there, it might be hard to secure the residents’ support. In addition, he suggested the Government study building an underground car park there, so as to resolve the problems of illegal parking and parking space shortage in Tai Po District. He said that the Government could also

consider granting idle sites through short-term tenancy for use as temporary public car parks.

- (ii) Mr. CHENG Chun-ping supported the Government's plan to develop the site on On Pong Road, but said that it was not sufficient that the proposed complex was just eight-storey high. He agreed with Mr. AU Chun-wah's suggestion that the Government should study providing multifarious facilities there and making use of idle sites as temporary car parks.
- (iii) Mr. Francis YAM said that Members had to consult the residents and stakeholders regarding the use of various sites, and he hoped that the departments concerned could provide Members with the relevant information as soon as possible. He pointed out that residents welcomed the Government's plan to build a community medical services centre in the district, but they also hoped that the Government could build cultural and leisure facilities. He suggested the Plan D develop the site on an integrated basis so as to provide libraries, elderly centres, healthcare or medical service centres, etc. In addition, he had compared the population to libraries ratio of Tai Po District with that of North District, Tsuen Wan District and Sai Kung District, and noticed that there was a shortage of libraries in Tai Po District, and the number of libraries was fewer than that in other districts. He said that he had repeatedly asked the Government to build more libraries in the district, and hoped that the Government could consider his request proactively.
- (iv) Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai supported the building of a community medical healthcare centre and wanted to know the Government's criteria in deciding what kind of medical services to be provided. He explained that in 2009, the Hospital Authority suggested to the DC the construction of an integrated health centre in Tai Po, providing day-time medical, nursing care and physiotherapy services, etc. However, it had been changed to provide students / elderly healthcare and part-time assessment services. He hoped that the Government would carry out a consultation before deciding on the services that medical healthcare service centre was going to provide. In addition, he pointed out that there was a shortage of libraries and study rooms in Tai Po District, and the Government had to increase the number of these facilities.
- (v) Ms. WONG Pik-kiu said that at the SSC meeting, Members pointed out that there was insufficient general out-patient service in Tai Po District, and there was no community medical healthcare centre in the district. The Plan D quickly responded to Members' appeals by providing the site on On Pong Road for the development of such facilities. She indicated that she did not oppose to the planning proposal concerned, but she was more concerned about the traffic condition in the Tai Po Centre area. She said that not long ago there were discussions about building a multi-storey car park or temporary car park on On Pong Road so as to resolve the shortage of parking spaces. However, the proposal

was shelved eventually because of the objection of the residents of Tai Po Centre. She said that whether Members would support or not depended on whether the planning proposal was supported by the local stakeholders. As such, he hoped that the Government could liaise with the owners' corporations of Tai Po Centre, to understand if they really supported building a community medical healthcare service centre there.

- (vi) Mr. LO Hiu-fung said that the Government should accept Members' suggestion of providing a library. In addition, owing to the shortage of medical facilities in the district, he did not oppose to the building of a community services centre. However, he pointed out that the Government did not consult the Member of the constituency with regard to the proposed planning, showing a lack of respect for him.
- (vii) The Chairman hoped that the Plan D would consider Members' suggestions and consult the local stakeholders. He also asked the Plan D to study the inclusion of a library and car park in Item D, and to grant idle sites to be uses as temporary car parks before the planning work had been completed.

32. Members' comments and questions regarding Item E were as follows:

- (i) Mr. LI Kwok-ying enquired whether the site would be used for public or private housing development.
- (ii) Mr. YAM Man-chuen enquired the estimated number of residential units and the number of people that would be accommodated with regard to public housing development at the site on Ma Wo Road.
- (iii) Mr. KWOK Wing-kin pointed out that there was conservation value in the Green Belts. He asked whether the Plan D had carried out any in-depth studies and assessment regarding the possible impact of the planning proposal on the environment in the area. He also asked if the Plan D planned to make use of Ma Wo Road as the main road to connect with the future development projects. In addition, he also asked about the results of the traffic assessment concerned. He said that there were houses in the site and wondered if they had been deserted.
- (iv) Mr. LO Hiu-fung enquired how the Plan D would handle the licensed structures and graves in the area. He noted that if it planned to rely on Ma Wo Road as the major access (which was also the only access there for emergency vehicles), congestion in the area would become more serious. He added that traffic infrastructure in the area was not enough to deal with population growth. He also indicated that population growth would heighten the shortage of community infrastructure services in the area. The residents had asked the Government to provide open

space and sports centre in Area 6. He urged the Government to deal with their request seriously before considering the development thereafter.

- (v) The Chairman asked the Plan D to consult the local residents regarding this planning proposal.

33. Members' comments and questions regarding the information on Annex 2 of TPDC Paper No. EHW 24/2017 (Table Showing the Supply of Open Space, Planning Standards of Major Community Facilities and Their Supply in Tai Po District) were as follows:

- (i) Mr. AU Chun-wah said that according to the information on Annex 2, the number of sports centres, sports playgrounds / stadiums and standard swimming pools under planning in the district was more than the current supply. He asked the Plan D to provide the locations of these facilities. He said that according to the HKPSG, there should be a library for every 200 000 people. Tai Po had a population close to 300 000. Shouldn't the Government build one more library in the district?
- (ii) Mr. YAM Man-chuen said that the paper showed that currently there were two standard swimming pools in the district and three under planning. He asked the Plan D to provide specific information. In addition, he pointed out that if all the 18 medium- to short-term housing sites in the district were all successfully rezoned, the population in Tai Po District would increase by about 70 000 to 80 000. According to the planning standards for open space and major community facilities, the number of supporting facilities in the area would not meet the target. He asked the Plan D to study ways to increase the number of supporting facilities in the area, so that Members could decide whether to support the revised planning proposal.
- (iii) Mr. Francis YAM hoped that the Plan D could point out the two standard swimming pools in the district at present. He said that the swimming pool to be built in future was not a standard swimming pool. He hoped that the Plan D would provide the relevant information.
- (iv) Mr. LAU Yung-wai said that the information in the table was out-dated. The population basis used for each item was different and there were doubts about the accuracy. In addition, he said that compared with Sha Tin District and North District, Tai Po District had way fewer libraries in terms of population standard and compared with other districts. He added that the current population of Tai Po had exceeded 300 000 and would increase to almost 400 000 if the sites concerned were successfully rezoned. As such, he hoped that the Plan D could provide more libraries as well as cultural and recreational facilities in the district, like building a library at the site on On Pong Road. He continued that there was a shortage of parking spaces in Tai Po District (particularly in the city centre), and the Government could consider providing parking facilities in the course of planning for the project on On Pong Road or other government sites.

