

DISCOVERY BAY CITY OWNERS' COMMITTEE
Minutes of Meeting No.5 2017-18 Held on 24 October 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 for item 6.1) |
| Mr. Kenneth Bradley | (KB) | Chairman, Parkvale VOC |
| Mrs. Baby Hefti | (BH) | Chairlady, Peninsula VOC |
| Dr. Francis Chiu | (FC) | Chairman, Siena Two B VOC |
| Mr. Edwin Rainbow | (ER) | Chairman, Hillgrove VOC |
| Mr. Stephen Lee | (SL) | Vice-Chairman, Greenvale 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. Christopher Chung | (CC) | Chairman, Siena One |
| Mrs. Maggie Chan | (MC) | Vice-Chairlady, DB Plaza VOC |
| Mr. Murray Stuart Craig | (MSG) | Vice-Chairman, Neo Horizon VOC |
| Mr. Michael Law-Kun | (MLK) | Chairman, La Vista VOC |
| Mr. David Kwok | (DK) | Chairman, Amalfi VOC |
| Mr. Li Hong Leung | (LHL) | Representative, Clubs |
| Ms. Joanna Kan | (JK) | Representative, Hotels |
| Mr. Vincent Chua | (CKC) | Representative, Registered Owner |
| Ms. Beatrice Lee | (BL) | Representative, Registered Owner |
| Mr. F.K. Wong | (FKW) | Chief Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. W.S. Yau | (WSY) | Senior Manager, Contract Mgt. and Works, DBSML |

Apologies:

| | | |
|----------------|------|--------------------------|
| Ms. Vivien Lau | (VL) | Chairlady, Greenvale VOC |
| Dr. Jennie Lee | (JL) | Chairlady, DB Plaza VOC |

Secretary:

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

Assistant to Secretary:

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

By Invitation:

| | | |
|--------------------|-------|---|
| Ms. Ellen Chan | (EC) | Assistant Secretary, Environment Bureau |
| Ms. Crystal Pang | (CP) | Senior Executive Officer, Environment Bureau |
| Mr. Ken Leung | (KNL) | Building Surveyor, Buildings Department |
| Mr. Mark Lai | (ML) | Senior Building Surveyor, Buildings Department |
| Mr. Chung Kwai Hon | (CKH) | Senior Engineer, EMSD |
| Mr. Peter Tsang | (PRT) | Senior Manager, Transportation, DBTPL |
| Mr. Andrew Lam | (AL) | Manager, Customer Services and Development DBTPL |
| Mr. Chris Mackreth | (CMK) | Chairman, Junior Challenge |
| Mr. Steve Corbin | (SC) | Founder, Junior Challenge |

Staff of City Management:

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| Mr. Wilson Chan | Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. Samuel Ip | Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. Kelvin Siu | Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. GH Koo | Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Ms. Emily Chiu | Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. Steve Kwok | Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. Brian Lau | Assistant Manager, Estate, DBSML |
| Mr. W. K. Li | Assistant Manager, Security, DBSML |

Observers: (Address registered by observers)

| | |
|---------------------|------------------|
| J. Rempel | Owner, Beach |
| Milag Gracia Alonso | Owner, Beach |
| Leung Chi Sing | Owner, Beach |
| Elizabeth Velle | Owner, Peninsula |
| Grabham JV | Owner, Parkvale |
| Stewart Aldcroft | Owner, Peninsula |
| Erin Leslie | Owner, Beach |
| S.Ho | Owner, Peninsula |
| David Ball | Owner, Headland |
| Christine Cheng | Owner, Positano |
| Kenneth Ip | Owner, Positano |
| Flavell | Owner, Headland |
| Tops EM | Owner, Peninsula |
| Dakin D. | Owner, Hillgrove |
| Warrew Bottrill | Owner, DB Plaza |
| Les Gee | Owner, Siena One |
| Antony Snow | Owner, Positano |
| Mr. Hefti | Owner, Peninsula |
| Lovegrove | Owner, Beach |
| Shaun Cocks | Owner, Parkridge |
| Mrs. Chan | Owner, Positano |
| Chris | Owner, Siena One |
| Gregoire Michand | Owner, Parkridge |
| Tessa Laue | Owner, Peninsula |
| Natalie Lesle | Owner, Beach |
| Leen Decs | Owner, Beach |
| D. Dakin | Owner, Greenvale |
| Florence Chan | Owner, Parkridge |
| Albert Chan | Owner, Parkridge |
| Mrs Chung | Owner, Hillgrove |
| Maria Dakin | Owner, Greenvale |
| Phippip Doobs | Owner, Peninsula |
| Dominic Chung | Owner, Chianti |
| Nimisho Kashyap | Owner, Parkvale |
| Madhe Kashyap | Owner, Midvale |
| Wu Chi Yun | Owner, Headland |
| J. Ebeling | Owner, Peninsula |
| To Connor | Owner, Parkridge |
| Mr. Gigott | Owner, Peninsula |
| Mrs. Gigott | Owner, Peninsula |
| Catherine Mackinn | Owner, Beach |
| A.Bucu | Owner, Peninsula |
| Klane | Owner, Peninsula |
| Alton Chin | Owner, Parkvale |
| Coyault Karl | Owner, Greenvale |
| Walki | Owner, Chianti |

