

Draft
DISCOVERY BAY CITY OWNERS' COMMITTEE
Minutes of Meeting No.5 2013-14 held on 8th Oct 2014
7:30pm at MPH, Discovery Bay Office Centre

Members Present:

| | | | |
|------|----------------|-------|----------------------------------|
| Mr. | Simon Mawdsley | (SM) | Chairman, COC & Midvale VOC |
| Ms. | Amy Yung | (AY) | Chairlady, Beach VOC |
| Mrs. | Baby Hefti | (BH) | Chairlady, Peninsula VOC |
| Mr. | Colin Bosher | (CB) | Chairman, La Vista VOC |
| Mr. | Rene Buts | (RB) | Vice-Chairman, Greenvale VOC |
| Mrs. | Alison Dack | (AD) | Chairlady, Siena One VOC |
| Mr. | Edwin Rainbow | (ER) | Chairman, Hillgrove VOC |
| Ms. | Lee Huen Yee | (LHY) | Chairlady, Parkvale VOC |
| Dr. | Francis Chiu | (FC) | Chairman, Siena Two B VOC |
| Mrs. | Maggie Chan | (MC) | Chairlady, Neo Horizon VOC |
| Mr. | Kent Rossiter | (KR) | Chairman, La Costa VOC |
| Dr. | Lee Shui | (LS) | Vice-Chairman, Amalfi VOC |
| Dr. | Jennie Lee | (JL) | Chairlady, DB Plaza VOC |
| Mr. | Eddy Shen | (ES) | Chairman, Headland VOC |
| Mr. | Tony Cheng | (TC) | Representative, Registered Owner |
| Mr. | Derek Chu | (DC) | Representative, Hotel |
| Mr. | Edwin Lu | (EL) | Representative, Clubs |
| Mr. | Vincent Chua | (CKC) | Director, DBSML |
| Mr. | F.K. Wong | (FKW) | Chief Manager, Estate, DBSML |

Apologies:

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------|----------------------------------|
| Mr. Sam Cole | (SC) | Chairman, Parkridge VOC |
| Mr. James Heathe | (JH) | Chairman, Chianti VOC |
| Mr. David Kwok | (DK) | Chairman, Amalfi VOC |
| Mr. Leslie Fung | (LF) | Representative, Registered Owner |
| Mr. Paul Tough | (PT) | Representative, School |
| Champion Associates Ltd. | (CAL) | Chairman, Bijou Hamlet VOC |

Secretary:

| | | |
|------------------|-------|-------------------------------|
| Mr. Kenneth Chan | (CYY) | Senior Manager, Estate, DBSML |
|------------------|-------|-------------------------------|

Assistant to Secretary:

| | | |
|-------------|------|----------------------------------|
| Ms. Key Lam | (KL) | Asst. Manager, CR & Admin, DBSML |
|-------------|------|----------------------------------|

By Invitation:

| | | |
|--------------|-------|--|
| Mr. W.S. Yau | (WSY) | Senior Manager, Contract Mgt. and Works, DBSML |
|--------------|-------|--|

Staff of City Management:

| | | |
|-----|-------------|----------------------------------|
| Mr. | Wilson Chan | Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. | Daniel Ma | Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. | Steve Kwok | Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. | G. H. Koo | Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. | Kenneth Kan | Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. | Samuel Ip | Assistant Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. | Kelvin Siu | Assistant Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. | Rudy Lai | Assistant Manager, Estate, DBSML |

Observers:

| | | |
|-----|--------------|----------------|
| Mr. | Victor Riley | Owner, Midvale |
|-----|--------------|----------------|

The Meeting was declared duly convened with the necessary quorum of Members present.

| | | Action |
|-----------|---|-----------------|
| 1. | <p>1.1 Apologies</p> <p>CYY reported that apologies had been received from SC of Parkridge and JM of Greenvale; representing on her behalf was RB, the Vice-chairperson of Greenvale. SM also welcomed ER, the newly elected chairperson of Hillgrove.</p> <p>1.2 Staff Recognition</p> <p>Before proceeding to other agenda items of the meeting, CYY announced that four security team members had been involved in the successful arrest of a burglar at around 8 pm on 18 July 2014.</p> <p>With the use of the new CCTV cameras, the security team had been able to identify three suspects from mainland China who were involved in the Seahorse Lane burglary, and the police have arrested one of those suspects.</p> <p>CYY invited FC, the convener of the Police Liaison Group, to award certificates to the anti-burglary team. The group included Mr. Dan Leung, Superintendent of the in-house security team, Mr. Eric Wu, senior security Officer of ISS, Mr. Chin Sin Shing, Security Guard of ISS and Mr. Chan Fu Tik, Senior Security Officer of ISS.</p> <p>CYY reported that Mr. Frankie Tsang, the Assistant Manager of the Security Team, had resigned and that his workload would be shared among all the superintendents under CYY's supervision.</p> <p>1.3 Declaration of Interest</p> <p>1.3.1 CYY stated that ES would now like to make a declaration of interest.</p> <p>1.3.2 ES stated that before the Headland Owners' Meeting, he had read an open letter from one of the owners with a malicious accusation of his involvement with HKR. In light of being elected as the chairman of Headland for another term, he gave a verbal declaration of interest, "I, Eddy Shen, have never been an employee of HKR or [been] dismissed by HKR; never worked as a consultant to HKR and never held any HKR shares; I swear I will serve my VOC and DB's interests as a whole as my motherland".</p> | 19:31 |
| 2. | <p>Previous Minutes</p> <p>2.1 SM called for confirmation of the minutes of previous meeting.</p> <p>2.2 CYY stated that RB's comments were lengthy and complicated in the last minutes, and apologised for the fact that CM needed more time to review them before getting the Chairman's endorsement. Hence, no confirmation could be made.</p> <p>2.3 CB appreciated that the quality of the meeting minutes was better this time.</p> <p>2.4 Members were further reminded to send their comments, if any, to CM in good time, or otherwise the minutes would not be able to be endorsed in the subsequent meeting. RB responded that the delay was caused by the over-</p> | 19.39 CM |