34. Ms. Jessica CHU's response to Members' questions was summarised as follows:

- (i) The TD had conducted traffic assessment for Items A and E to ensure that the development concerned would not affect the traffic in the area.
- (ii) The Plan D allocated land for public and private housing development mainly according to the situation and environment of each area, and would not focus on developing public housing or high-end residences only.
- (iii) As regards Members' concern that Item A would create walled buildings, she pointed out that the current building height restriction of the area was 47 metres above principal datum ("PD") (the Plan D suggested increasing it to 50 metres above the PD). According to the Plan D's feasibility study reports, the future development project would be about 13 to 14-storey high with a residential coverage of about 34%. The Plan D would ensure that there would be sufficient distance between the buildings.
- (iv) The Plan D had received letters from the residents of Cheung Shue Tan Village regarding Item B, requesting the Plan D to visit the site and provide them with more information regarding the planning situation and carry out a consultation. The Plan D would proactively respond to their requests.
- (v) Item D was situated on a site on On Pong Road that had always been designated as a GIC site. The Plan D had considered granting the site for other short-term uses, but the Lands D's suggestions could not be taken forward due to the opposing views of the residents nearby. She thanked Members for supporting the relaxation of building height restriction from three storeys to eight so as to make the best use of the site. She added that it was a GIC site which was not restricted to the provision of medical facilities. The Plan D would proactively discuss with the FHB regarding the suggestion of providing a library and an underground car park.
- (vi) The site in Item E would be reserved for private housing development. As regards community infrastructure, there was a GIC site in the area, and she knew that the LCSD was carrying out preparation work for the project concerned.
- (vii) The Plan D would estimate the supply of various recreational and community services in accordance with the estimated population in the Tai Po District Outline Zoning Plan. Regarding the number of swimming pools in the district, the Plan D would contact the Members concerned after the meeting for follow-up action.
- (viii) The Government had to provide various housing to satisfy public demand. Owing to the abundance of "nano apartments" in the market, the Government had to increase land supply as soon as possible to prevent the situation from deteriorating further. She hoped that Members would support the proposed amendments to Items A, B, D and E.

- (ix) The Plan D would forward Items A, B, D and E together with Members' comments to the Town Planning Board ("TPB") for consideration. The Plan D would continue with the consultation and introduce the relevant planning proposals to the residents.
- (x) The Government planned to build a columbarium at the Shuen Wan site and to accommodate with the plan, the Plan D suggested rezoning the site concerned. The Plan D had submitted meeting papers to the Secretariat before the TPDC meeting. As such, the Plan D did not decide to submit the paper only after being informed of Members' comments.
- (xi) The Plan D carried out an in-depth study in 2011 regarding the Tai Po site of the columbarium. The Plan D believed that the present site in Shuen Wan was appropriate. The site was an ex-landfill and with sewage and toxic gas underground. It had enormous restrictions on development and hence was not suitable for residential or commercial development. Building a columbarium there could make the best use of the site, and could prevent using other sites that could be used for housing and commercial development in future.

35. Ms. Diane WONG's additional comments regarding the columbarium project were as follows:

- (i) The FHB had consulted the policy bureaux and departments concerned with regards to the sites of the columbarium suggested by DC Members. According to information, Ping Shan Chai and Sha Lo Tung lacked the basic facilities and road network, and were therefore not suitable for building a columbarium.
- (ii) The proposed columbarium was a low-rise structure. According to the cross-section diagram, the relevant structure would not bring about any adverse visual impact on the surrounding environment.
- (iii) The FHB noted that Members hoped to extend the Tai Po Waterfront Park bicycle track in future, and had consulted the policy bureaux and departments concerned in this regard. The FHB would reserve sufficient space at the waterfront near the proposed site for the columbarium, so that the DC could take follow-up action if there were plans for the bicycle track in future.
- (iv) Currently, the proposed amendments for rezoning only reflected the planning intention. Upon the completion of the conceptual design, the FHB would report to the TPDC again in due course, before applying for funding.

36. Members' second round of comments and questions was as follows:

- (i) Mr. LI Yiu-ban said that it was not worthwhile to spend such a large amount of resources to build a limited number of niches. He said that due to the shortage of niches, the Government might have to identify sites to build columbaria in a few years again. He said that it would be disrespectful to the ancestors if the columbarium was to be built on an ex-landfill. As such, he opposed to building a columbarium at the Shuen Wan site. He criticised the Government for their lack of sincerity to solve the problem by rejecting the proposal of building a columbarium in Ping Shan Chai and Sha Lo Tung due to the lack of road facilities. In addition, he said that there were vacated school premises in Tai Yuen Estate and a bus terminus nearby, and it was easily accessible. He suggested the Government make use of these existing resources to build a columbarium.
- (ii) Mr. Patrick TANG said that even if the exterior design of the columbarium could merge with the natural environment, it did not mean that it did not exist, and the residents nearby would still be affected psychologically. He said that the Government had to carry out long-term planning to build large-scale and permanent columbaria through developing the rural areas, so as to meet the public demand for the coming decades and reduce the disturbance to the residents. He asked the Plan D to withdraw the proposed amendment to Item C.
- (iii) Mr. AU Chun-wah had reservations regarding the Plan D's statement that the EHWC did not oppose to the proposed amendment to Item D. He said that Mr. Francis YAM, Mr. KWAN Wing-yip and himself suggested building a small- to medium-sized complex on the On Pong Road site, equipped with facilities like library, study rooms, government and public institutions offices, elderly centres, car parks, etc. so that it would be easier for the residents to accept the planning proposal concerned. Therefore, he hoped that Plan D would make further amendments to Item D by incorporating the above suggestions.
- (iv) Mr. KWAN Wing-yip said that Sha Lo Tung Development Company and green groups suggested earlier to the TPDC the construction of a columbarium with a capacity of around 80 000 units, but the plan fell through in the end. He said that DC Members generally supported the plan at that time, believing that there was room for columbarium development in the area. He did not understand why the Government did not try to study the feasibility of building a columbarium in that area.
- (v) Mr. LEE Siu-man hoped that the Plan D would confirm whether it would submit the revised proposal for Item A to the TPB after the meeting. In addition, regarding the columbarium, he enquired whether the Plan D had statistics on the number of niches in the community. He said that if these niches were to be relocated back to the government columbarium, tens of thousands of niches would be used up very quickly. Apart from Ping Shan Chai and Sha Lo Tung, he said that the Government could also consider building them in caverns.

