

**DISCOVERY BAY CITY OWNERS' COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of Meeting No.2 2017-18 Held on 28 Feb 2018**  
**7:30pm at MPH, Discovery Bay Office Centre**

---

**Members Present:**

Mr. Simon Mawdsley	(SM)	Chairman, COC & Midvale VOC
Mr. Victor Riley	(VR)	Chairman, Headland VOC
Ms. Amy Yung	(AY)	Chairlady, Beach VOC
Mr. G.W. Lovegrove	(GWL)	Vice-Chairman, Beach VOC (replace AY after 10 p.m.)
Mr. Kenneth Bradley	(KB)	Chairman, Parkvale VOC
Mr. Murray Stuart Craig	(MSG)	Vice-Chairman, Neo Horizon VOC
Mrs. Baby Hefti	(BH)	Chairlady, Peninsula VOC
Dr. Francis Chiu	(FC)	Chairman, Siena Two B VOC
Mr. Edwin Rainbow	(ER)	Chairman, Hillgrove VOC
Dr. Jennie Lee	(JL)	Chairlady, DB Plaza VOC
Mr. Lee Shiu	(LS)	Vice-Chairman, Amalfi VOC
Mr. Michael Law-Kun	(MLK)	Chairman, La Vista VOC
Mr. Kent Rossiter	(KR)	Chairman, La Costa VOC
Mr. Darren Barton	(DRB)	Chairman, Parkridge VOC
Mrs. Kathy Lui-Landheer	(KYL)	Chairlady, Chianti VOC
Mr. Way Kwik	(WK)	Representative, Clubs
Ms. Elena Cheung	(EC)	Representative, Hotels
Mr. Vincent Chua	(CKC)	Representative, Registered Owner
Ms. Beatrice Lee	(BL)	Representative, Registered Owner
Mr. Patrick Ho	(PH)	Assistant Director, DBSML
Mr. F.K. Wong	(FKW)	Chief Manager, Estate, DBSML

**Apologies:**

Mr. Christopher Chung	(CC)	Chairman, Siena One VOC
-----------------------	------	-------------------------

**Secretary:**

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

**Assistant to Secretary:**

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

**By Invitation:**

Mr. W.S. Yau	(WSY)	Senior Manager, Contract Mgt. and Works, DBSML
Mr. Thomas Cheung	(TMC)	Senior Resident Engineer, B&V
Mr. Romeo Chung	(RMC)	Engineer, Consultants Management Division, DSD
Mr. Peter Tsang	(PRT)	Senior Manager, Transportation, DBTPL

**Staff of City Management:**

Mr. Wilson Chan	Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. G. H. Koo	Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. Daniel Ma	Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. Samuel Ip	Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. Alan Mak	Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. Kelvin Siu	Assistant Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. W. K. Li	Assistant Manager, Security, DBSML

**Observers:**

Ms. Ana M. Da Rocha	Owner, Parkridge
Mr. Antony Snow	Owner, Positano
Ms. Valerie Cheuan	Owner, Siena Two