| | | |
|------------|---|-------|
| | sight of JM for not passing the draft minutes to him in time. | |
| 2.5 | SM also reminded all Members to read and offer comments on the minutes in time. | |
| 3. | Matters Arising | |
| 3.1 | Follow up on the proposed development of the sports area adjacent to Discovery College | 19:42 |
| 3.1.1 | SM reported that an agreement had been reached between HKR and Discovery College and that he would organize a meeting with the Sports and Leisure Sub-Committee in the next two weeks. SM further stated that he had received a written confirmation from DC, advising that their project contractor was ready to hold a meeting with COC and they looked forward to the project probably starting around Christmas time. | SM |
| 3.1.2 | RB queried whether the Sports and Leisure Sub-Committee was aware if it had obtained the approval from Lands Department since this area did not belong to HKR anymore. | |
| 3.1.3 | SM responded that it had been discussed at a very early stage with HKR and DC. It was very clear that it was a public area with no bookings on the plot and no fence was allowed. This area was available to use by anyone at any time with no known restrictions. . | |
| 3.1.4 | RB commented that the Sports and Leisure Sub-Committee should not make the same mistake by wasting everyone's money. SM stressed that no money was changing hands and DC would be doing some enhancements to the ground and this had nothing to do with Sports and Leisure Sub-Committee. | |
| 3.1.5 | TC commented that those who wanted to create trouble could write to the Lands Department. It would be DC's responsibility to deal with the unlikely outcome of the project not going ahead and any potential waste of money. | |
| 3.2 | Follow up on engagement of consultant to study the road system | 19:45 |
| 3.2.1 | With a PowerPoint presentation, WSY gave a short review of the last COC meeting, and that members had discussed the need to engage a consultant to study the road system in DB including driveways, adjacent pedestrian walkways, and utilities. | |
| 3.2.2 | As requested by a COC member, the COC had agreed to review the Consultant's Report issued in 2008 regarding underground water supply pipes and its suggestions. WSY gave a short review of the 2008 Consultant's Report that concentrated on the Siu Ho Wan pumping station and underground water supply pipes to the south of Siena 2A/Greenvale, east of the water treatment plant and north of La Vista/Peninsula, the earlier development stages of DB. It was recommended to abandon the existing asbestos cement pipes (AC), and lay high-density polyethylene pipes (HDPE), suggesting a new pipe routing causing less impact to the existing underground utilities. | |
| 3.2.3 | WSY further elaborated that studies of the other utilities, including systems at the reservoir and water treatment plant, storm drains, sewage, electrical ducts, power cables and gas pipes were excluded in the 2008 Consultant Report. The pipe replacement period was expected to be 18 months with the estimated cost | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>of \$19 million at the time of 2008.</p> <p>3.2.4 In response to an enquiry by one of the Members about the Consultant's Roads Report in 2001/2002, WSY informed Members that the report could not be retrieved after such a long period of time.</p> <p>3.2.5 WSY recommended the formation of a Working Group to discuss the definition of the project at a working group level and to seek consent at a COC level. He explained that possible project value might need a Project Controls Approach, and project definition might include the 'Gate Method' which required to meet clear requirements before proceeding to the next stage.</p> <p>3.2.6 SM was invited to elaborate in further detail.</p> <p>3.2.7 SM stated that the estimated cost was \$19 Million in 2008 and the construction costs may have increased since then. He said that if Members wanted to go ahead with the project, they would have to define exactly what the project was and that members of the group would have to implement ways of allowing the COC to make decisions throughout every step of the project.</p> <p>3.2.8 SM explained that the 'Gate Method' was a simple method that combined the working group with the COC for the decision making process, stressing that the COC could stop the project at any time.</p> <p>3.2.9 SM showed how the 'Gate Method' would work if the COC agreed to formulate the working group, showing that at different points, the COC would be shown the project details and that the COC could abort the project at any of these points, specifically after finding the project's projected costs.</p> <p>3.2.10 SM showed that if the COC created the working group, they would have to define the scope of the project for the City and Villages.</p> <p>3.2.11 SM further elaborated that the idea would be the working group came up with the proposed scope of the consultancy and overall project and an information package would be put together and passed out to individual VOCs. After the VOCs had revised the information, they would decide if they wanted to be involved in the project, and if they had specific requirements for their individual villages. There would also be a possible money saving opportunity for the same or similar specific requirements. SM reiterated that they needed to determine the difference between City and Village areas. SM interpreted that once they had agreed with the individual VOCs, they needed to commit to the consultant's budget. The COC would then be presented with the gate one review. The working group report would be to confirm the scope areas, the proposed consultant's scope of the City and the participating Villages. The working group would also have to report any conflicts at this stage.</p> <p>3.2.12 SM specified that the COC would then have to agree to the consultancy-funding route, and decide whether the money came from the Road Fund or another fund. He reiterated that the COC would make the final decisions, and that they would adjudicate and resolve any of the conflicts that arose.</p> <p>3.2.13 SM concluded that the COC had to decide whether to approve the Gate One Report and pass through the gate to the next stage, to reject the Gate One Report with comments and resubmit, or to reject the Gate One Report outright. SM summarized that this was about managing expectations from the Working Group and the Villages and putting the responsibility of the project going</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|------------|---|---------------|
| | forward with the COC. | |
| 3.2.14 | BH inquired about the time frame of this project. SM responded that the first thing to do was decide what the programme for progression was, that if they decided to formulate the Working Group, the surveys may start in the following year. | |
| 3.2.15 | LHY was slightly confused about the project. SM clarified that it was a combination of surveys, and that they needed to ascertain their present underground services, as well as the road conditions. SM reiterated that it was generally about the infrastructure and road replacement for the City and Villages. | |
| 3.2.16 | CB enquired if City Management had drainage system drawings. SM affirmed in the positive but stated that Midvale did not have complete CCTV coverage of the drainage system. If several Villages were also eager to have such a review, a joint review may be beneficial. | |
| 3.2.17 | CB commented that the last report conducted in 2001 was a very important document and would like it to be available. WSY said that he would try retrieving it but could not guarantee availability. | CM |
| 3.2.18 | RB commented that in Greenvale they had CCTV surveillance of the drainage system, and the conclusion was that some of the pipes had to be re-lined, and normally the pipes had to be replaced. He added that learning from previous experience, he thought the first step was to carry out CCTV surveillance on the pipes that potentially had to be replaced, and then to see whether re-lining was an option before spending money for consultancy, which he regarded as potentially unnecessary. | |
| 3.2.19 | RB pointed out that the Committee should pay attention to the extent of the DMC and not to impose on other owners the financial obligation in respect to the Village questions. | |
| 3.2.20 | SM then motioned to form a Working Group for this project. With no objections, SM announced that the proposal to form the Working Group would be advanced by further work by WSY and SM. SM requested input and direction from the various VOC Chairs. | CHAIRS OF VOC |
| 3.2.21 | ES remarked that members of this Working Group should possess specific knowledge and professional capacity, that a financial adviser was also needed to manage the large sums of money over the next 5 to 10 years, and that surveyor should be appointed to control the cost of the project. SM responded that he and WSY would take those suggestions into account. | |
| 3.3 | Progress Update for Hillgrove AGM | 20:07 |
| 3.3.1 | ER expressed his appreciation to AY for helping out at the AGM but he also commented that City Management did not make adequate efforts in convening the Owners' meeting. ER said that not only had the management notice been given at short notice, but also that the owner's posters were taken down. | |
| 3.3.2 | In response to ER's comments, CYY clarified that the duty guard would take down any unauthorized notices posted in common areas as instructed by management. CYY also complained that the owner's notice was only written in English. | |

| | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| <p>3.3.3</p> <p>3.3.4</p> <p>3.3.5</p> <p>3.3.6</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.4.1</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.3</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>3.5.1</p> <p>3.5.2</p> <p>3.5.3</p> <p>3.5.4</p> | <p>CYY also clarified that City Management had tried four times over the last nine months in convening the AGM. The reason why the owners were given such short notice on the fourth attempt was because CM wanted a further endeavour before the current COC meeting. The purpose being to give opportunity for the Chairperson of Hillgrove VOC to participate in the COC meetings over the last nine months. Although the owners of Hillgrove had all been informed on various occasions that the Hillgrove VOC had not been convened, he hoped the owners would have been aware of this and had attended the owners' meeting. He stressed that due to the coming renovation, City Management looked forward to working with the newly elected Hillgrove VOC.</p> <p>RB expressed his disappointment on the arrangement by City Management.</p> <p>ER replied that he sent an email in which he had asked to put up the notices but had not received any replies. Upon seeing no posters, one of the owners took the initiative to produce and place notices personally.</p> <p>While he accepted that the security guards are working on the standing order to remove unauthorised notices and did not deserve to be blamed, ER commented he was not satisfied as there was no provision in the sub DMC allowing CM to take down the notice.</p> <p>Pollution Sensor</p> <p>CKC reported that they had collected information about pollution sensors. Upon researching cost, features, uses and techniques, they then passed the information onto the Environmental Protection Sub-Committee (EPSC) for further discussion. Members of the EPSC were not interested in using the device in DB due to the cost of one sensor being one and half million Hong Kong Dollars.</p> <p>Citing an SCMP article about the recent air pollution index in Central improving due to the recent demonstrations, RB suggested declaring car-free Sundays in Discovery Bay. He said this is practiced in Europe.</p> <p>ES mentioned that by using electric buses and Euro 6 buses, the pollution problem could be eased. He stated that he had repeatedly appealed to the COC to ask HKR to put a specific deadline on the changeover. He also raised the point that residents should change from two-stroke golf carts to electrically powered carts. He said that the COC should request HKR to comply with the clean air charter, as all the COC Members had signed for it.</p> <p>Location of the Water Fountain at Seahorse Lane</p> <p>AY asked if No.15 Seahorse Lane was still within the Beach Village boundary, as the Beach VOC unanimously objected to the water fountain installation on the grounds that it was not necessary. AY enquired whether this project could be legitimately cancelled.</p> <p>WSY believed the fountain was located in the City area. CYY also responded that the contract had already been awarded.</p> <p>BH was in favour of installing the water fountain, if necessary, in Peninsula.</p> <p>CYY stated No. 15 Seahorse Lane would be a convenient spot to cater for all</p> | <p>20:12</p> |
|--|--|--------------|