- (vi) Mr. LO Hiu-fung said that Members generally opposed to the revised proposals, but the Plan D still insisted on submitting them to the TPB. He wondered why the Plan D consulted the DC. He said that the Plan D had not carried out sufficient air circulation assessment, traffic impact assessment and district consultation, nor did it put forward any suggestions regarding the community infrastructure facilities. He urged the EHWC to oppose to the proposed amendments for the Approved Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TP/26.
- (vii) Dr. LAU Chee-sing hoped that the Chairman could confirm whether the Plan D would withdraw the proposed amendment to Item C.
- (viii) Mr. LAU Yung-wai requested the Plan D to explain why different population basis were used for the information in each item. He also asked why the Plan D could only respond to the enquiry regarding standard swimming pools after the meeting. In addition, he said that if a library could not be built on the On Pong Road site, the Plan D could also study building one in other areas of the district.

37. The Chairman summarised Members' comments and made the following conclusions regarding Items A to E:

- (i) For Item A, villager representatives of the area had clearly expressed their opposing views before the meeting. The Plan D should first explain to them the planning proposal concerned, and present the proposal to the EHWC for discussion after consulting them. At this stage the EHWC did not support the planning proposal concerned.
- (ii) For Item B, the Plan D had revised the plot ratio and building height restriction. There were less opposing views from the residents nearby.
- (iii) For Item C, the EHWC requested the Plan D to withdraw the amendment first, and study with the FHB replacing the Shuen Wan site with Ping Shan Chai, Sha Lo Tung or other sites.
- (iv) For Item D, the EHWC generally supported the relaxation of building height restriction, but had made numerous suggestions regarding the facilities and services to be provided at the site concerned in future, such as building a library and car park, etc. The Plan D should consult the stakeholders regarding the usage of the proposed complex.
- (v) For Item E, Mr. LO Hiu-fung had clearly expressed the opposing views of his and the owners' corporations concerned. The EHWC said that there was insufficient traffic infrastructure and the site should not be developed in a rush. Therefore, he opposed to the planning proposal concerned and the Plan D should also continue to consult the district.

38. Ms. Jessica CHU's response was as follows:

- (i) The Plan D had received Members' comments on Items A, B, D and E and would forward them truthfully to the TPB later on. The Plan D would arrange to visit the area to consult the stakeholders through the TPDO.
- (ii) The Plan D noted Members' concerns regarding the site for the columbarium. She would truthfully forward the EHWC's request to temporarily withdraw the revised proposal for Item C to the policy bureaux and departments concerned, and would report to the DC in a timely manner.

39. Ms. Diane WONG added that numerous Government policy bureaux and departments participated in the columbarium project. As such, the Plan D had to forward Members' comments to these bureaux and departments first before replying the DC.

40. Mr. AU Chun-wah queried that it might be difficult to amend the details of the planning proposal if the gazettal took place before the district consultation.

41. Ms. Jessica CHU said that there was a two-month public consultation period after the gazettal and, according to the Town Planning Ordinance, any person could make a written representation to the TPB during the plan's exhibition period, and the TPB would decide whether to revise the plan. She added that the TPB had withdrawn the revised planning proposals for the area around Fung Yuen and Nethersole Hospital in the past on the grounds stated in the representation.

42. Mr. AU Chun-wah said that the Plan D should complete the consultation and revise the proposed amendments accordingly before the gazettal. In addition, he said that he enquired the Plan D not long ago about the number of sports centres, playgrounds / stadiums, standard swimming pools and libraries set out in Annex 2. He asked the Plan D to reply to him in writing in due course.

43. Mr. LO Hiu-fung again enquired the Plan D the purpose for consulting the EHWC. He stressed that apart from Item C, he also opposed to Item E. He said that the Plan D should first collect the comments of district stakeholders and respond to Members' suggestions and then amend the plans concerned accordingly, before submitting the plans concerned to the TPB for consideration and gazettal for public consultation.

44. Ms. Jessica CHU responded that the Plan D expected to forward the comments concerned to the TPB for consideration in late May 2017. During that period, if the HAD could arrange for staff to visit the area to meet the residents, the Plan D would also be happy to co-operate. She reiterated that the Plan D would truthfully reflect Members' comments to the TPB, and she would also inform the policy bureaux and departments concerned of the EHWC's demand that the revised

proposal for Item C be withdrawn. She stressed that the consultation would not stop and the Plan D would also continue to visit the area to consult the residents.

45. Ms. LEE Kai-ying, Iris said that in accordance with the guidelines, district consultation for planning should be led by the Plan D, which could liaise directly with the Members of the constituencies concerned to invite them to participate in the consultation. If necessary, the TPDO would provide assistance as requested by the Plan D.

46. The Chairman hoped that the Plan D would postpone the date to submit the documents concerned to the TPB. In addition, he asked the Plan D to clarify whether it would withdraw the revised proposal for Item C.

47. Dr. LAU Chee-sing said that if the Government regarded the Shuen Wan site as the only suitable site and the columbarium had to be built there, he suggested the FHB build it at another site in Shuen Wan so as to dispel the worries of some of the residents.

48. Ms. Diane WONG responded that the decision to withdraw the revised proposal for Item C would be made collectively by the Government. As such, she could respond to the TPDC only after discussion among the departments concerned had been carried out.

49. Ms. Jessica CHU added that the Plan D would consider submitting the revised proposal for Item C to the TPB after the Government had made a decision.

50. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai said that there were only two weeks from the day of the meeting to the end of May. He wondered if the Plan D had enough time to collect Members' comments. He asked the Plan D about the purpose for submitting Members' suggestions to the TPB.