Ms. S. Ho  
Mr. David Ball  
Mr. Klansctment

Owner, Peninsula  
Owner, Headland  
Owner, Peninsular

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

1.0	<p><b>Apologies</b> Apologies received from CC. CYY welcomed Mrs. Kathy Lui-Landheer (KYL), the newly elected Chairlady of Chianti.</p> <p>Members also agreed that the meeting should finish by 22:30pm. Requested by AY and with no objection by members, Chairman agreed to move forward Item 9.5 under Item 6.3.</p>	19.35
2.0	<p><b>Progress Report on DSD's Contract No. DC/2016/01</b> Mr. Romeo Chung (RMC) from the Drainage Services Department briefed the COC members on the background of the project which involved construction of additional sewage rising main on Cheung Tung Road. RMC then invited the senior resident engineer, Mr. Thomas Cheung (TMC) to provide a progress report.</p> <p>TMC advised the members that the project was planned for completion by 2023 and so far work was being carried out according to schedule. The current working hours were Mon-Sat 9am-7pm. Although DSD's proposed arrangement of five work fronts were endorsed by DBCOC meeting held in February 2017 and T&amp;TC meeting held in March 2017, there were currently no more than four work fronts being allowed along the carriageway, including all interfacing contracts. TMC proposed to carry out night work within DSD's current work sites to form two additional 24-hour work fronts in order to catch up the progress and shorten the overall construction period. DSD's project team would further contact Police, Transport Department and other interfacing contracts for detailed coordination and discussion. The traffic impact was recorded and indicated a minimum of one-minute delay and a maximum of three-minute delay. TMC added that further mitigation measures would be taken and they included trenchless methods, realignment to verge area and traffic diversion.</p> <p>AY enquired why the project would take seven years to complete as it would cause a great inconvenience to the public. AY asked if the project period could be shortened. TMC replied that the long construction period was due to road opening restriction and number of work fronts limited at Cheung Tung Road. TMC assured members that DSD were actively looking for mitigation measures to speed up the-progress and minimize the impact to road users as far as possible.</p> <p>SM referred to the four work-fronts causing one-minute delays which equaled a total delay of four minutes. RMC clarified that there was a 45-second delay for each work-front. However, the synchronized manual traffic light system meant a minimum one-minute delay and a maximum three-minute delay. SM enquired about their locations. RMC advised the work-fronts were positioned between Tung Chung Interchange and DB tunnel toll plaza which meant DB traffic to Sunny Bay would not be affected. KB noted that the primary mitigation measure was to implement 24-hour working arrangement and asked what was being done about that</p>	

	<p>and whether there would be an increase in cost. RMC replied it would be more expensive for implementing 24-hour works but minimizing inconvenience to the public by timely completion of works within budget would be of paramount importance. KB asked how much time would be saved and RMC answered this was subject to further investigation.</p> <p>All members had no further comment on the above works arrangement. SM thanked RMC and TMC for their presentation.</p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<p><b>Presentation of DB Transportation Services Limited on proposed ferry fare increase</b></p> <p>With the aid of the power-point , Mr. Peter Tsang (PRT), Senior Manager from DBTPL informed members on the rationale behind the proposed ferry fare increase. PRT indicated that over the years the ferry service ridership was in a downward trend even though they had projected a small growth by end 2018. This had impacted the financial situation even though the expenditure was lower on fuel price in year 2015/2016, the services were running at a deficit with the potential for a huge loss of \$32M this coming Financial Year.</p> <p>DBTPL proposed a higher fare rise to non-residents in order to facilitate a smaller fare increase to residents. PRT presented a comparison of existing and proposed fares and remarked that the ferry-bus interchange discount had minimize the impact to a number of residents. PRT explained that high operating costs were brought about by upsurge in fuel costs, and high manpower cost due to salary increase and provision of training to retain staff . In addition changes in docking cycle as well as replacement of vessel parts had brought up the R&amp;M cost. PRT also reminded members that DBTPL had no government subsidy, unlike other ferry operators. PRT said that efforts had been made to increase income through various promotions in which additional revenue were fully booked into the DBTPL account to subsidize operations. The Transport Department had all the financial information to assess the application and the proposal had been presented to PLG with no major comments. A town hall forum had been scheduled for March. PRT finally asked members for their understanding of the situation.</p> <p>DRB remarked that it was not on the agenda until objection to the ferry fare increase was raised and asked why the figures presented did not match the figures presented to and circulated by the government. PRT explained that the difference related to the senior citizen fare was due to that DBTPL offered 50% discount to senior citizen, and the government further subsidized their fares. DRB clarified that DBTPL were able to charge any amount for senior citizens and the government paid the difference to ensure the fare was \$2. PRT confirmed that was correct. DRB also asked if the fuel was purchased by any company connected to HKR or its subsidiaries. PRT replied no. DRB queried if the repair services were used by any company connected to HKR, its subsidiaries or shareholders. PRT replied yes, and added that tender exercises were carried out for the dockings.</p> <p>KB asked PRT to explain on why the number of customers had decreased. PRT responded that the downward trend was due to improvement of the external bus services including the introduction of the double-decker buses. KB highlighted the efficiency and comfort of travelling to TST. PRT agreed the destination of passengers had changed. KB asked what was the depreciation policy for the new engines. PRT replied up to now there had been no replacement of the</p>	<b>19:50</b>