| | | |
|----|---|---------------------------|
| | <p>residents in both the north and south of Discovery Bay. He would also discuss with individual VOCs if any other villages wanted installations.</p> <p>3.5.5 AY said that a water fountain had already been installed at the Beach Promenade, near the Lantau Boat Club, which is quite close to the proposed location. Hence the Beach VOC deliberated the need for another.</p> <p>3.5.6 RB agreed with AY's location point, also saying that it was not fair to pay for a fountain that they did not want.</p> <p>3.5.7 CKC emphasized that apart from listening to the views of the COC, City Management also had to listen to individual VOC members, and more specifically, the views of individual owners. RB responded that they were represented.</p> <p>3.5.8 Regardless of the location of the drinking water fountain, FKW stated that the COC resolution was binding to all owners; therefore the individual VOC resolution could not contradict the COC resolution.</p> <p>3.5.9 AY commented that all Beach VOC members were unanimously opposed to the location, and she pointed out that there was no reason for installing the water fountain at a cost of \$93,000.</p> <p>3.5.10 FKW reiterated that every member should be aware that the COC resolution was binding to all the owners, but shall not be binding to the manager, and therefore could consider the resolution of the VOC, yet not be obliged to observe that resolution.</p> <p>3.5.11 As a member of EPSC, BH clarified that EPSC was objecting to the original design of the fountain, which could not fill up a bottle. She personally supported the installation of the fountain, as it would save thousands of water bottles. She stated she would talk with Peninsula VOC to install the water fountain, if Beach did not want it.</p> <p>3.5.12 AD requested and WSY agreed to provide the locations of the fountain to AD and RB.</p> <p>3.5.13 AY remarked that taking this as an example, she would like City Management to consider not marking every COC paper as confidential so that she could share the papers with the VOC.</p> | |
| 4. | <p>CM Report</p> <p>4.1 Upcoming Tenders</p> <p>4.1.1 WSY gave an update of two tenders that were under analysis; The 'Tender for WR2 inspection of P&D plants in the city area' and the 'Tender for the replacement of the existing 5.5 tones dumping truck (DB85)' which was used by the landscaping team. WSY also reported on four upcoming tenders in the next three months; 'Replacement of defective water pumps at Water Treatment Plant', 'Replace the faulty fresh water inlet valve with the associated pressure reducing valve at Siu Ho Wan Pumping Station' and 'Consultancy services for reviewing and improving communal facilities of P&D and sewage discharge system'. He further elaborated that for the last tender, SM and he would discuss how to form a working group before deciding on how to proceed on the tender.</p> | <p>20:25</p> <p>SM/CM</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|-----------|
| | <p>4.2 COC Papers Endorsed (<i>COC Paper 460/14</i>)</p> <p>4.2.1 With reference to the COC Paper460/14, WSY updated members on the two COC papers being endorsed. The first paper was the 'Concrete Repair in Discovery Bay', which was a term contract, meaning it is only to be paid if the service has been used. The second paper was the 'Mobile Base Station at Water Treatment Plant- License renewal (Smartone)', which was a three-year contract. The license fee would be received from Smartone each month.</p> <p>4.3 Service Update</p> <p>4.3.1 CYY then gave a security update about the change of uniform for ISS security guards. By taking advantage of the driving course organized by HKR in these two years, City Management had arranged drivers from the security team and City Management to attend this training course. The seminar, conducted by the Hong Kong Traffic Police , focused on driving behavior, etiquette, and techniques, specifically citing the speed limit in Discovery Bay.</p> <p>4.3.2 Regarding the Upgrade Work on PCO/PRO, CYY showed pictures of the foundations that had already been finished, in which just a temporary structure was completed in case they were forced to move elsewhere. With the implementation of the Octopus Card system, they would be able to relocate the control points to a central area, hopefully reducing the security headcount from 1st November. He also highlighted the road usage fee had increased from \$10 to \$11 from the 1st October.</p> <p>4.3.3 The 'Tool Kit on Loan' service was introduced to all members, showing that all residents could borrow tool kits, including ladders and battery operated drills, which would be available to most of the Local Management Offices from 1st November.</p> <p>4.4 Dog Control</p> <p>4.4.1 In view of a recent dog attack in La Costa area, CYY briefed members on the action taken by CM. He first presented that the estimated dog population in Discovery Bay was around 1000, with few units keeping more than one dog. There were 7 dog-related incidents, involving 2 dog attacks and 5 dog control incidents in public areas over the past three months. He stated that they had also received complaints from residents about dog behavioral issues.</p> <p>4.4.2 To address the dog incidents occurring in Discovery Bay, the COC Chairman had issued a letter to the AFCD urging them to take more proactive action in Discovery Bay. As a result, the AFCD has conducted two operations in Discovery Bay and have been to the Plaza, Marina Club, Peninsula, Siena, and Greenvale, placed where dogs are most likely to be found. They had also talked with the dog owners, distributed leaflets and explained what they needed to do to be a responsible dog owner. On top of that, the AFCD had also promised to hold a seminar for DB residents, aimed at dog owners, about various issues involving dog control.</p> <p>4.4.3 CYY reiterated that this was a joint effort of the Chairman and City Management to press the government to work on the dog control issue in Discovery Bay.</p> <p>4.4.4 With regard to the internal effort, City Management would conduct training for security guards on how to approach dog owners in a diplomatic and assertive</p> | <p>CM</p> |
|--|---|-----------|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>manner. CYY would review the situation within three months, as it was an ongoing campaign.</p> <p>4.4.5 CYY stressed that for the overall dog campaign, they might have to change the approach on advising dog owners in a positive manner, and he reaffirmed that they would create a more positive image to encourage the dog owners to look after their dogs in a proper manner.</p> <p>4.4.6 AD asked to clarify the locations the AFCD had visited, whether Siena area meant Siena Two or Central Park. CYY responded that he did not think it was Central Park. AD believed more dogs would go to the Siena Two area. She agreed with CYY's suggestion of a positive message as a method of promoting education. She believed the idea of muzzling dogs in the lift was a very valid one to convey the positive message that CYY had just mentioned.</p> <p>4.5 The Sports Pitch Update</p> <p>4.5.1 CYY gave a financial overview update with booking fees received to the value of \$785,000. In order to protect the pitch condition, CYY suggested increasing the frequency of maintenance from two to four times a year.</p> <p>4.5.2 CYY also mentioned the cleaning and security cost of \$2.9 million, and the remaining outstanding amount they needed to meet the target was about \$2.1 to \$2.2 million. He further illustrated that they had projected another 33 to 35 months to break-even, allowing them to return the borrowed funds to the Owners' Fund. The electricity costs would also be included in future presentations.</p> <p>4.5.3 CYY proposed having new booking fees effective from November. He specified that for daytime bookings, fees would increase from \$550 to \$630, while for evening bookings, rates would increase from \$660 to \$750. He also considered storage space charges of \$300 per month for users to store equipment. Such arrangements would not only neaten the site, but also generate supplementary income.</p> <p>4.5.4 He said more flexibility on half hour booking periods might also raise income to some extent.</p> <p>4.5.5 Extending the public section is also being considered, so that by increasing the supply of sections, more demands would be fostered.</p> <p>4.6 Community Events</p> <p>4.6.1 CYY gave a short review of community events, including 'OIWA Eco Workshop-Making Paper Owls' on 16th August and 'OIWA – Eco-Tour to Peng Chau' on 23rd August.</p> <p>4.6.2 With regard to the upcoming events, there were 'Eco-Tour to Mui Wo' organized by OIWA on 11th October and 'Gardening Installation Carnival@DB' organized by NAAC on 16th November at DB Plaza.</p> <p>4.6.3 For Halloween, CYY disclosed that the budgeted of \$20,000 with IDC funding was to be confirmed. Thanks to the suggestion of MC, there would be a joint effort of DB residents as well as the local group organizations to decorate the bus stops at the strategic points along the Main Road.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 4.6.4 | '10K Run for Charity' and 'Picnic in the Park' both were organized by local residents and would be held on the same date, 8th November. 'DMK Charity Walk' would be conducted on 15 th November, while 'Junior Challenge' would be scheduled for 16 th November. | CM |
| 4.6.5 | Referring to the previous COC meeting where HKR had agreed to sponsor \$10,000 for each Village, CYY reported that after discussion with different VOCs, they had received the responses from nine Villages of how to utilize the sponsorship. He would continue to follow up with the rest of the Villages of whom had not decided how to make use of the sponsorship. | |
| 4.7 | DB Family Farm | |
| 4.7.1 | CYY presented that the DB Family Farm was set up in Central Park under the Love.Together@DB Project. 44 plots of farm land were made available for allocation to families for a period of 4 months. 88 applications were received for the first allocation. He pointed out that all participants had been very excited for the opportunity of being 'urban farmers'. However, the District Lands Office had just issued a letter demanding HKR to close down the farm within one month in response to a complaint. | |
| 4.7.2 | BH stated that this was undemocratic, as most people who are happy with the project are not being heard as much as one unhappy person. | |
| 4.7.3 | TC stated that it was a rewarding and amazing experience to see so many families working happily on the Farm at the opening ceremony. The Farm was probably one of the best projects so far under the Love.together@DB Project. With a set up cost of \$160,000, the Farm had provided 44 plots of farm land for allocation to families. Once every four months, there would be 44 happy families which could enjoy the fun of farming. | |
| 4.7.4 | TC elaborated that the District Lands Office demanded HKR to close down the farm because HKR was allegedly charging the participants for using the Central Park. While it was true that each participating family was required to pay \$500 for the 4-month period, the said amount was used for hiring a landscape contractor to take care of the plants on behalf of the participants. He stressed that HKR had not made any profit from the Farm or charged any person for using Central Park. | |
| 4.7.5 | TC could not understand what the habitual complainant wanted to achieve by destroying the Farm which was welcomed by so many residents. He reiterated that he would be working closely with all 44 participants to explain to the DLO that the participants were not charged for using the Central Park. He was hopeful that they could convince the government that there was no breach of government requirement. | |
| 4.7.6 | RB asked TC to read the email of the Lands Department. That place belonged to all people of Hong Kong according to an undertaking signed by HKR. It was a scam for HKR to allocate the place to the participants and there was no chance for HKR to ask the government to reverse its decision. | |
| 4.7.7 | TC asked if any Member had seen the email from Lands Department. RB said that he had seen the email from the Lands Department. TC asked whether RB could forward the email to all Members. RB responded that he thought the email came from FC originally. FC responded that he had not seen such an email and it was very clear what was going on. | |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| 4.7.8 | TC urged RB, on behalf of all DB residents or at least those 44 participants, to explain how he could have seen the email from the Lands Department which TC had not seen. RB argued that it had been copied to everybody. TC urged RB again to send the email to all Members after the meeting. RB asked SM whether he had noticed that email or not. SM replied that he had not seen it. TC asked again whether RB could send the email to everybody after the meeting. RB responded that he would do so. | |
| 4.7.9 | SM commented that he would inform Midvale VOC to consider their stance towards the Family Farm issue. | |
| 4.7.10 | LHY suggested HKR could explore whether there was other land that could be used as an alternative. | |
| 4.7.11 | TC advised that a large piece of land near the look-out point would be turned into an organic farm as proposed in an earlier consultation exercise with COC. However, he did not see any contradiction between the proposal and the Family Farm in Central Park. | |
| 4.7.12 | Regarding the proposed organic farm near the look-out point, BH commented that it was too high and inconvenient for people, unless they have golf carts. She also considered that the 44 plots in Central Park were not sufficient. She shared her experience from Peninsula, that planting and farming could definitely enhance the relationship among residents. | |
| 4.7.13 | TC responded that he and the participants would fight to keep the Farm. | |
| 4.7.14 | RB stated that he remembered that the email was sent out by Key Lam and asked SM to copy it to Members next time. | |
| 4.8 | Discussion on Dog Control | |
| 4.8.1 | ES mentioned that he had talked to the AFCD representative. City Management should have more authority over dog related issues than members currently thought. He had the impression that City Management deliberately picked the official departments and the Police to put their efforts into the dog control issue, but they were not the gate keepers and therefore not ultimately responsible. He would give City Management three months to deal with the case. | |
| 4.8.2 | ES said no solutions had been reached for the ten years old child who was bitten by a dog and hospitalized for seven days. ES stressed the fact that HKR should be liable for attacks that happen in areas that they own. | |
| 4.8.3 | ES added that there was another case in which one cleaner had been bitten by a dog near Bijou Hamlet and could not return to work, resulting in a large settlement. He proposed that HKR should ensure there is comprehensive insurance cover in crowded areas like DB Plaza where there are large dogs without leashes. | |
| 4.8.4 | LHY expressed concern about CM's response to these incidents being an overreaction. She asked City Management to be careful with the use of words and the frequency of issuing notices. | |
| 4.8.5 | RB agreed with ES that City Management could do more. He suggested that it was not a solution to muzzle every dog, but to punish the guilty ones, which he | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-------|
| | <p>thought might be only one percent of dogs. He expressed that there was no point in everybody paying the cost of another's misbehaviour, and he reaffirmed that it would be simple to only muzzle the dogs that had bitten others.</p> <p>4.8.6 BH agreed with RB that only small percentage of dogs were misbehaving. RB further stated that maybe the same dog would bite somebody else a month later, illustrating the fact that no proper resolution had been made to deal with the problem.</p> <p>4.8.7 KR agreed with members about the dog issue. He declared that he had dogs as well and he did not think muzzling dogs was the answer to remove people's fear of them. He asked whether the dog-waiting area near ParknShop had been closed or moved.</p> <p>4.8.8 TC responded that the temporary relocation to the other side of the wall was due for refurbishment and it was now back to normal. KR asked if there was a chance for expanding that area as he noticed that it was always full.</p> <p>4.8.9 TC replied that he would convey KR's suggestion to the commercial services department for consideration. TC understood that the dog issue was very controversial in that people who loved dogs and people who hated dogs always had contradictory views. He believed that City Management could properly handle such a controversial issue by balancing the interests of both groups.</p> <p>4.9 Sports Pitch</p> <p>4.9.1 AY asked City Management to advise members on the deviation from the original business plan and the forecast of raising the fees. AY said that City Management did not have a full picture of whether there would be a negative impact on the cash flow or not. AY requested the possibility of City Management preparing a forecast and sending it to the Finance Sub-Committee for review.</p> <p>4.9.2 SM responded that he had received emails over the last two months about the closure of Tung Chung pitch, and that the use of the pitch was now in great demand and it would not be a good time to increase the fees.</p> <p>4.9.3 CYY also supplemented that the new rate would be implemented from 1st November to 31st March, and a review could take place then.</p> | |
| 5. | <p>Items for Discussion</p> <p>5.1 Implementation of Taxi and Coach Proposals</p> <p>5.1.1 TC informed Members that the taxi and coach proposals would be implemented by the end of October, with the exact date being confirmed by the Transport Department. Upon receiving TD's confirmation, HKR will issue letters to inform all residents. Also, he would invite all COC Members and people who have contributed to this matter in the past 5 years to attend a ceremony on the implementation date.</p> <p>5.1.2 RB queried whether the government had approved the taxi and coach proposals. TC responded that both proposals had already been formally approved and he was awaiting TD's confirmation on the implementation date.</p> | 21:06 |