H. Ebrling
 Mark Mckeown
 Regis Manin
 D.Gibson
 E.Hemmings
 L.Hazen
 Franck Janini
 K Wilson

Owner, Peninsula
 Owner, Parkvale
 Owner, Peninsula
 Owner, Beach

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

| | | |
|-----|--|-------|
| 1.0 | <p>Apologies Apologies received from VL and JL.</p> <p>CYY welcomed Mrs. Maggie Chan Vice-Chairman of DB Plaza and Mr. Stephen Lee Vice-Chairman of Greenvale.</p> <p>CYY and SM reminded observers attending that they there to observe only and they were not allowed to interrupt, take photos or make recordings.</p> <p>CYY requested item 3.0 be brought forward to allow the visiting government officials to present. SM reminded everyone of the time restriction and asked for item 3.0 to be brief.</p> <p>Members also agreed to finish the meeting by 10:30pm.</p> | 19.31 |
| 2.0 | <p>Confirmation of Minutes of Previous Meeting (No. 4 2017/2018) Meeting minutes edited and circulated on 20 Sept 2018. Three comments received and revised minutes circulated on 16 October 2018. Minutes proposed by FC, seconded by DRB.</p> <p>CYY reported that a follow up item of 6.1 was submitted for discussion after the deadline by AY and CYY asked for members to consider if it was appropriate.</p> <p>AY responded that the item 6.1 was proposed on 16th October and the two motions were then prepared and emailed on the 17th October at 7:13pm, exactly 7 days before the meeting. FC requested a shorter period for amendments to be allowed. DRB asked for rules to be clarified SM agreed to do so before the next meeting.</p> <p>CYY reminded members of the process. FKW stressed that Schedule 8 to the Building Management Ordinance for Owners' Committee, which was applicable to the Principal Deed, clearly stated seven days' notice was given for the timing of the agenda to be issued and was not for any agenda items proposed by the members. SM closed down the discussion.</p> <p>SM asked for agreement to go ahead with additional motions after item 6.1 and there were no objections.</p> | |
| 3.0 | <p>Follow Up of the invitation to CLP and relevant government department (Environment Bureau) to introduce the solar renewable energy system at a FIT rate and how the system can benefit our environment, particularly Discovery Bay. Ms. Ellen Chan (EC) from the Environment Bureau gave a presentation</p> | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>on the Feed-in Tariff Scheme (FiT) alongside colleagues from the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department and Buildings Department (BD). EC advised members that the government had been stepping up its effort in developing and promoting renewable energy to mitigate climate change. CLP recently launched its FiT Scheme in October 2018 and applications had been received since May. This scheme provides financial incentives to the private sector, which includes individuals and organizations, to invest in renewable energy. EC explained the FiT rates were set at three levels with a view to reducing the payback period to about ten years. The Environment Bureau will be providing more facilitation and support to the community in order for them to consider developing renewable energy. EMSD and power companies have set up websites and hotlines to provide information and handle enquiries. EC also presented on the relevant building safety requirements for erection of PV systems and their supporting structures.</p> <p>SM thanked EC and her colleagues for their presentation.</p> <p>AY asked how many projects had been started and was DB a suitable place. EC responded that over 500 applications had been received and many were currently going through the installation process. There were approximately 12 completed projects connected to the grid and receiving FiT payments. EC confirmed there were some constraints in developing renewable energy in Hong Kong due to its physical characteristics, however low density places like DB present unique opportunities for such development, subject to relevant building planning and safety requirements.</p> <p>SM asked about GFA concession for the PV system and Mr. Mark Lai (ML) replied that there was no established policy on the GFA concession for the PV system and depending on the design and construction of the system, BD would favorably consider individual cases upon formal submission.