	<p>main engine, only some auxiliary engines of much lower price were replaced.</p> <p>DRB enquired if the ferry and bus company were owned by the same parent company and PRT confirmed they were. DRB further enquired if PRT had considered the impact of the renovation works and the disjointed bus timings on people's choice of not to ride the ferry. PRT agreed there was some impact but he believed that the loss in patronage was mainly due to changes in destination. AY supported DRB's suggestion that the temporary bus terminus made it more difficult for people to rush to catch the ferry and proposed ferry riders would increase again after the plaza project was completed. AY also referred to the incident where a ferry crushed into the pier causing damage to the ferry and pier. AY asked about the insurance coverage and who would bear the repair cost. PRT answered the repairs had been covered by insurance. AY enquired if the future insurance premium would increase due to the claim and PRT responded that it was not known for the time being but believed it would more or less be the same.</p> <p>SM referred to the Central to Peng Chau ferry and asked if benchmarking was carried out. PRT said it was not easy to bench-mark and also advised that the government subsidized the Peng Chau ferry. FC asked what the subsidy was and PRT referred to the legco paper and claimed it was around \$100M. KB clarified that the amount did not go directly to the ferry companies but also to the Maritime Navigation Training fund. SM acknowledged that in comparison the DB ferry service was first class.</p> <p>CKC disagreed with DRB that the presentation was added to the agenda only after DRB requested a motion to vote, and clarified the consultation period would have been closed on 23 February 2018 and the Transport Department asked for an extension to the consultation period. Once that was agreed the COC Secretary was informed and a request for the agenda item was made. PRT also reminded members the proposal had been presented to the PLG meeting one month ago.</p> <p>KB enquired about the utilization of pier infrastructure and what revenue was received. PRT informed members that the Central ferry pier belonged to the government and all advertising and businesses must be approved by the government. KB asked for clarification that there was no commercial revenue received from businesses at Central pier and it was confirmed that minimal revenue was received from both Central and Discovery Bay pier businesses.</p> <p>AY also suggested advertising on top of the ferries. VR reported that all ferry companies, around the world, including subsidized companies were losing money. VR argued that in general the people who objected had no idea and stated that public interest was safeguarded by the government auditors so if they allowed the increase it was justified. FC said the campaign for the Octopus Card was to ensure the protection of the residents which was seen in the proposed higher increase of the ferry fare for non residents. FC reminded members that they had been campaigning, with the help of legislative councilors, to get ferry subsidies for the DB ferry route which was considered the second-highest ridership. The government said that the review would continue and FC assured members the fight for the subsidies would also continue.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>MLK shared the proposal had been introduced to the La Vista/La Serene owners and there was no objection at their AGM. KB suggested that a motion was put forward that the COC supports the application and the continued battle to get a subsidy. SM requested a copy of the presentation but PRT confirmed it was for member's reference only. ER requested full transparency of accounts. PRT advised that some figures were sensitive and shared only for members to gain a better understanding of the situation. KB argued that the information was from audited accounts and any sensitive information could be redacted. SM asked PRT to find out if that was possible and then advised CYY. DRB queried why the figures of the ferry bus interchange discount was not removed and PRT replied the purpose was to provide a comparison to members. SM thanked PRT for the presentation and confirmed that members would now move to agenda item 7.5.</p>	
<b>7.5</b>	<p><b>COC strongly disagrees with the application for ferry fare increases for the central-DB route (COC Paper 573/18)</b></p> <p>SM read out the motion and FC disagreed with part of the paper stating that the DBTPL had presented the proposal at the PLG meeting. CYY also noted the second-to last paragraph referring to the "<i>Passenger Liaison Group, formed by City Management</i>" and clarified that the PLG was not formed by CM.</p> <p>AY commented that there was a conflict of interest by two members representing HKR, however SM advised they had the right to vote.</p> <p>Motion proposed by DRB, seconded by ER  In Favor: ER, DRB, AY  Against: FC, BH, MSG, KB, MLK, JL, LS, VR, CKC, BL, WK, EC, PH, FKW  Abstain: SM, KYL, KR  The motion was denied.</p>	
<b>4.0</b>	<p><b>Confirmation of Minutes of Previous Meeting (No.1 2017/2018)</b></p> <p>Draft minutes were sent on 18th January 2018 and the deadline for comments was 14<sup>th</sup> February 2018. Two members' comments were received and minutes edited. AY's comments were received on 21<sup>st</sup> February and finalized minutes were sent on 28th February.</p> <p>CYY asked members to consider if AY comments were accepted as they were after the deadline date. SM asked AY to adhere to deadline. ER asked for AY edits to be accepted but KB requested to stick to the rule. CYY emphasized the importance of following the deadline and SM agreed and stated that in the future no additional changes would be allowed if submitted after the deadline.</p> <p>Proposed by ER and seconded by MLK, the minutes were approved.</p>	<b>20:34</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Matters Arising / Items Carried Forward from Previous Meeting</b>	
<b>5.1</b>	<p><b>Communications to the Chairman</b></p> <p>SM said that letters from IDO were received and forwarded to members as well as three personal letters were distributed accordingly but were not for discussion as they were of a personal nature. SM shared that because the Chairman's email was open to the public emails were often</p>	