| | | |
|------------|---|-------|
| 5.2 | Proposed Concessionary Ferry Fare for Foreign Domestic Helpers Serving DB Residents | 21:07 |
| 5.2.1 | TC briefed Members that at the last Passenger Liaison Group meeting, there was a suggestion of providing ferry fare concession to foreign domestic helpers (FDHs) working for DB residents. Since the cost for taking external bus and MTR to Central would be cheaper than the single trip ferry fare, most FDH's would not take ferry. If FDHs could be attracted to take ferry, it would increase the revenue of ferry operation. TC wanted to hear the Member's views. | |
| 5.2.2 | BH said that the proposal might be discriminatory. She regarded it as a good idea to have a lower fare, but for everybody, not only the domestic helpers. Personally, she thought it was the employers' responsibility to pay for their employee's transportation, not the whole community responsibilities. She counter suggested this scheme be implemented in off-peak hours only, and apply to all passengers. | |
| 5.2.3 | LHY remarked that it was a great idea but she raised concerns about the legal aspect of discrimination, and how to differentiate domestic helpers from other passengers. | |
| 5.2.4 | TC responded that the domestic helpers would need to apply for a special card from the ferry company by producing their employment contracts. The validity of the card will tally with their employment contracts. Further details could be worked out if it was decided that the suggestion should be adopted. TC stressed that he would assess the suggestion from the perspective of whether it would increase the revenue of the ferry operation but not from the perspective of which group of people should be given subsidy. | |
| 5.2.5 | ER considered that domestic helpers were a special category of people, and the use of the word 'discriminate' might not be appropriate. BH and LHY both objected to his view due to the fact that they believe employers, including BH herself, already paid for their transport, and wondered why the community had to 'shoulder' or subsidies their transport. ER argued that the domestic helpers didn't make much money and therefore this would benefit them directly. | |
| 5.2.6 | AD said that it would be quite difficult to monitor who was using the card at any time. | |
| 5.2.7 | CB gave his full support to the idea, saying FC had explained it very well in the PLG meeting. He disagreed with BH, saying he regarded it as a positive discrimination and he stated that an increase in salary might not be used for transportation. He further explained that if domestic helpers were encouraged to use ferry, it would be good for the ferry operator which would in turn be good for all the residents. He reaffirmed that he supported the idea. | |
| 5.2.8 | AD further responded that there are other categories of people that did not earn a great deal of money. She added that the employers had already been paying for the ferry cards for their helpers and she believed they would not stop doing so, therefore rendering the adoption of this new method as pointless. | |
| 5.2.9 | CB responded that on Sundays, ferries were hardly used, especially at the time when helpers go out, and that this would increase the ridership of the ferry and produce savings for the helpers. | |
| 5.2.10 | In response to AD's suggestion of cutting the ferry fare in half from after | |