51. Mr. LI Yiu-ban said that the Plan D would definitely consult the DC in accordance with the procedures, and would truthfully forward DC's comments to the TPB. However, the TPB would only make decisions in accordance with the Government's wishes and would ignore the comments of the district or the DC. This was a flaw in the system.

52. Mr. YAM Man-chuen quoted Area 9 of Tai Po as an example and said that the TPB had ignored the residents' opposition in the past and went ahead to approve the planning proposals concerned.

53. As for some Members saying that they only received the discussion paper on 5 May 2017, the Secretary responded that according to normal practice, the Secretariat would gather all the supplementary papers submitted by the departments concerned wherever possible, and distribute them altogether to Members so as to avoid confusion. He said that the Secretariat received the discussion papers for agenda items 2 and 3 submitted by the Plan D in the afternoon

of 2 May 2017, and distributed them together with the supplementary papers for other agenda items to Members on 5 May 2017.

54. The Chairman reiterated that the EHWC requested the Plan D to withdraw the revised proposal for Item C, and postpone the submission of all the revised proposals set out in the paper to the TPB before the completion of district consultation.

IV. Draft Ping Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-PC/1
(TPDC Paper No. EHW 25/2017)

55. The Chairman welcomed Ms. Jessica CHU, District Planning Officer / Sha Tin, Tai Po and North and Ms. KONG Sze-nga, Tammy, Town Planner of the Plan D to the meeting for the discussion of this item.

56. Mr. LI Yiu-ban said that the Plan D had consulted the EHWC earlier regarding the above draft plan. However, the Plan D did not make any amendments to the draft plan in the end, and hence there was no need to introduce the paper again. He said that Ping Chau residents had on numerous occasions opposed to the afore-mentioned draft plan, believing the planning proposal concerned did not cater for and take into consideration their needs. Nonetheless, the TPB had ignored their appeals. As such, he strongly opposed to the afore-mentioned draft plan.

57. Mr. Rex LI, the Vice-chairman, said that there had been numerous discussions on the afore-mentioned draft plan since the beginning of the year, but the Plan D had neither accepted the stakeholders' comments nor amended the draft plan. He was extremely furious about it, and reiterated that he opposed to the afore-mentioned draft plan.

58. The Chairman said that the Plan D consulted the EHWC on 11 January 2017 regarding the Draft Ping Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-PC/C. At that time, the EHWC respected the views of the SKNRC and the local residents and hence opposed to that plan. He added that the EHWC wrote to the TPB and the DEVB to express their dissatisfaction on 2 March 2017, but the TPB still did not amend the draft plan. He opined that the residents' application for expanding the Village Type Development zone did not lead to any negative impact to the outside, and the Government did not have to provide them with any funding for housing development. Rezoning their private land as Green Belts and conservation zones was unfair. He said that the EHWC should respect the comments of the SKNRC, Members of the constituency concerned, residents and stakeholders. As such, he opposed to the Draft Ping Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-PC/1, and would write to the TPB to express the EHWC's stance.

59. Ms. Jessica CHU added that the above draft plan was gazetted on 24 March 2017 (with a two-month exhibition period), and anyone who would like to make a representation with regard to

the plan could do so directly to the TPB before 24 May 2017.

60. The Chairman asked the Plan D to forward the EHWC's comments to the TPB.

(Post-meeting note: The Chairman wrote to the TPB on 12 June 2017.)

V. Report on the work of the Buildings Department in 2017 that affects the livelihood of people in Tai Po

(TPDC Paper No. EHW 26/2017)

61. The Chairman welcomed Mr. SOONG Ngar-ting, Martin and Mr. TSANG Chi-wai, Terence, Senior Structural Engineer and Structural Engineer respectively of the BD to the meeting for the discussion of this item.

62. Mr. Martin SOONG introduced the captioned paper.

63. Members noted the afore-mentioned paper and did not have any comments or questions.

VI. The Food and Environmental Hygiene Department's strategies and tasks on improving the environmental hygiene in Hong Kong

(TPDC Paper No. EHW 27/2017)

64. Mr. CHAN Yiu-wa, Andrew introduced the captioned paper.

65. Mr. TAM Wing-fun, Eric said that as summer was fast approaching, he would liaise with the FEHD after the meeting to discuss about the anti-mosquito and anti-rodent work.

66. The Chairman said that if Members noticed any mosquito or rodent problems in the district, they could directly contact the FEHD and ask them to follow up and visit the site.

VII. Annual District Plan of Housing Department (2017/18)

(TPDC Paper No. EHW 35/2017)

67. Ms. CHIU TSE Shuk-yin, Winnie introduced the captioned paper.

68. Mr. LAU Yung-wai said that according to the report compiled by the Audit Commission, the structural parts of Tai Yuen Estate contained asbestos. He enquired whether the HD would follow up on the issue.

69. Ms. Winnie TSE responded that the structural parts containing asbestos were situated on the roof. It was outside the residential area and out of reach of the residents. The HD would examine the condition of the structural parts on a regular basis.

VIII. Proposed planting of Cerasus Campanulata in Tai Po

(TPDC Paper No. 28/2017)

70. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had received a letter from Mr. KWAN Wing-yip, Mr. Francis YAM, Mr. AU Chun-wah, Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai, Mr. LAU Yung-wai and Mr. YAM Man-chuen, suggesting the FEHD plant *Cerasus Campanulata* in the LCSD parks in Tai Po District, with details in TPDC Paper No. EHW 28/2017. He said that pursuant to Order 13(1) of the Standing Orders, DC Members had to submit notice and papers concerned to the Secretariat ten clear working days before the date of meeting. He said that as Members informed the Secretariat of the proposed discussion almost ten clear working days in advance, and the discussion topics also fell within the scope of the EHWC, hence he approved with discretion the inclusion of this agenda item.