	sent directly to him. SM agreed to advise CYY of the past twelve months' communications for the record and for all future communications received.	
5.2	<p><b>To provide evidence on HKR and CM are forcefully fighting against the STTs and whether payment is from the City Fund</b></p> <p>DRB advised this should have been resolved by email when it was first raised. SM enquired if there had been a resolution. FKW reported that the government was able to review the STT charges and CM would check the charges proposed. After checking, CM presented a paper to the COC members about the proposed charges and the justification(s) of the new charges. FKW recalled that the COC members objected to the charge at one time and said it was too much. For the appeal, it was required to engage a consultant to do so, however at that time COC rejected the engagement of a consultant because of the cost.</p> <p>AY <b>reaffirmed</b> her position stating that the agreement was entered into by HKR and the government, the pipes <b>were laid</b> outside the <b>Lot</b> boundary, <b>and the demand notes were issued to HKR</b>, it was wrong for CM <b>to pick the bills and paid them</b> out of the City Fund. AY said <b>at the time HKR negotiated with the government we were not informed and had</b> no access to the agreement. <b>COC was told of such an arrangement a few years later and it is</b> completely unfair <b>for us to pay for the bills</b> and thus the cost should not have been paid by CM. KB agreed and remarked that it had not been fully explained. KB suggested the only way to move forward was for HKR to pay the amount and reimburse CM however to date there has been no resolution.</p> <p>After deliberation among Members, DRB agreed to move on.</p>	20:41
5.3	<p><b>Traffic and parking control imposed by individual villages</b></p> <p>FC explained that some villages had imposed specific traffic rules that did not allow golf-carts to be parked and questioned if that was allowed. FC also asked if villages could charge a toll for using their roads. CYY responded that all traffic control measures, expenses and manpower was from the City team but had no objection for individual villages to pay for their own manpower, vehicles and equipment to manage the request. BH said that some golf-cart drivers parked at the village closest to the pier and left them there all day which resulted in the local village owners not being able to park their carts. BH suggested villages should be able to charge.</p> <p>KR described the problem his village faced whereby La Costa residents could not park their carts because other drivers were using all the golf cart parking spaces. KR 's village implemented a <i>no parking for non-residents</i> policy, where golf carts being parked by owners or tenants not related to La Costa would get warnings, and those ignored could find further action (like wheel clamping). Golf Cart visitors of La Costa owners/tenants merely had to register at the management office or let security guards know of their La Costa business/visiting, and that's is fine. DRB enquired if villages had the power to make their own rules. CM responded that as long as it does not infringe on CM rules then they have no objection. DRB stated that according to the sub-DMC villages do have the authority to make their own rules. AY agreed but noted that it does incur expenses and stressed the solution was for HKR to address the problem of inadequate car parking. The new car park may create more</p>	20:46