| | | |
|--|---|-------|
| | <p>midnight to increase usage, CB pointed out passengers had no choice during that period, but to wait for the night ferries. On the contrary, the helpers had chosen not to take the morning ferries in order to save \$20, if we offered the helpers a concessionary ferry fare, we would have earned \$20 from the MTR fares.</p> <p>5.2.11 AD expressed that there were lots of people who choose to save the \$20 by taking the bus and then MTR instead of taking the ferry. She suggested that we could direct those people back from the MTR to the ferry in order to increase the ridership, especially during non-peak times, when the ferry was largely empty. Domestic helpers did not prefer to travel during peak times.</p> <p>5.2.12 AY recalled that we had tried to introduce a scheme to encourage people to take ferries during non-peak hours a few years ago, though she did not know why it had failed. She however fully supported the idea of implementing this scheme so that people who were originally ineligible to have a concessionary fare could enjoy it during non-peak hours. She considered that such a scheme would not involve any legal implications of discrimination and, in theory, more people would take ferries rather than going to Tung Chung.</p> <p>5.2.13 BH proposed that during the non-peak times, everybody should have the discount and the ferry would then be full. BH was also concerned with the potential increase of abuse of the concessionary fare card, for example, many senior people's ferry cards had already been misused by young people. RB agreed with BH and proposed the only way to avoid such an abuse was to make the concessionary fare applicable to everybody.</p> <p>5.2.14 ES viewed that the proposed concessionary fare to the domestic helpers would create more class distinction between people. As an alternative, he has requested for a DB resident card many times. This would save all residents money. He also suggested that the ferry operator offer a concessionary fare of \$20 to all seniors.</p> <p>5.2.15 FC clarified that a resident from Siena One suggested the idea, and he just supported this idea in the PLG meeting.</p> <p>5.2.16 TC reiterated that he would only consider a suggestion from the business point of view, that was whether it would generate additional revenue for ferry operation. If the amount of concession offered was too large in order to attract additional passengers, it might result in decrease of revenue for ferry operation instead.</p> <p>5.3 Procurement of Food Waste Decomposer</p> <p>5.3.1 With reference to COC Paper T1042/14, FKW outlined three developments since the last COC meeting. The first one was about the existing decomposer. He reported that they had just received a reply from EPD last week, to confirm they could apply for funding to finance the operation for another two years, with a maximum of 50% of the actual operation costs or \$300,000 as a ceiling, to run the existing decomposer.</p> <p>5.3.2 In relation to the second decomposer, he stated that the tendering exercise and analysis had already been passed to members for review. He suggested that the COC accepted the Associate Engineers' decomposer because they met the tender's requirement to have the quality standard of 2005, and their total cost including the maintenance fee was the lowest amongst those considered. He</p> | |
| | | 21:22 |

| | | |
|-------|--|--|
| | <p>showed that the existing decomposer already served about 200 units, roughly 2.4% of the total housing units in Discovery Bay. Given the same capacity, he believed if that the second decomposer were purchased, it would serve about 4 to 5% of the total housing units in Discovery Bay.</p> | |
| 5.3.3 | <p>The third issue was the 'Community-based Zero Waste Town Development Project'. With the co-ordination of the Environmental Protection Sub-Committee, City Management had entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the City University to apply for funding to install eight food waste collection machines at no cost to owners, except for the electricity consumed by the machines. The result of the application would be announced in October/November this year. Based on the view of development, he explained that City Management provided 4 options for the Members' consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Not to apply for funding the existing decomposer and return it to the EPD ii. To approve the funding application for the existing decomposer but not to purchase a second decomposer iii. To approve the funding application for the existing decomposer and to purchase a second decomposer iv. To approve the funding application for the existing decomposer and to purchase a second decomposer if the community-based zero waste project is rejected | |
| 5.3.4 | <p>RB wanted to clarify whether option one had been approved and therefore the others be rejected. He expected that nothing should have changed since the COC already approved it two years ago.</p> | |
| 5.3.5 | <p>In response to RB's concern, FKW explained in more detail that at the beginning of this scheme, EPD had only absorbed the total fund for two years, which had already expired at the end of September 2014. He further elaborated that starting from 1st October 2014, Owners' fund had to pay the operation costs otherwise the existing machine had to be returned to the government.</p> | |
| 5.3.6 | <p>SM said the question was whether to continue the operation or return the machine. He then directed the focus on options two, three, and four.</p> | |
| 5.3.7 | <p>CB gave his full support to the forth proposal and commented that when the waste charge was introduced, he believed everybody in DB would prefer to put food waste into the decomposer. It also didn't require much infrastructure. He reiterated his support to this programme, highlighting a positive impact to be seen due to less solid waste and fewer plastic bags.</p> | |
| 5.3.8 | <p>BH expressed her support of CB in suggesting the forth option, but questioned the usefulness of the buckets. With reference to Ping Chau's example, using recycling containers, she suggested using plastic bags, instead of buckets, to contain food waste, then empty the bags and put them into the garbage bin nearby, which would be more convenient to the participating households, and also could save \$25,000 on bucket purchases.</p> | |
| 5.3.9 | <p>FKW responded that he would still prefer to purchase a new set of buckets as the use of plastic bags, wouldn't help solve the existing problem of residents using plastic bags to collect food waste, thus still having to dispose of the plastic bags. Since plastic bags could not be decomposed, the only thing the cleaners were required to do was to unwrap the plastic bags. He preferred to</p> | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>use the buckets with the reason they at least provide participating units a means for food waste collection, otherwise the situation might be even worse if no containers were provided.</p> <p>5.3.10 AD queried how often the machine needed to be replaced due to the fact that the machine could only serve 200 household units with the cost of \$252,000 for the machine and \$25,000 for the buckets. She questioned the length of functionality and was worried about only two years of use.</p> <p>5.3.11 FKW responded that this was not the case. For reference, City Management installed a small capacity food decomposer in the Nursery in the year 2000 and it is still functioning. He presented the core value of this scheme was to rotate to another group of 200 units after two years' time, giving more of a chance to other households to participate.</p> <p>5.3.12 AD wanted to clarify if option four was meant to approve the application for \$6,000 per month from the EPD, which was 50% of the cost. FKW responded that in Annex 1, it stated clearly that City Management had to have the approval from the COC for the funding application on a 50% subsidy.</p> <p>5.3.13 AD further asked whether it was true that eight machines could be given under the 'Community-based Zero Waste town Development Project'. FKW responded that they had been under the memorandum of understanding with City University to apply for the funding of the government to install eight food waste machines in Discovery Bay.</p> <p>5.3.14 AD asked whether they could also apply for \$6,000 for each of the eight machines, as with the first one. FKW responded that the other eight machines were totally free, and the entire running cost would be absorbed by the funding. They would only have to provide the electricity to run the machines.</p> <p>5.3.15 CB inquired as to where the second decomposer would be located. He added that the first one is not in a good location, and was infested with pests such as cockroaches and rats.</p> <p>5.3.16 FKW stated that they would find a more suitable location for the second decomposer.</p> <p>5.3.17 CB then asked about the proposed location of the other eight decomposers. FKW answered that it was quite premature to identify the locations.</p> <p>5.3.18 RB suggested putting the decomposer on the farm and this was noted.</p> <p>5.3.19 ES supported the proposal of option four.</p> <p>5.3.20 FKW motioned to put these four options to vote. CB seconded. FKW stated that since the item would be funded by City Reserve Fund, City Management would like to carry out the voting by progressive elimination, meaning that if any options receive less than 50% of majority votes, the least popular option would be eliminated before the second round of the voting.</p> <p>5.3.21 BH raised the question as to why nobody talked about the compost being a good way to save money on fertilizers. FKW responded that in fact he had replied to CB in an email that they would save \$500 on purchasing fertilizers. BH remarked it seemed a minor saving.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| <p>5.3.22 FKW proposed the voting by show of hands. CYY declared a unanimous decision by members of choosing option four – <i>To approve the funding application for the existing decomposer and to purchase a second decomposer if the community-based zero waste project is rejected.</i></p> | |
| <p>5.4 Objection Against Site Work and Future Use of Car Park at Pump House Area near Seahorse Lane (COC Paper 465/14)</p> | <p>21:41</p> |
| <p>5.4.1 With reference to COC Paper 465/14, AY stated that Beach VOC had passed a resolution on the 14th August 2014 to endorse Mr. Andrew Burns' open letter to CKC, which objects the site work carried out by HKR and the future use by HKR, of the Pump Station area for illegal activities that would disrupt the enjoyment of Beach Village.</p> | |
| <p>5.4.2 AY gave background information to show that, during the construction of the Discovery Bay Office Centre in 1996, part of the main golf cart parking area was closed. Since then, people have been allowed to park their golf carts near the pumping station. Such an arrangement was supposed to be on a temporary basis. However, it has lasted for 18 years and HKR have made no attempt to find a place for a proper car park.</p> | |
| <p>5.4.3 She addressed the notice issued by City Management, asking all golf cart owners to vacate this area, as it is being reserved for commercial, HKR, and DB vehicles. AY expressed her view that this place was not meant for parking, saying that it was against the law.</p> | |
| <p>5.4.4 AY raised her concerns about the lack of golf cart parking spaces, saying it may force owners to park golf carts illegally in nearby villages, for example, along Seahorse Lane and near the pumping station. She said that the situation is even worse on weekends.</p> | |
| <p>5.4.5 AY appealed to HKR to plan for a proper car park with its retained areas, not only for the golf carts, but also the commercial use. She put emphasis on the safety of both vehicle owners, and pedestrians.</p> | |
| <p>5.4.6 In response to AY's concern, FKW expressed his confusion over her claim regarding the future use of the pumping station being taken by HKR as an illegal activity. He asked that members be aware that the parking area, as AY had just mentioned, was used for the past 20 years. He wondered why AY claimed parking was illegal there once it was assumed by HKR.</p> | |
| <p>5.4.7 With regard to the open letter, FKW addressed that the writer had simply ignored the fact, or misled the COC Members, that there was no alternative arrangement other than licensing of City Retained Area for the use of the gardening or recreational activities. He gave the fact that HKR had the right to grant a lease or bare license to City Management. Whether City Management had the power to take such a lease or license can be referred to the following two clauses of the Principal Deed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>To do all things which the Manger shall in its discretion deem necessary or desirable for the purposes of maintaining and improving all facilities and services in or on the City and each Village for the better enjoyment or use of the City and each Village by its Owners occupiers and their licensees.</i> Paragraph 20 on page 21. 2. <i>To do all such other things that are reasonably incidental to the</i> | |