71. Mr. Francis YAM introduced the captioned paper.

72. Mr. WONG Yiu-ming, Brian's response was as follows:

- (i) *Cerasus Campanulata* or cherry blossom, classified as Rosaceae (Ceraras), normally bloomed between late March and early April every year and was suitable to be grown at the height of between 100 to 400 metres. They were suitable to be grown on the mountains and in cooler climate, and the cold weather would also help them bloom.
- (ii) The Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden donated 50 cherry blossom trees to the FEHD in 2015, of which 12 were planted in Mui Shue Hang Playground in Tai Po. Currently, 6 of them remained in the playground. As they did not bloom as well as expected, no cherry blossoms in full bloom could be seen.
- (iii) As the cherry blossom trees were growing well at the Hong Kong Velodrome Park in Tseung Kwan O, the LCSD would also consider Members' suggestions to identify suitable sites to plant cherry blossom trees in Tai Po District on a trial basis. Currently, the LCSD was test planting other species of cherry blossom trees at the Tai Po Waterfront Park, like Yoshino Cherry, Fuji Cherry and Oshima Cherry, etc. If the results were good, the LCSD would consider planting these cheery blossom trees at other locations in the district as well.

73. Ms. WONG Pik-kiu supported the planting of cherry blossom trees. She said that planting colourful trees at the Kwong Fuk Roundabout would uplift the spirits of persons entering Tai Po. Apart from cherry blossom trees, she also suggested the LCSD grow plants of different colours. In addition, she believed that the planting of cherry blossom trees should not necessarily be restricted to the locations mentioned in the paper. She pointed out that the area on Po Heung Bridge near Golden Gate was full of weeds and the LCSD could consider planting cheery blossom trees there first.

(Post-meeting note: The FEHD cleared the weeds at the Po Heung Bridge Sitting-out Area on 8 June 2017.)

74. Mr. Eric TAM supported the planting of cherry blossom trees, but said that they had to be of certain scale and quality to create the full bloom, which would attract members of the public and tourists to come and enjoy the scene.

75. Mr. Ken YU said that it was an excellent idea to plant cherry blossom trees, but the climate of Hong Kong might not be suitable for their growth. He pointed out that the LCSD had already test planted different species of cherry blossom trees in the district, and hence it was not necessary for the TPDC to specifically suggest the LCSD test plant them in the district. He was worried that the EHWC would become a laughingstock if they were unable to plant cherry blossom trees successfully.

76. Dr. YAU Wing-kwong said that the greening efforts in Tai Po District were excellent and the greening work in the district should be consolidated on a continued basis. He pointed out that plants such as Bombax Ceiba, Delonix Regia and Lagerstroemia Speciosa had been planted in the district, and they always attracted lots of people to come to take pictures and enjoy the scenery when they were in full bloom. He supported planting cherry blossom trees in the district on a trial basis, and suggested the LCSD consider planting Enkianthus Quinqueflorus, a specie native to Hong Kong.

77. Mr. YAM Man-chuen said that attempts could be made to plant cherry blossom trees as well as other plants in Tai Po District. He said that the EHWC would not become a laughingstock even if they failed to plant cherry blossom tress successfully eventually.

78. Mr. LO Hiu-fung agreed to plant cherry blossom trees on a trial basis, but pointed out that the trees had to be planted in a large quantity so as to create a full bloom effect, regardless of whether they were cherry blossoms or any other species. In addition, he said that the tree management afterwards was equally important (such as ways to handle the dead plants or which department should be responsible for clearing the fallen branches on the ground, etc.), and the departments concerned should enhance their co-ordination work.

79. Mr. Francis YAM said that planting cherry blossom trees in the district was a good idea. He added that the planting of roadside vegetation might involve management issues in future. Therefore, he suggested the LCSD plant cheery blossom trees at the parks under its management.

80. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai said that as planting cherry blossom trees was not among the current priority of the LCSD, he suggested planting them in the district. He hoped that Members would support the proposal.

81. Mr. LAU Yung-wai said that planting a small amount of cherry blossom trees would already be beautiful, and it was not necessarily to plant a lot of them or to create the full bloom effect.

82. Mr. Patrick TANG said that he supported the planting of cherry blossom trees which would give the parks more distinctive features. In addition, he pointed out that the LCSD's horticulturalists knew very well what kind of plants were suitable to be grown in each of the districts. As such, he hoped that the LCSD would provide professional advice for the EHWC.

83. The Chairman said that the Bombax Ceiba and Delonix Regia trees had flourished in Tai Po District, and the EHWC generally supported planting other species, such as cherry blossom trees, in the district on a trial basis. He said that even though Members' motion was moved less than ten clear working days in advance, he had given his approval with discretion.

84. Mr. Francis YAM moved the following motion: "The Environment, Housing and Works Committee of Tai Po District Council requested the planting of cherry blossom trees in the LCSD parks in Tai Po District." The motion was seconded by Mr. LAU Yung-wai.

85. Mr. LI Yiu-ban said that it was not necessary for Members to put forward revised proposal as regards the species of the vegetation, as the LCSD would make a decision depending on whether the species concerned were suitable to be grown in the district. He said that the EHWC could make suggestions to the LCSD and take follow-up action upon receiving the LCSD's reply.

86. The Chairman commented that there were different species of cherry blossom trees. The LCSD could plant different species of cherry blossom trees on a trial basis, and only planted them in large quantity if the trial was successful. He clarified that the motion of Mr. Francis YAM did not specify any particular species of cherry blossom trees.

87. Mr. Brian WONG thanked Members' comments and responded as follows:

- (i) The LCSD was open to planting different species of plants.
- (ii) The LCSD was planting Delonix Regia and Bombax Ceiba trees at present. However, the white fibres of Bombax Ceiba trees would have certain impact on

members of the public or the eateries. As such, the LCSD would only plant them in places far away from people's homes.

- (iii) The LCSD would refer to Members' suggestions, and take into consideration the planting conditions and limits as well as the actual environment, before deciding on which species of plants should be planted at which location.
- (iv) Apart from the locations suggested by Members, the LCSD would also identify other suitable locations for planting trees.
- (v) Owing to conservation considerations, the LCSD would try everything to preserve a tree unless it was dead. As such, the LCSD could not plant a huge amount of new plants at locations with vegetation cover.
- (vi) The LCSD had recently planted some *Tabebuia Rosea* trees in Tai Po Kau Park and Members comments were welcomed.

88. Mr. Ken YU moved the following amended motion (the first amendment to the original motion): "The Environment, Housing and Works Committee of Tai Po District Council requested the planting of cherry blossom, *Enkianthus Quinqueflorus*, *Jacaranda Mimosifolia* and ginkgo trees in the LCSD parks in Tai Po District." The amended motion was seconded by Dr. LAU Chee-sing.