	<p>space for parking and urged HKR to review the new masterplan to make more parking areas in the transport interchanges for residents that have golf-carts.</p> <p>MLK advised there were a lot of golf-carts and not enough spaces, and suggested having color stickers which identified which village they were from so security can identify who are the offenders. CYY responded that the owners were not always the drivers and it could be very difficult to utilize the manpower to manage this. CYY also highlighted all over HK there was not adequate car parking in the central area so it has to be on a first-come first-serve basis. On the other hand, if government approval was given from HKR of the waiver application, then the open space area next to Pump house will accommodate golf-carts and other commercial vehicles.</p> <p>AY said the application was allocated for twenty spaces for golf-carts and the other spaces were for other vehicles. AY observed that CM had 17-18 vehicles for tunnel maintenance however AY questioned their use and had noticed around DB most of the vehicles acted like chauffeurs. SM asked for AY to stay on point and relate to the golf-cart issue. AY pointed out that the space should be reserved only for golf-carts and HKR should find alternative parking for maintenance vehicles.</p>	
5.4	<p><b>Follow up on COC meeting dated 18 Oct Item 6.1 with further information (COC Paper 567/17)</b></p> <p>FC referred to a previous meeting about PRFs and explained how the calculation was made as well as refuted AY's initial claim that she did not put pressure on the government to publicize DB as a public recreation facility. FC referred to the COC paper that noted AY as the counsellor in communication with the Islands District Council. DRB commented that according to FC's calculation AY had saved DB HK\$19.375M. FC retorted by asking for an estimation of the number of visitors now visiting DB.</p> <p>AY advised members that the government asked all developers with public recreation facilities inside their private area to publicize it. AY said she did not say she published the hyperlink and added that visitors come to DB through publications by HKR such as Citylink and not the government department link where people seldom visit. AY also disputed the figures and said the numbers supplied by CM must be verified. AY mentioned capital expenditure and said in 2012 the hiking trail by the reservoir, towards the Trappist monastery, was altered to a longer and inferior standard because HKR decided to build five or six houses. The \$300K did not cover that type of capital expenditure and AY suggested that if the PRFs had been fixed earlier there wouldn't have been this \$2M in our capital expenditure. AY also referred to the renovation of the pier and beach toilets and the beach playground borne by the city fund and further argued these were additional costs on capital expenditures. AY continued that in 2012 the first Egg Hunt was organized by HKR and only three years later when AY checked the accounts was it seen that the city fund had to cover the costs. HKR then gave \$500 per annum which increased in 2014 to \$1500 which was minimal revenue. AY requested CM to give a breakdown of the costs including cleaning, security, electricity, water, landscaping, insurance, tree maintenance and inspection. AY also referenced the \$30,000 per month cleaning cost of two toilets. AY went on to say it was her duty as District Counselor to ensure what was stated in the audit commissioner's report was put in</p>	20:57

	<p>effect otherwise there would be huge costs carried by the city fund. AY said she hoped the misunderstanding was cleared up and asked for rumors to stop as well as CM to provide the supporting information. FC asked if FKW could provide that information as it was many years ago. FKW responded that it would be difficult to trace back the account record after six years. FKW further clarified that the pier toilet was not public recreational facility. FC said even if AY's numbers were right it was not right to have all the visitors traipsing through Discovery Bay and suggested the advertising stop. KB interjected and respectfully asked FC and AY to draw the line on this and move on. FC agreed.</p>	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>CM Report</b>	
<b>6.1</b>	<p><b>Upcoming Tenders</b></p> <p>WSY reported there were two tenders in progress and under analysis. 1) The water tanks cleansing for all villages and 2) The Dam monitoring services at an estimated annual cost of \$297K. There were three tenders scheduled to be sent out in the next three months. 1) Repair of deteriorated water pump no. 2 at the Water Treatment Plant, 2) Reinstatement of flushing water supply ring and replacement of defective flushing water isolating valve near Beach Village and 3) patch repair to deteriorated roads in city areas. All are scheduled for April 2018.</p>	
<b>6.2</b>	<p><b>COC Papers Endorsed (COC Paper 571/18)</b></p> <p>WSY advised there were two COC papers endorsed 1) for the appointment of a contractor for pest control and 2) for the repair work on defective isolating valve in sewage pump room no.1.</p>	
<b>6.3</b>	<p><b>Community Events</b></p> <p>CYY highlighted that the Dragon Boat Race was proposed for Sunday 17<sup>th</sup> June 2018. CYY shared that the FSC was concerned about the expenditure and CYY provided a financial breakdown of costs incurred in 2017. CYY showed that there were high costs incurred due to arrangement of practice sessions. It was suggested to cancel the practice sessions which would save a lot of money and it would also take pressure off CM staff. CYY provided a comparison table of enrolment fees and noted that all other fees of other areas in Hong Kong were cheaper than DB so there would be pressure to reduce fees again this year. CYY presented that the majority of teams were from DB and loyal participants and suggested outsiders had dropped out because of the fee. CYY continued that they would look at increasing the income and would like to consider asking renovation contractors to sponsor the event KB acknowledged the concerns of the owners' contribution to the Dragon Boat event and suggested FSC should review the figures and discuss a ceiling amount of \$260K.</p> <p>BH objected to the cancellation of the practice sessions which would mean the majority of rowers would not have a safe environment to practice. BH added the Lantau Boat Club's help would be minimal and also explained that the choice of the day was crucial as many outside rowers chose DB to practice. In Stanley, BH claimed they allow Junks to moor along the coast and this attracted a lot of money. BH stressed there were different ways to raise additional income and reiterated her disagreement with cancelling the practices. BH also suggested hiring extra staff for the practice weekends.</p>	