| | | |
|--------|---|----|
| | <p><i>management of the City or for the common benefit of the Owners.</i> Paragraph 40 on page 23.</p> | |
| 5.4.8 | <p>FKW further elaborated, according to the extra-ordinary Meeting, held on 10th August 1994, that the COC requested HKR to open up some free parking space at the pump house. City Management initially reserved its position as recorded in the meeting minutes. However in consideration of the COC's request, City Management finally agreed to use the subject parking areas for golf carts and commercial vehicle parking. The City Rules, which were approved by the COC, also reflected the fact that City Management manages the subject area.</p> | |
| 5.4.9 | <p>The provision of the parking area to CM was a good intention of HKR, and if Members would like to record the use of parking area in a proper manner, City Management could enter into a lease agreement with HKR and City Owners' Fund would then be subject to the market rent for the past 20 years of the parking space.</p> | |
| 5.4.10 | <p>FKW added that a road usage license fee is imposed on all licensed vehicles operating in Discovery Bay, City Management therefore is obliged to provide parking spaces to them. Contrary to what the writer stated that the access to the pump house must be part of the City Common Facility, HKR could grant an easement right to City Management to use the access road.</p> | |
| 5.4.11 | <p>FKW gave his final remark that the areas which were used for open parking and open car park were permitted in planning areas in any master plans.</p> | |
| 5.4.12 | <p>AY tabled the Sub-DMC of Beach Village to Members stating that in section 2A, they could reserve the right to disallow people to use their driveway but regarded it as the last resort, as they would like to be more accommodating. She however did not want to see the situation become worse for the sake of drivers, owners, and pedestrians' safety.</p> | |
| 5.4.13 | <p>CYY addressed AY's comment by providing some information on the golf cart parking conditions. The total number of parking spaces in the main car park for three-hour parking is 112, while for one-hour parking there are 12 spaces. He also gave a report that in the past three weeks, the utilization of the main road car parking, in a 24-hour period, was 91. This is the highest record of golf carts parking over three hours in the afternoon. At midnight though, this number doesn't exceed single digits. CYY further elaborated that some golf cart drivers had been taking advantage of convenient spots, while in fact there were parking spaces available.</p> | |
| 5.4.14 | <p>FKW suggested that the Beach VOC seek available measures to control the parking condition within the Village.</p> | |
| 5.4.15 | <p>AY insisted on looking at the problem on a long-term basis, with a proper car park located for all these vehicles. She addressed again the serious parking situation along Seahorse Lane, especially during weekends. She restated that all these roads are two-way roads, as well as the road going to the pumping station, in which accidents might occur if drivers were not aware of people walking out from behind vehicles.</p> | |
| 5.4.16 | <p>CYY suggested AY discuss this with her estate manager, Daniel, to tighten up on traffic and parking control in Beach village. He also stated that it might be</p> | CM |

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------|
| | <p>appropriate to introduce a concessionary rate for the golf cart parking area during the evening, including some flexibility to encourage drivers to use the existing main golf cart parking area. They would investigate further.</p> <p>5.4.17 KR supported CYY's idea, and supposed there was probably more space at the main golf cart parking area. He however expressed that as he lived in La Costa, every single parking spot near the Plaza side, within La Costa, is always full due to them being free and their convenience.</p> <p>5.4.18 BH agreed with KR, citing the free accessibility and no need to move the vehicle throughout the day. She proposed identification for the golf carts drivers, to help eliminate these issues.</p> <p><i>(LS was excused for the meeting)</i></p> <p>5.4.19 RB argued that the situation was different in La Costa where there were only a few golf carts with enough parking spaces, compared with Beach where ample space was available.</p> <p>5.4.20 FKW stated that CM had introduced golf cart permits at Siena One, about five years ago. The procedure was to identify the number of golf cart driving visitors entering Siena One. A permit would be issued to genuine users or to those living in Siena One. It was successful in managing golf cart parking in Siena One. Even after two or three years the situation was still under control.</p> <p>5.4.21 FKW reiterated they needed to discuss with individual VOC's on if and how they wanted to introduce the suggested system to the effected villages.</p> <p>5.4.22 AD confirmed that the scheme at Siena One had been introduced successfully but the situation had worsened again. She requested the scheme be reinforced again and shared among other villages too.</p> <p>5.4.23 RB supported AY's idea of providing a proper parking lot. He commented that they were meant to be allowed to park anywhere under the master plan, but he could not see any parking spaces marked in the master plan as FKW had mentioned.</p> <p>5.4.24 FC commented that parking spaces themselves could not solve the problem. He mentioned convenience as a major factor as to why there could be congestion in one area and huge availability in another.</p> | <p>21:50</p> <p>CM</p> |
|--|---|------------------------|