89. Mr. YAM Man-chuen enquired whether it was possible to amend the amended motion moved by other Members.

90. Mr. LEE Yu-sau, Terence said that the Secretariat consulted the Department of Justice ("DoJ") a couple of years ago regarding the amendment of amended motions. The DoJ replied that the Standing Orders did not stipulate ways to deal with amended motions that had been further amended. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to regard the amendment concerned as an amendment to the original motion rather than the amended motion.

91. Mr. YAM Man-chuen moved the following amended motion (the second amendment to the original motion): "The Environment, Housing and Works Committee of Tai Po District Council requested the planting of cherry blossom, *Enkianthus Quinqueflorus*, *Jacaranda Mimosifolia* and ginkgo trees, as well as plums, orchids, chrysanthemums and bamboos in the LCSD parks in Tai Po District." The amended motion was seconded by Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai.

92. Mr. LO Hiu-fung enquired whether the plants mentioned by Members were suitable to be grown in the district.

93. Mr. Brian WONG responded that generally speaking, the plants mentioned by Members could be grown.

94. The EHWC agreed that voting on all motions would be recorded on a named basis.

95. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the first amended motion moved by Mr. Ken YU and the results were as follows:

For:	13 votes	Mr. Francis YAM, Mr. AU Chun-wah, Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai, Mr. LAU Yung-wai, Mr. YAM Man-chuen, Mr. Eric TAM, Mr. Ken YU, Dr. LAU Chee-sing, Mr. Patrick TANG, Mr. Clement WOO, Mr. LO Hiu-fung, Dr. YAU Wing-kwong, Mr. LEE Siu-man
Against:	0 votes	
<u>Abstained:</u>	<u>0 votes</u>	
Total:	13 votes	

96. The Chairman announced that the first amended motion was passed.

97. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the second amended motion moved by Mr. YAM Man-chuen and the results were as follows:

For:	13 votes	Mr. Francis YAM, Mr. AU Chun-wah, Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai, Mr. LAU Yung-wai, Mr. YAM Man-chuen, Mr. Eric TAM, Mr. Ken YU, Dr. LAU Chee-sing, Mr. Patrick TANG, Mr. Clement WOO, Mr. LO Hiu-fung, Dr. YAU Wing-kwong, Mr. LEE Siu-man
Against:	0 votes	
<u>Abstained:</u>	<u>0 votes</u>	
Total:	13 votes	

98. The Chairman announced that the second amended motion was passed. He said that as both the first and second amended motions were passed, it was not necessary to vote on the original motion.

IX. Second phase of anti-mosquito campaign 2017 in Tai Po

(TPDC Paper No. 29/2017)

99. Mr. Andrew CHAN introduced the captioned paper.

100. Mr. AU Chun-wah enquired whether the FEHD had stepped up its anti-mosquito efforts at all the residential estates and their surrounding areas.

101. Mr. LAU Yung-wai noted that the FEHD had carried out a 38-day anti-mosquito campaign in light of a confirmed Zika case in the district. He asked if that campaign was equivalent to the second phase of anti-mosquito campaign.

102. Mr. Andrew CHAN's response was as follows:

- (i) FEHD had stepped up its anti-mosquito efforts mainly within a 500-metre radius of Fortune Plaza and the Nethersole Hospital where the patient lived. Measures taken included anti-mosquito fogging, and clearing the stagnant water and rubbish, etc.
- (ii) The FEHD distributed pamphlets in private residential estates to remind the management companies to step up their anti-mosquito work. If the FEHD noticed mosquito breeding in any residential estate, it would take prosecution action against the company responsible for the anti-mosquito work of that residential estate.
- (iii) The two anti-mosquito campaigns mentioned by Mr. LAU were not the same. The anti-mosquito campaign in Tai Po was a regular anti-mosquito initiative of the FEHD that was carried out in three phases every year. The one that lasted for 38 days mainly targeted at high risk viruses like Dengue fever virus or Zika virus, etc., and anti-mosquito fogging were carried out and larvicidal oil used to eliminate mosquitos and their larvae.
- (iv) The most effective way to eliminate mosquitoes was to clear the stagnant water.

103. Mr. Clement WOO asked the FEHD to strengthen its anti-biting midges efforts in the district.

104. Mr. LAU Yung-wai requested the FEHD to provide the EHWC with the work report of the afore-mentioned 38-day anti-mosquito campaign.

105. The Chairman asked the FEHD to provide the relevant information for Mr. LAU after the meeting. In addition, he said that he had asked the FEHD to step up its anti-mosquito and weeding efforts in major areas like public minibus stops and bus stops. He suggested that if Members noticed signs of mosquitos and biting midges growth, they could report directly to the

FEHD for follow-up action.

X. Report of the Tai Po District Environmental Hygiene Office of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

(TPDC Paper No. 30/2017)

106. Mr. Andrew CHAN asked Members note the captioned paper.

107. Mr. LAU Yung-wai pointed out that the illegal expansion of shop area at Greenery Plaza had deteriorated in recent months, and he hoped that the FEHD could take follow-up action.

108. Mr. AU Chun-wah said that some shops were keeping their goods at Lane Square, the inner streets nearby and the roadside on a long-term basis, thus affecting the safety of pedestrians and drivers. Some of the shops near the fire shutters had even built concrete platforms outside the door. He asked the FEHD, the BD and the Lands D to enhance their patrolling efforts and take stringent enforcement action.

109. Mr. Ken YU pointed out that several shops selling fruits and vegetables in Tai Po Market had been habitually displaying their goods outside their shops, causing a lot of inconvenience to the pedestrians and even threatening their safety. He hoped that the FEHD could strengthen their communication with the shops so as to study ways to improve the situation and prevent accidents.

110. Mr. Andrew CHAN responded that the FEHD often held joint actions with the HKPF to follow up on the goods placed at the roadside. He said that the FEHD would step up its enforcement efforts, and the number of prosecutions regarding the illegal expansion of shop area for the shops in Lane Square had also increased from 8 in March 2017 to 19 in April 2017.