	<p>CYY responded that capping the ceiling would not alter the decision to cancel practice sessions. The event had been run for many years and CYY questioned if it was the core business of CM, at the same time acknowledged the importance of activities that fostered community spirit. CYY shared that the reality was there was not enough manpower. In addition, if the enrolment fee was raised the result would speak for itself and a smaller scale would mean a smaller team. The sea arrangement was not easy to handle and CYY reminded members this was DB not Stanley. CYY once again requested getting sponsorship from contractors. CYY also confirmed that the date had already been checked to ensure there were no clashes. CYY would inform team captains next Wednesday there would be no practice sessions.</p> <p>BH insisted the Chinese tradition had been happening for over thirty years. All the communities gathered and by cancelling the training session it would impact the future of the event. ER sympathized with CM position but highlighted that 60-70% of the attraction of the event was in the training sessions. KB conveyed that the FSC had discussed the impact on CM staff and it was not seen as a core function. KB highlighted cost was the issue which was escalating. MLK agreed with both sides and noted all the event costs were increasing. MLK said a line had to be drawn at some point. CKC asked if other members wanted to keep the practice session. BH stressed it was for the benefit of the residents. AY referred to the past when it was suggested <b>by CM</b> to cancel the event however residents grouped together <b>to organize and fund the event</b> and it was reactivated and was a success. <b>AY supported BH. BH then asked HKR if they would financially sponsor the event as their image would also benefit.</b> CKC supported BH and agreed with ER that the practice sessions were good for team building although emphasized it was not a HKR event. CKC agreed to discuss further with CYY to determine how much was needed by HKR to sponsor the event to keep the practice sessions. CKC agreed to give confirmation to CYY within two weeks.</p> <p>Motion for HKR to cover the sponsorship of practice sessions. In favour: FC, BH, KR, ER, DRB, KYL, MSG, AY, KB, MLK, JL, LS, VR Against: Abstain: SM, CKC, BL, WK, EL, PH, FKW</p> <p>CYY reported on the dog's 'Tea Gathering' that was held in September 2017 and would be held bi-monthly in 2018 to network among dog owners and enhance communications. CYY reported over twenty owners were recruited so far. The response from the dog owners was positive and it was a successful and friendly event.</p> <p>It was confirmed by CYY that the Easter Egg Hunt was scheduled for 30<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> March from 10:30 to 18:30.</p> <p>AY expressed concern about the event and referred to an email that was sent highlighting that for many Christians Good Friday was a time of reflection and meditation. AY asked that in this multinational community there should be mutual respect for different religions and requested this event not be held on this particular day. AY further asked that CM put in place mitigation measures on noise and transport to reduce the chaos. CYY acknowledged that there were issues including transportation, F&amp;B, toilets and shower facilities, and then went on to explain how HKR had and would address them. HKR had chartered a special ferry service for visitors last year and would do the same this year. They would also</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>provide adequate bus services to accommodate the increase in visitors. HKR will also add extra washing facilities near the Lantau boat club as well as additional temporary washing stations. In addition, HKR will have portable toilets. With regards to F&amp;B a food truck would be stationed by the beach. CYT sympathized with AY's request for reflection and meditation and highlighted that 40% of the participants were DB residents that would enjoy the event and emphasized it was a family environment.</p> <p>FC suggested in the future the event could be held on Sunday and Monday, or Saturday and Monday.</p> <p>BH asked for priority for residents travelling on the buses. CKC stated that the transportation should not be congested with all the measures that have been taken and felt that it would be confusing for bus drivers. ER pointed out that 60% were visitors and 40% were DB residents and it was a huge event. ER considered Saturday and Monday as a great idea.</p> <p>VR mentioned the toilets were a major concern with huge queues regardless of having portable toilets.</p> <p>JL shared her view <b>and agreed with AY</b> that Saturday and Sunday was a good idea.</p>	
<b>6.4</b>	<p><b>Green Lifestyle Committee Update</b></p> <p>FKW shared that CM won the Bronze Award for Hong Kong Awards of Environmental Excellence. CM would focus on fine-tuning and strengthening the various initiatives that were on-going in Discovery Bay and would remain committed to providing a greener lifestyle in the coming year. This was the last report of the committee and FKW thanked COC members for their support.</p>	<b>21:56</b>
<b>6.5</b>	<p><b>Update on Other Services</b></p> <p><b>As per VR's request, CM to brief members on the conduct of the Parkridge Owners meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2018.</b></p> <p>AY remarked that it was a village matter and should not be discussed in the COC at the request of one member. AY also asked that she be excused from this discussion citing a possible conflict of interest as she <b>might be asked to act as</b> witness in <b>a trial</b>. It was requested that GWL replace AY for the rest of the meeting and this was accepted by SM.</p> <p>DRB said that the issue was in discussion but so far CM had failed to provide any meeting minutes to <b>the VOC</b>.</p> <p>FKW reported that CM had been served a writ by the Chairman of Parkridge Village and a notice of Opposition had subsequently been issued. The Chairman had filed <b>a request for</b> an injunction to prevent CM from <b>acting on its declaration that the Meeting of 11 January was adjourned and that the meeting would be reconvened at a later date</b>, and a declaration to seek CM to carry out the poll vote outside the meeting, as directed by the Chairman. In response CM filed an opposition as seen in Appendix One.</p> <p>VR explained it was raised because of the questions that were being asked and had thought DRB could help villages who had problems getting quorums. VR said this was then opposed by DRB and AY. VR questioned how a Chairman with a complete quorum and a requested poll vote could abandon the meeting. SM asked VR to clarify if he</p>	