| | | |
|-------|---|-------|
| 6. | COC Sub-Committees' Reports | |
| | 6.1 Finance Sub-Committee | 22:04 |
| 6.1.1 | <p>MC gave a report from the Finance Sub-Committee's meeting on 29th September 2014. Following up on the last COC's discussion, she gave an update on the engagement of a consultant for a road system study. Members noted that the COC Chairman would discuss this with the Senior Manager – Works of City Management and arrange a further report for the next COC meeting. Two members would consolidate the concerns of this Committee and share them with the COC Chairman. Upon the request of a member, City Management will forward both road re-surfacing consultancy reports regarding Discovery Bay Road and Discovery Valley Road to the COC for reference.</p> | |
| 6.1.2 | <p>Regarding the financial situation of the Rehabus Operation, MC mentioned that a member had suggested that the HKRS would engage their internal auditor to prepare the audit report of the DB Rehabus operation. To address the concern of independency, a member had reiterated that such an arrangement had been permissible by trade practice. Members had raised a number of queries on the financial information. After discussion, it had been agreed to summarize those queries in writing (Annex 1) and send it to the Convener of the Rehab Bus Working Group for clarification at the next working group meeting on 27th September (Annex 2).</p> | |
| 6.1.3 | <p>MC then reported that regarding Completeness of Income, City Management had clarified that the Landscape Department would not carry out services to individual residential units during office hours but would provide service to other business units of HKR at the same rate as that for City and Villages. The Works Department would, upon request made through the Customer Service Centre (3651 2345), provide emergency service to individual residential units and other business units outside office hours at standard rates (Annex 3).</p> | |
| 6.1.4 | <p>MC added that for both services, a job order attached to an undertaking would be passed to the user for acceptance after the service. The job order and the signed undertaking would then be sent to the Accounts Department to prepare a debit note to business units and include the charge in the management statement for the service to residential units. A member advised that she had requested an emergency service recently, however, no staff had requested her to sign the undertaking after the service rendered. She would like City Management to remind all front-line staff of the pre-set procedure for proper job order tracking.</p> | |
| 6.1.5 | <p>MC further reported that City Management advised an audit clearance meeting be conducted with the auditor KPMG on 22nd September and welcomed interested members to join. One member, however, had voiced that it might create liability for the Finance Sub-Committee if members participated in the meeting, since the contractual relationship was only between KPMG and City Management. City Management retorted that the invitation was for the promotion of transparency, it was up to members to join or not.</p> | |
| 6.1.6 | <p>MC reported that a member requested City Management to post the financial report of community events, such as the Dragon Boat Festival. City Management replied that the financial report of the Dragon Boat Festival was indeed sent to COC Members after its presentation at the COC meeting. The member clarified that his request was for all community events. City Management suggested the member talk to his VOC Chairperson to raise the</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>issue at the COC.</p> <p>6.1.7 AY commented that it should be an external auditor instead of an internal auditor who prepares the audit report of the DB Rehabus operation, and that the trade practice of such an arrangement was incorrect.</p> <p>6.1.8 Referring to the Completeness of Income, AY said that she had requested City Management do some minor work in her apartment, however, no document was signed by her. She therefore asked City Management to provide some documents for her to do an audit trail with, but the documents she received were unsatisfactory. She stated that she would follow this up with the Finance Sub-Committee to ensure the Completeness of Income.</p> <p>6.1.9 RB tabled an agenda of the KPMG meeting, regarding the DB Fund, and commented he was confused and thought he was a representative of the owners' fund.</p> <p>6.1.10 FC responded that RB was completely confused with his role at the meeting, and that he should be there as an observer and not an auditor.</p> <p>6.1.11 To address RB's concern, FKW explained that RB might misinterpret the purpose of the audit clearance meeting which is when the auditor completed the field work of their account; they would confirm any outstanding issues, such as any flaws or legal action incurred in the auditing period. He advised that City Management was the representative of the DB Fund to deal with the auditor. It had been clearly mentioned in the report of Finance Sub-Committee (FSC) that their members had been invited to attend the meeting for the promotion of transparency only. He wondered why RB claimed that he was the representative of the DB Fund.</p> <p>6.1.12 AY recalled that last year MC had attended the meeting with KPMG, while FKW had not informed members to attend. She added that when it was disclosed in the FSC around Mid-Autumn Festival last year, it was at that time that the account had to be issued. AY insisted on clarifying whether it was an audit clearance meeting or a training session, as somebody said they were learning a lot from the meeting. She commented that it should be transparent and announced at the previous meeting. She was also surprised that people presented in the meeting had not known their proper positions, thinking this a serious matter for the responsibility of misrepresentation.</p> <p>6.1.13 AY pointed out that she would review item 2, revenue recognition, and expenses allocation, and related party transactions in detail in her term of FSC, but at this point they had not looked into those items, which were of equal importance, as the auditor would also examine them. She argued that item 3, fraud, contingent liabilities, litigations or claims, should also be confirmed because they had to know who the auditor and audited were. She suggested that if members had no positions in the DB Fund, it should state clearly that they are there as an observer and not to review the account; they did not have to bear any responsibilities or risks.</p> <p>6.1.14 SM clarified with FKW that for the record, RB, FC, and MC had been the observers. FKW agreed.</p> <p>6.1.15 To address AY's enquiry, FKW stated that last year, the exercise of inviting members to attend the audit clearance meeting was not a new issue. He recalled clearly that when AY was the Convenor of FSC, she had requested a</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| | <p>meeting with the auditor, after the audit clearance for the DB Fund had been completed. FKW reminded members that because of the ruling case of Headland, the VOCs of 9 Villages had been suspended; hence he could only invite MC as the Convenor of FSC to attend the audit clearance meeting as an observer.</p> <p>6.1.16 AY replied to FKW that she recalled in the meeting minutes, last year, that it was FKW who invited these people to attend the audit clearance meeting. But she thanked him for clarification, in which it was initiated by AY two years ago to ask people to attend the audit clearance meeting in the capacity of an observer.</p> <p>6.1.17 AY requested clarification again for whether the meeting last year was an audit clearance meeting or audit training session. She wondered if the COC was suspended last year, why all the Sub-Committees were not suspended, and how MC could be the Convenor of FSC, representing the COC.</p> <p>6.1.18 FKW responded that he had already mentioned that the 9 VOCs had been suspended, but did not include the COC. With regard to the meeting last year, he stated that he had answered this in his previous response.</p> <p>6.1.19 FC added that FKW had also asked him to attend the meeting last year and he could not make it because of a personal commitment. Regarding the word 'training' as AY had repeatedly mentioned, he stated that MC had only said that she had learnt much.</p> <p>6.1.20 AY considered that the members who had attended the meeting might have to bear the responsibilities.</p> <p>6.1.21 AY gave her overall perception that it looked like endorsing or assisting City Management for initiating a project, which was not the duty of the FSC. For example, 'the resurfacing of the road' which had been discussed in the COC, should only have been discussed in the capacity of FSC once the COC has endorsed the project. Another example is the drinking water fountain project. AY expressed that FSC should review it within the term of reference instead of initiating the project expenses or taking the lead in introducing a new project. She wanted the Convenor to be clear about the role of FSC before proceeding.</p> <p>6.1.22 Upon the investigation of the completeness of income, AY suggested inviting experienced financial residents at a Village level to join the FSC. AY stressed that she was the only person with a professional qualification and did not want to explain every detail to other members.</p> <p>6.1.23 FC recalled that under AY's leadership of the FSC, she focused on dealing with the BMS project and he stated that at that time, he had only been the assistant of Mr. Andrew Burns. He therefore felt confused about why AY now challenged the individual projects, which she had also asked them to do, under her leadership.</p> <p>6.1.24 AY responded that under her term, by looking at the BMO and DMC, the FSC could exactly understand the revenue recognition, expenses allocation, and related party transaction and could be familiar with whether the expenses were borne from HKR or City Fund.</p> | CM |
|--|---|----|