</p> <p>FC expressed his interest in the numbers and asked about the data regarding carbon footprint. EC did not have data related specifically to carbon footprint on hand. However CKH advised that the estimated annual electricity generation were 1000kWh/kW and highlighted such figure as rough estimates.</p> <p>VR considered it a great idea for the government and CLP to do this however noted that in the past people were encouraged to participate but then subsidies were withdrawn. VR asked if there was a guarantee on the subsidy. EC assured members the FiT Scheme was set up and designed in a way that the three fixed rates determined based on system capacity (i.e. \$3, \$4 and \$5 currently) would be offered to renewable energy systems which joined the FiT Scheme when the rates were effective until 2033. The rates are subject to annual review between the power companies and the government. VR questioned the guarantee during review periods and EC confirmed any changes would only affect new applicants.</p> <p>AY asked about the installation and the supporting structure for the panels and whether it would be seen as unauthorized building works or would legislation be modified so that it was more user friendly. Mr. Ken Leung responded that if erection of supporting structures for PV systems on grade or on a slab (other than a cantilevered slab) were Minor Works</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| | <p>Item 1.19 or 3.15, they would not need approval from the BD however qualified persons should be appointed to carry out the work and notification and certification should be submitted to the BD according to the simplified requirements under Minor Works Control System. Mr Leung continued that if the supporting structures were not exempted works or minor works items, then the owner should appoint an authorized person to submit building plans seeking prior approval of plans and consent to the commencement of works from the BD in accordance with the Buildings Ordinance.</p> <p>BH enquired about the term organization and asked if it covered DB villages, and as most of the roofs were the same would a cost be given for the total village. EC clarified the term organization referred to a registered organization, for example a corporation or an owners' committee. EC explained that actual costs of installing solar PV systems were subject to a number of factors, including the types of PV panels used, installation method, professional services employed, etc. The FiT rates were set having regard to the findings of a consultant engaged by the Government with a view to reducing the payback period to about ten years.</p> <p>ER asked about a list of suppliers, contractors and Authorized Persons and EC confirmed all the information was available on EMSD's and BD's websites.</p> <p>KB stated VOCs cannot enter into commercial agreements and therefore it would be the responsibility of CM. SM confirmed CM would be the correct entity to act on behalf of villages.</p> <p>AY asked if standalone houses could apply and EC confirmed that individuals may apply for FiT.</p> <p>SM thanked EC and her colleagues. CYY said that CLP were willing to provide an additional presentation. SM suggested the Environmental Working Group should follow up alongside CM.</p> | |
| 4.0 | Matters Arising / Items Carried Forward from Previous Meeting | |
| 4.1 | <p>A presentation about the Typhoon floating of the boat</p> <p>SM confirmed the date for the presentation to be held in November and assured members' information would be sent prior to the day.</p> | 19:57 |
| 4.2 | <p>Follow up on the problems of DB overflight in 2017 with CAD</p> <p>CYY referred to the reply received from the Air Accident Investigation Authority (AAIA) department which advised members to refer to their website for updates and notification. Members were also reminded that as the investigation was officially in progress it was confidential and there would be no disclosure to outside parties.</p> <p>SM agreed to forward reply to relevant owners.</p> <p>KB remarked that governments had contingency plans for a range of scenarios like this and residents should be assured.</p> | 19:58 |
| 4.3 | <p>Golf Course House Development at Area 1A/1B</p> <p>After reviewing comments from previous meeting FKW stated that CM had taken the view that it was HKR's right to enter into a sub-DMC which</p> | 20:00 |

| | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| | <p>was approved by the relevant legal authorities. Therefore, it was considered inappropriate for CM to engage an independent Authorized Person.</p> <p>KB responded that he would not challenge the statement made by FKW but the COC could take action and put forward a resolution to the members. SM reminded members from the last meeting that it had been agreed that if CM were unable to support the request a resolution would be drawn up.</p> <p>SM read out the proposed resolution:</p> <p><i>The COC authorizes the COC Chairman to write to the head of the Legal Advisory and Conveyancing Office, at ACO in respect to the new developments at Discovery Bay area 1A, 1B and 2A/B and N1 North, stating that the COC requests LACO to note Discovery Bay deed of mutual covenants (DMC) requires management units (MU) thus undivided shares to be allocated on the basis of the GBA as defined in the DMC.</i></p> <p>Proposed by KB, seconded by ER. In favour: FC,BH,KR,ER,DRB,KYL,MSG,AY,KB,MLK,MC,DK,VR Against: N/A Abstain: SL,CC,SM,CKC,BL,LHL, JK, FKW,WSY The resolution was passed.</p> <p>SM confirmed that the COC Chairman would send, using the above words, a letter asap and circulate for checking prior to sending.</p> | |
| 4.4 | <p>Progress of Plaza Development</p> <p>CKC apologized on behalf of HKR for failing to provide a progress update. The construction works had experienced some delays mainly due to the inclement weather and typhoon last month. The project teams were working closely with contractors to catch up with the delay. CKC advised that it was still targeted to obtain the Occupation Permit for the new bus terminus by March 2019. CKC further stated HKR would provide a progress update by 10 November 2018.</p> <p>AY referred to an earlier request for HKR to conduct a survey amongst residents for the type of shops and services the residents would like. CKC assured AY her request would be forwarded to HKR leasing team.</p> <p>KB asked when the ice-rink would be opened. CKC informed members that development approval and consent from the Building Department had been obtained but formal approval from the Lands Department was still pending.</p> | 20:06 |
| 5.0 | CM Report | 20:09 |
| 5.2 | <p>COC Papers Endorsed (COC Paper 588/18)</p> <p>WSY reported on two endorsed tenders. 1) Replacement of existing 8 seated MPV (DB191) and 2) Replacement of 5.5 Tonnes Truck with Crane. Procurement was in process.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 5.1 | <p>Upcoming Tenders</p> <p>WSY reported on one tender in progress for repair of deteriorated water pump no. 2 at Water Treatment Plant, and one tender scheduled in the next three months for replacement of deactivated carbon media and filters for deodorizers in Sewage Pumping Stations No. 2 & 3.</p> | |
| 5.3 | <p>Community Events</p> <p>CYY apologized for not sending a draft copy of the presentation prior to the meeting. CYY highlighted the following upcoming events:</p> <p>Basketball tournament would be held on Sunday 28th October at Discovery College at 11am. There were eight teams participating.</p> <p>The Big Picnic would be held on Saturday 3rd November at Tai Tak Beach / The Plaza from 10am-10pm.</p> <p>The DMK Charity Walk would be held on Saturday 17th November from 9.15am with around 350 participants.</p> <p>The Uncle Russ Coffee Adventure Challenge will be held on Sunday 25th November from 8am-2pm with around 800 participants. This item was discussed further in 7.3.</p> <p>The DB 10K Run would be on Saturday 1st December from 8am-12 with around 450 runners.</p> | |
| | <p>Update on Other Services</p> <p>CYY updated members on the aftermath of Typhoon Mangkhut. There were approximately 1000 trees damaged, 650 trees had been rescued and 95% of the clean-up and clearance had been done and should be completed within the next week.</p> <p>Installation of CCTV at the reservoir had been completed.</p> <p>CYY reported on the patch repair work on the road and initially the item was budgeted at \$3.5M and after tendering, the amount sum was around \$2.17M with estimated repair area of 2400 square meters. Work was being carried out as shown in the presentation photos. CYY emphasized the work was patch repair and targeted the most serious sections. CYY advised that despite following this repair tactic the estimated total repair cost would be higher as the damaged area was larger than anticipated. In order to keep overall cost to the agreed tender sum, repair work would now restricted to remaining DB Road whereas the section in Parkvale Drive would have to be carried out in next repair exercise. Even so, the difference with original tender sum was about \$0.2 M.</p> <p>WSY reported an update on the eroded underground sewer near Siena 2B. A consultant was engaged to carry out rehabilitation. Initial finding of causing serious erosion, preliminary recommendations and timeframe were presented in the CM power-point presentation.</p> <p>KB asked about the original contractor who installed this particular section and would there be a forensic test to show if it was a proper standard with correct specifications. WSY confirmed the report would address this aspect and be provided to all COC members.</p> | |