	<p>observed what happened as first-hand information or not. VR confirmed he was not there. SM added that Midvale had failed in achieving complete quorums in the past and was also interested in understanding more fully.</p> <p>DRB clarified that the meeting was not abandoned and it was nothing to do with a quorum.</p> <p>ER considered VR's idea was a good idea to have owners simply attend to vote with the expectation they are allowed to attend for a stated period of time only, <b>and that the poll vote would be conducted outside the meeting.</b> KB said that it was clear in the sub-DMC that a quorum was needed to run a meeting and questioned why DRB had not gone ahead with the vote having a complete quorum in attendance. <b>He could not understand why the meeting was abandoned.</b> BH asked for clarification that when there was a presentation that needed endorsing the owners could not leave the meeting. SM <b>said</b> that was correct <b>if they had to vote.</b> VR said that there was a quorum and a vote could have taken place however the meeting was stopped. VR queried why the district councilor in the meeting did not advise DRB against stopping the meeting.</p> <p>DRB replied <b>that for the record he had</b> no comment.</p> <p>MLK suggested keeping it simple with a show of hands in votes and a complete quorum otherwise additional caveats could result in villages going their own way. SM considered the ruling clear and that if the process was not broken don't fix it. BH asked how long this would take to get an answer from the tribunal case. FKW remarked past experience suggested it could take two to three years to resolve. SM advised members to continue meeting as before.</p> <p>CKC asked to give his view however assured members he did not want to touch on the legitimacy of whether the Chairman had the right or not to give such directions, as this would be determined by the Lands Tribunal judgment. CKC then referred to a Headland AGM a few years ago which was a very painful experience in getting a quorum for a successful meeting. CKC continued that for the last Parkridge AGM a lot of effort by CM staff was needed to convince owners to personally participate in the meeting and some owners also convinced their neighbors to attend.</p> <p><b>CM staff were very upset after the Owners Meeting. CKC would like to express his dissatisfaction to the officials from the Home Affairs Department who attended the Parkridge Owners Meeting. Government officials at least had to advise the Chairman to respect the attending owners with a number more than 100 and allow them to vote on the spot. Unfortunately the Government Officials did nothing. CKC expressed that he had no intention to challenge the performance of the District Councilor who was present at the said Meeting .BH asked if the owners agreed with the decision.</b></p> <p>DRB said no meeting minutes had been issued by CM despite the request hence there was no accurate or agreed record of what had happened.</p> <p>FC questioned why the sub-DMC clause was written that way and considered finding out would be helpful. KB argued that was irrelevant and clarified 20% was a quorum for a meeting to proceed with a show of</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>hands or poll vote. BH considered it was unfair as owners that are not in the country lose their share because they cannot be transferred.</p> <p>PH showed the relevant section of the Parkridge sub-DMC and expressed that if only one sentence was taken out of the three pages, it was completely out of context. It is clearly stated in the sub-DMC what the VOC should do. KB agreed it was the totality of the document.</p>	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Items for Discussion</b>	<b>22:19</b>