111. Mr. Ken YU said that relying solely on the issuing of penalty tickets would not solve the problem, as the penalty was too low to be deterrent to the shop owners. Hence, he hoped that the FEHD would discuss with the shops so as to find a solution.

112. Mr. LO Hiu-fung pointed out that staff of fruits stores in Lane Square often had knives in their hands cutting fruits for tasting by pedestrians on the pavement there. He hoped that the departments concerned would pay attention to the situation. In addition, he also said that there were signs of rodents at the covered walkway and flower beds outside the Tai Po Market MTR Station and he urged the FEHD to take follow-up action.

113. The Chairman said that for the environmental hygiene of specific locations, Members could liaise directly with the FEHD requiring follow-up action.

XI. Progress of replacement and rehabilitation of water mains in Tai Po District

(TPDC Paper No. EHW 31/2017)

114. The Chairman welcomed Mr. LO Wai-ki, Engineer of the WSD and Mr. FUNG Tsz-king, Project Resident Engineer of Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited to the meeting for the discussion of this item.

115. Mr. LO Wai-ki introduced the captioned paper.

116. Dr. LAU Chee-sing said that according to the information in the paper, the works for contract no. 8/WSD/10 had been completed. He asked if the new water mains were being used for the supply of water at present. In addition, he pointed out that WSD works were being carried out on Sam Mun Tsai Road recently, and he asked the WSD about the situation.

117. Mr. LO Wai-ki said that the new water mains laid under contract no. 8/WSD/10 had been connected to the existing water supply system. In addition, he pointed out that there were other water mains network improvement works on Sam Mun Tsai Road and the works concerned were not included in the contract for replacement and rehabilitation of water mains in Tai Po District.

118. Mr. Patrick TANG asked the WSD to update its internal database upon the completion of the replacement and rehabilitation of water mains, so that in the event of water mains burst in future, it could know the exact location of the underground water mains if it had to look for the underground facilities.

119. Mr. LO Wai-ki responded that the WSD would update its internal database upon the completion of the works.

XII. Progress report of the Working Group on Tai Po District Environmental Controls

(TPDC Paper No. 32/2017)

120. Ms. LAU So-mui, Rebecca introduced the captioned paper.

121. Mr. CHAN Lok-him, Dennis reported on the details of the inter-departmental bicycle removal operation:

- (i) The TPDO, together with the TD, the TPDLO, the FEHD and the Tai Po Police Station carried out inter-departmental bicycle removal operations on 3 March, 31 March and 28 April 2017 respectively. The departments concerned posted 103,

263 and 328 notices before the launch of the joint operations, and confiscated 38, 46 and 53 bicycles respectively.

(ii) The next joint bicycle removal operation was tentatively scheduled for May 2017.

122. Mr. LEE Siu-man noticed that there were shared bicycles parked on the roadside in the district. He asked the departments concerned what follow-up action would be taken.

123. Mr. LAU Yung-wai enquired whether the 238 new cases of illegal occupation of government land stated in the afore-mentioned paper were new cases in the past two months, and if there were any backlog cases that had lasted for more than a year.

124. Mr. Dennis CHAN responded that when the departments concerned received complaints about illegal parking of bicycles, they would deal with them according to the established procedures. If the illegal parking of bicycles at a certain location had been confirmed, the location would be included in the “to be cleared” list, and a joint bicycle removal operation would be arranged to remove the illegally parked bicycles.

125. Ms. Rebecca LAU responded that the 238 cases were new cases in the past two months. She pointed out that the Lands D would determine their priority in terms of their severity and complexity, and currently the “not yet completed cases” included the new cases and cases that were being dealt with.

126. Mr. LAU Yung-wai hoped that the TPDLO could provide the number of cases that had lasted for more than a year.

127. The Chairman asked the Lands D to liaise with Mr. LAU after the meeting and provide the information concerned.

XIII. Review on the guidelines for display of roadside non-commercial publicity materials

128. Ms. Rebecca LAU said that the TPDLO had forwarded to the Lands D comments of DC Members and Members regarding the afore-mentioned issue, and she also noted that several DC Members had written separately to the Lands D to express their concerns. She indicated that the Lands D was currently reviewing the comments concerned and would reply in writing in due course.

129. Mr. Andrew CHAN tabled the FEHD’s report regarding the clearing of non-commercial publicity materials in March 2017 for Members’ reference.

130. Mr. Ken YU noticed that publicity pamphlets claiming “Free legal services” were posted

throughout the territory, and he opined that such acts were commercial activities. As there was only one contact number on the publicity materials, he enquired how the FEHD would deal with these pamphlets.

131. Mr. AU Chun-wah's comments were as follows:

- (i) He said that there were other illegal publicity materials as well at the locations where DC Members' publicity materials were removed. He did not understand why the FEHD only removed the publicity materials of DC Members. He hoped that the FEHD would treat everyone the same when dealing with the matter.
- (ii) He noted that Lands D was still reviewing the comments in connection with the Implementation Guidelines of the Management Scheme for the Display of Roadside Non-commercial Publicity Materials. He hoped that the Lands D could reply as soon as possible.
- (iii) He pointed out that sometimes the FEHD could not take prosecution action regarding illegal commercial publicity materials due to a lack of information. He asked about the number of illegal commercial publicity materials concerned. In addition, he also asked about the number of prosecutions taken against illegal commercial publicity materials.

132. Mr. Patrick TANG enquired how the FEHD would deal with property agencies posting commercial publicity materials on the streets.

133. Mr. LAU Yung-wai said that someone had posted commercial publicity materials of property agencies on his banners. He asked under these circumstances, whether the FEHD would remove his banners or only the commercial publicity materials of the property agencies, and who would be responsible for the cost of removal.

134. Mr. Ken YU said that not long ago, the FEHD asked him to pay for the cost after removing the illegal publicity materials of someone else, which he found extremely unreasonable. He hoped that the FEHD would review such a practice.

135. Mr. LO Hiu-fung enquired whether the FEHD would charge DC Members with the administrative costs for removing someone else's commercial publicity materials posted on DC Members' banners. In addition, he pointed out that as there were a lot of commercial publicity materials and advertisement on the streets, he wondered why the FEHD only removed DC Members' banners and charged them with the removal cost.

136. Mr. LEE Siu-man indicated that commercial organisations were profit-making organisations, and he asked why the FEHD did not removal their publicity materials.