| | | |
|--|---|-------|
| 6.2 | Environmental Protection Sub-Committee | 22:35 |
| 6.2.1 | FC reported some items are ongoing while some items were being discussed earlier in the meeting. He therefore commented that he would not discuss every topic in this report. He informed all members that Winson, the cleaning contractor, had acquired a few 'glass implosion machines', so that the glass bottles collected could be broken into very small pieces. As such, this could save a lot of trips to the recycling plants situated in Tuen Mun, which in turn could save a lot of energy and money. | |
| 6.2.2 | FC then gave an update on the installation of a drinking machine. They had received only one objection so far, but not an objection to the idea but an objection to choice of drinking machine because the proposed one could not fill up water bottles. FC told CM they were looking into the possibility of modifying the design in order to accommodate bottle filling as well. | |
| 6.3 | Sports and Leisure Sub-Committee | 22:37 |
| 6.3.1 | SM stated that there had been no meetings for the Sports and Leisure Sub-Committee and the committee would meet with Discovery College in the next two weeks. | |
| 6.4 | Security Liaison Group | 22:38 |
| 6.4.1 | FC reported that a meeting was held on 19 th September with the Lantau Police, during which the two parties had discussed a few things, in particular the crime rate. He then showed figures provided by the police to the members. He cited the figures in July and August; the total crime incidents reported to the Police was 8 during the period. Compared to the figures of the same period in 2013, the figures were reduced from 15, conceiving a remarkable improvement. There had been 3 burglary cases in July, but since the arrest of that particular burglar, there had been zero cases in August; there had been no theft cases reported in July and August. During the same period in the last year, the number of burglaries and thefts was 4 and 4 respectively. FC was thankful for the efforts of the Police, security team and City Management for this noticeable improvement. | |
| 6.4.2 | FC spoke about the issue of speed checks by the Police and had asked them whether they would keep doing the checks. The Police replied that it was a continuous exercise and they would do it at least once a month. At this point the Police had only caught one person for speeding. | |
| <i>(JL was excused from the meeting)</i> | | |
| 6.5 | Rehab Bus Working Group | 22:41 |
| 6.5.1 | CB reported that as a result of promotional activities, the usage had been slowly increasing as well as the operation's income. | |
| 6.5.2 | CB stated that the group had received queries from the Finance Sub-Committee and that he had answered the questions by email. | |
| 6.5.3 | CB further displayed some figures to the members showing that the usage of Rehabus since the absorption of the promotional package, between April and July, was slowly increasing. | |

| | |
|--------|--|
| 6.5.4 | CB stressed that the long-term objective would be self-financing and in order to achieve that goal, it would be required to obtain the Transport Department (TD)'s permission for the bus to be shared with the Easy-Assess Travel Ltd (EAT). He suggested that the committee had been trying to persuade TD but it was of a very slow progress. Even if the bus was shared with EAT, DB users would still have first priority in the use of the vehicle. |
| 6.5.5 | CB clarified that one answer to the question asked by the Financial Sub-Committee was incorrect. The bank charge for the transaction of octopus payment was \$30 per day instead of per transaction. |
| 6.5.6 | CB asked that the COC allow the money to be sent to the Hong Kong Society for Rehabilitation on the due date, prior to reaching the goal of being self-financed. |
| 6.5.7 | CYY reminded all members that the \$240,000 budget was approved in principle but split it into two parts for simplicity, to approve funding. He reminded CB that Parkvale and Midvale VOCs were not in favour of supporting the Rehabus. LHY clarified that they were individual members' views during the discussion at Parkvale VOC meeting. |
| 6.5.8 | SM queried whether the final chart showing the total number of trips necessarily had to be the same as the chart showing the total number of users because the two figures of July, August, and September did not match. SM also doubted the accuracy of the figures since the expense of diesel was greater in September, compared to August, even though there were more trips in August. |
| 6.5.9 | SM asked that since the service was shared with the PCFB, would the cost involved be greater. He questioned whether the partnership with the PCFB should be continued in the long run. He supported his argument by saying that for every \$1 in revenue, it required \$2.6 in cost for the years of 2012/2014 whereas for the months of August and September, the expenses induced were greater than they were without the partnership, especially as there was only one trip for PCFB in September. Therefore, SM enquired as to whether the Working Group should have more external trips with the PCFB or have more internal trips for DB residents with a lower fare. |
| 6.5.10 | CB replied that the bus offered a concessionary fare to DB residents but when they were working with the PCFB, they stopped the offer. CB further explained the current partnership was a transition period. CB stated that it was not possible to tell how long the transition period would be because they were having very slow progress with the TD. |
| 6.5.11 | ES commented that the Rehabus could not attract too much ridership from DB residents, especially the elderly group since they considered the cost too high. He further stated that some people in the elderly group were not happy to see CM's sponsoring of the Rehabus since it was an outside entity. Moreover, he commented that the Rehabus would soon be unnecessary with taxis being introduced to DB at the end of October. |
| 6.5.12 | CB replied that ES was the one asking him to press for the sponsorship from the CM. |
| 6.5.13 | LHY commented that it was a kind of social service. She understood that it was hard to convince all residents to be in favour of the Rehabus but with a business plan, they could show that the service would be able to become self- |

| | | |
|------------|---|-------|
| | <p>financing. This would make it easier to convince other residents.</p> <p>6.5.14 FC commented that he understood that the overheads were so extraordinary high that they were higher than the drivers' cost, but he was convinced of what CB mentioned previously. He suggested that the committee should offer the sponsorship and review the situation by the end of the financial year.</p> <p>6.5.15 AY expressed her gratitude to CB for his hard work and clear answers to the Financial Sub-Committee.</p> <p>6.5.16 SM concluded that what the members had to do was to endorse the second installment, in the amount of \$120,000 to the HKSR; this was seconded by FC and MC.</p> <p>6.5.17 The vote was recorded by a show of hands:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">In favour : MC, FC, LHY, BH, AD, AY, RB, CB, and ES Against : SM Abstain : ER, KR, HKR and CM</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">CYY declared that the motion carried forward.</p> | |
| 6.6 | Senior Citizen's Working Group | 22:59 |
| 6.6.1 | ES said that the SCWG should hire the Rehabus for the elderly in need, and for any upcoming health talks. He highlighted a recent health talk, 'Breast and Prostate Cancer' which was held on 18 th September, in which many people were asking for further consultation on medical issues. He gave a financial review of the last health talks costing \$2708.78, for various miscellaneous items. | |
| 6.6.2 | ES said that the SCWG would also explore the possibility of organizing recreational activities for senior citizens in the multi-purpose hall and that he had received a reply from HKR via City Management saying they could use the space for providing activities for elderly once a week. He also mentioned that in the last meeting, they had discussed purchasing a table tennis table as well as Chinese and international chess sets, as part of the activities. With an estimated budget of \$4,000, the Working Group, initially wanted request funding from the COC, but later decided to donate the money amongst themselves. | |
| 6.6.3 | ES further stated that they had just received a letter from a lady complimenting City Management on organizing these kinds of health talks for the elderly in Discovery Bay. He appealed to members to pass to their individual VOCs that these kinds of elderly talks were not only aimed at the elderly, but welcomed any residents of Discovery Bay as a whole. He continued to mention that lots of health talks would be held soon, with blood and sugar tests for the elderly, saying that a small cost would be involved. | |
| 6.6.4 | To echo the promotion of a seat offering culture, ES had discussed with the Transport Department of HKR, and requested to have more publicity and promotion for the importance of priority seats in buses, educating passengers to give seats to the elderly, pregnant, disabled, or people in need. He advised that City Management had been considering the installation of priority seats in the bus shelters for those in need. He added that he would also like to discuss the issue with the heads of schools, to educate young kids about the seat offering culture. | |

| | | |
|------------------|---|--------------|
| <p>7.</p> | <p>Any Other Business</p> <p>7.1 Team FEAR Junior Challenge</p> <p>7.1.1 BH said there would be a race for kids from 8am to 6pm, all over Discovery Bay on 16th November. They would swim, run, mountain bike, and climb around DB to raise money for a local charity called Youth Outreach. She expressed that most children today are too often playing computer games, but could learn more about team work and sports. She appealed to members to pass the message to their individual VOCs, supporting this activity and keeping children out of trouble.</p> <p>7.1.2 RB asked how to support them at a VOC level. BH answered that some Villages had not allowed them to pass through their Villages. She appealed to the members again to support these kids for the future development of COC.</p> <p>7.1.3 AY commented that she personally supported this activity, but as in the previous year, as a matter of formality, she had to ask her VOC for endorsement and she did think Beach would support the activity.</p> <p>7.1.4 RB reminded BH that there were lots of these kinds of activities and they all passed through the same Villages. BH understood that, but this activity was particularly for a group of kids, and that she would like to approach all chairpersons to reconsider the arrangement to pass through their Villages.</p> <p>7.1.5 LHY remarked that for this kind of activity, the organization should liaise with City Management, especially for the slope area.</p> <p><i>(FC and MC were excused from the meeting)</i></p> | <p>23:06</p> |
| <p>8.</p> | <p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>The meeting was adjourned at 23:14 and the date of next meeting was to be scheduled. CYY reminded all Members that the Christmas Party would be held on 19th December at the Auberge Hotel.</p> | |

Chairman