<b>7.1</b>	<p><b>To propose adopting the code of conduct (COC Paper 570/18)</b>  Proposed by CM and seconded by BH  In favour: FC, BH, KR, ER, DRB, KYL, KB, MLK, JL, LS, VR, CKC, BL, WK, EL PH FKW  Against: MSG  Abstain: SM, GWL  Motion agreed.</p>	
<b>7.2</b>	<p><b>Engage previous consultant Meinhardt to update the water mains improvement proposal submitted in 2008 (COC Paper T1468/18)</b>  WSY updated members regarding the need for and to update the proposal because it was prepared ten years ago. The cost was \$150K.</p> <p>KB objected and noted it was not a difficult job and asked for competitive bids for a conditions survey with recommendations on how to deal with their findings. GWL agreed and said that the condition of the water mains should be ascertained and then a brief should be prepared for repair of replace the water mains. MLK enquired whether a second opinion would be sought and KB insisted for survey only.</p> <p>WSY further explained that replacement was not the only option in 2008 report but the most cost effective way recommended was to replace with a new pipe and abandon the existing pipe. WSY reminded members there was only one pipe to serve the community and a new pipe would ensure minimal disruption.</p> <p>SM asked if a working group was needed. KB said no and advised a tender submission on a 2018 conditions survey. SM requested CM to put a tender together for a conditions survey with recommendation.</p>	<b>22:23</b>
<b>7.3</b>	<p><b>Endorsement of the COC Paper T1471/18 for Cleaning Tender (COC Paper T1471/18)</b>  FKW advised members the existing contract would expire end of June 2018. The tender was for one year with an option to extend for a further year, with the condition that the service would be terminated the last month before the implementation of the Solid Waste Charging. It was mentioned that the two-envelope system was recommended and all tenderers with tender returned would be invited for an interview and the ratio of price and interview performance was 65/35.</p> <p>BH clarified there would not be a sub-committee to prepare the tender and the interview would be conducted by a Chairperson or Vice-person of the COC. KB requested there should be provision made if the COC member could not attend. FKW advised that because the tender document was similar to the previous one, there was no need to form a Cleaning Tender Sub-Committee to review it. Since the final recommendation of appointment would still be required to be endorsed</p>	<b>22:30</b>

	<p>by the COC, the interview panel would be confined to COC Members. KB expressed concern on the tight turnaround for the next contract and requested a back-up. FKW confirmed there would be time for the COC to review and regarding the implementation of the Solid Waste Charging system, the government would give sufficient advance notice to the public, so there was enough time for the next tender exercise.</p> <p>CYY mentioned that the scoring ratio was proposed as 35% on interview and 65% on price and remarked that the score result was not for reference. FKW supplemented that FSC had reviewed the tender exercise and made the recommendation to the COC that the COC had the right and authority to appoint another contractor for reason other than price.</p> <p>KYL asked for confirmation that the cleaning contract excluded Chianti and Amalfi and that was confirmed by FKW.</p> <p>Proposed by CM, seconded by KB  In favour: FC, BH, KR, ER, DRB, MSG, AY, KB, MLK, JL, LS, VR, CKC, BL, WK, EL, PH, FKW  Against: Nil  Abstain: SM</p>	
	<b>SM closed the meeting and advised members the next meeting was scheduled for 30<sup>th</sup> May 2018</b>	

Chairman