137. Mr. YAM Man-chuen asked if there was a complaint mechanism regarding the FEHD's charging of removal cost for publicity materials.

138. The Chairman said he would ask the FEHD to follow up on Members' comments and review the situation after the Lands D had finished reviewing the guidelines.

139. Mr. Andrew CHAN's response was as follows:

- (i) If the FEHD noticed anyone posting bills illegally, it would issue fixed penalty tickets of \$1,500 to those involved. The FEHD issued ten and nine fixed penalty tickets in March and April respectively for the illegal posting of bills.
- (ii) As some of the commercial publicity materials only had contact numbers, and the commercial organisation concerned would not provide the FEHD with details of the contact persons, the FEHD had certain difficulties in collecting evidence. The FEHD had the authority to remove the illegal commercial publicity materials, and would also take prosecution action should there be sufficient evidence.
- (iii) If Members believed that they had been charged by the FEHD with the removal cost for publicity materials by mistake, they could ask the FEHD to take follow-up action in writing.
- (iv) The Lands D's guidelines required banner applicants to keep the banners tidy and clean. He hoped that DC Members would pay more attention to it.

140. Mr. LAU Yung-wai made further enquiries about someone else posting commercial publicity materials on his banners. He asked if he was allowed by law to remove these publicity materials by himself.

141. Mr. AU Chun-wah asked whether the FEHD would track down the persons who posted the commercial publicity materials and take prosecution action through the Business Registration Office or other channels.

142. Mr. Andrew CHAN believed that those who illegally posted commercial publicity materials would not hold anyone accountable for the removal of their publicity materials. In the event of the afore-mentioned situation, he asked Members to contact the FEHD. In addition, he also said that the FEHD would endeavour to collect all the necessary information so as to take prosecution against those who had violated the law.

143. The Secretary said that Members asked at the previous meeting about the nature of the DC and DC Members' offices. He said that according to the HAD's response, the DCs were statutory organisations established pursuant to the District Councils Ordinance and DC Members' offices were where DC Members worked, and neither belonged to government organisations. As regards the nature of DC Members' offices under the Implementation Guidelines of the Management Scheme for the Display of Roadside Non-commercial Publicity Materials, he said that Members should enquire with the departments concerned which formulated the guidelines.

XIV. Vetting of district minor work project proposals to be recommended to the District Facilities Management Committee

(TPDC Paper No. EHW 33/2017)

144. The Chairman said that district works project proposals had to secure the support of the committee concerned before being forwarded to the District Facilities Management Committee ("DFMC") for consideration. He continued that the Secretariat had received 20 proposals from Members and various departments, and the EHWC had to consider whether to recommend these proposals. The proposals concerned had been set out in TPDC Paper No. 33/2017.

145. The Chairman continued that he received a revised proposal from Ms. WONG Pik-kiu before the meeting to rename Item 11 from "Construction of rainshelters at the Kwong Fuk Estate Minibus Stops" to "Construction of rainshelters cum benches at Tai Po Road (Yuen Chau Tsai Session) near Kwong Fuk Estate".

146. Dr. LAU Chee-sing put forward a revised proposal for Item 20. He suggested adding "Tai Po-bound Minibus stop at The Beverly Hills" as the 5th works site of that project.

147. Mr. Patrick TANG and Mr. LO Hiu-fung said that they had both submitted a back-up works proposal not long ago. They asked if these proposals should be examined at this meeting altogether.

148. Ms. Iris LEE responded as follows: The Secretariat had received all the proposals submitted by DC Members. According to the procedures, the Secretariat would forward these proposals to the committees concerned for vetting and recommendation, then to the Working Group on District Works under the DFMC for discussion, and eventually to the DFMC for official approval. As such, the EHWC was mainly responsible for deliberating on the district minor works that were related to the EHWC, and then make recommendations accordingly.

149. Members did not have any other questions or comments. The EHWC accepted the two afore-mentioned amendments and agreed to recommend the 20 projects to the DFMC.

XV. Allocation of DC Funds to EHWC in 2017/18

(TPDC Paper No. EHW 34/2017)

150. The Chairman said that at the meeting on 4 May 2017, the TPDC approved the funding of \$338,000 to the EHWC for the 2017-18 financial year (assuming that the TPDC was to be allocated additional funding of \$5 million for 2017/18), and asked Members to take note of it.

XVI. Reports of working groups

(I) Working Group on Environmental Protection and Optimisation

151. The Secretary reported on behalf of the Working Group Chairman that at the meeting on 4 May 2017, the TPDC approved the funding of \$280,000 (including surplus funding of \$17,000) to the Working Group for the 2017-18 financial year (assuming that the TPDC was to be allocated additional funding of \$5 million for 2017/18). He added that the Working Group would convene a meeting in due course to discuss the details of activities to be held in 2017/18, and would report the progress to the EHWC on a regular basis.

(II) Working Group on Monitoring of Public Housing Development in Tai Po

152. The Secretary reported on behalf of the Working Group Chairman that the Working Group did not convene any meeting recently. Once the date of the next meeting had been confirmed, the Secretariat would inform Members to attend the meeting.

XVII. Discussion on DC Funds cases

153. The Chairman said that Members examined the funding application of a conservation activity at the EHWC meeting on 7 September 2016. At that time, Members pointed out that according to the website of the applicant organisation, there were fee-charging items in the identical activities that the applicant organisation organised in the past, but the applicant organisation did not declare to the Secretariat the income concerned. He asked the Secretariat to seek more information from the applicant organisation. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to report on the situation concerned.

154. Mr. YAM Man-chuen said that as there was no quorum at the meeting, he suggested postponing this agenda item to the next meeting for further discussion.

155. Due to the lack of a quorum, the Chairman instructed under Order 12(2) of the Standing Orders to call those missing Members to the meeting (it was 8:28 p.m. at the time). Pursuant to the said Order, the Chairman should immediately declare the adjournment of the meeting if a quorum remained absent after 15 minutes.

156. Owing to the lack of a quorum present in the Conference Room after 15 minutes, the Chairman declared at 8:43 p.m. that the meeting was adjourned.

(Post-meeting note: The next meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 12 July 2017 (Wednesday).)

Tai Po District Council Secretariat
June 2017