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| | <p>CYY informed members that an Appreciation Dinner for the Typhoon Mangkhut Duty Team was held to thank them for all the work carried out to get Discovery Bay cleared. SM once again thanked all those involved and acknowledged the huge effort and hard work needed. CYY said there were a number of videos that were shown to COC members which highlighted the dangerous work involved. CYY shared how appreciative the teams were that COC had arranged the dinner for them and they expressed their thanks and desire to do their best to safeguard the city of Discovery Bay and behave in a professional manner. BH added in Peninsula village there were a lot of trees down and personally witnessed a landscape team clearing trees early in the morning to ensure the community would be safe. FC also acknowledged the cooks in Peony who catered for those working.</p> | |
| 6.0 | Items for Discussion | |
| 6.1 | <p>To endorse the recommendation of Passenger Liaison Group for replacing the overnight ferry with bus service (COC Paper 586/18) CYY advised HKR transport department would be presenting.</p> <p>AY notified SM that she would excuse herself from item 6.1 discussion and GWL would take her place representing Beach VOC.</p> <p>DRB referred to the paper received seven days ago and questioned if the presentation was different there should be no vote and discussed properly within VOCs.</p> <p>Peter Tsang (PRT) briefed the COC on the background of the proposal which originated from a passenger liaison group (PLG) meeting in August 2018, where members generally agreed that running an overnight bus would provide a more efficient and economical option. The DBTSL was then invited to prepare a proposal to the COC prior to seeking approval from the government Transport Department after which a public consultation would be carried out.</p> <p>PRT gave a detailed power-point presentation of the proposal.</p> <p>CYY reminded observers photo taking was not permitted.</p> <p>SM confirmed the paper was for endorsement by the COC and was proposed by FC and VR.</p> <p>FC emphasized the significant carbon footprint reduction, which was the equivalent of electricity consumption for the entire city common area including water works. VR added that at the PLG meeting there was discussion around how to mitigate fare increases. VR acknowledged change generally causes an outcry however stressed the impact of ferry fare increases which would affect everyone in DB, whereas the overnight ferry service affects a minority. VR stated the whole of the PLG endorsed the idea and had now brought it to the COC to allow a discussion.</p> <p>SM advised that a number of emails had been received about the proposal, some were for and some were against.</p> <p>SM read the proposal:</p> <p><i>To seek the endorsement of COC on the proposal of replacing the</i></p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p><i>existing overnight ferry service between DB and Central with a new overnight bus route ("DB08R") in order to provide more frequent and door to door service for residents at lower fares while to help reduce emissions from the underutilized ferry.</i></p> <p>KB considered, and based on his representative's account of the proceedings that the PLG "endorsement" had been exaggerated and noted that despite FC stating the need for user consultation in the August PLG minutes that this was not mentioned in the paper to the COC. KB stressed the emphasis on consultation should be upfront with the users not completely left with the Transport Department (TD) who are likely to assume that COC endorsement implies that VOCs had already discussed and consulted widely. KB said, as before, any request for meaningful financial information would not be given by the ferry and bus companies. KB added that savings would be made but considered the bigger question was why did the PLG not discuss the renewing of the ferry license which is due for renewal starting from the 1st May 2019. As a fundamental service to DB residents, COC should be endorsing action to review the future of the ferry service. KB said the government was committed to reviewing in 2019 the existing "Special Help Measures" (SHMs) i.e government subsidies for 6 outlying island ferry service and would consider including a further 8 ferry service including DB in the next SHM which if approved would start in 2020. Therefore in the next seven months DB was faced with renewing their ferry license and would be under a review for government subsidies. KB suggested the PLG should have increased accountability and the COC should be considering how to protect the ferry service and not waste time discussing just one aspect.</p> <p>FC said KB was suggesting that TD did not take seriously public consultation. KB refuted this statement saying that the TD public consultation process was always too short. FC referred to the recent situation with Park Island whereby there was the possibility of cutting the ferry service, however after consultation the transport department rejected the application.</p> <p>KB asked why the ferry company did not ask for the views of passengers and the community before asking the COC for endorsement. KB further stressed the bigger picture and the need to address the license renewal. FC asked KB to see the proposal not the process and KB replied the proposal has to be considered within the context of the total ferry service and process and not in isolation.</p> <p>DRB agreed with KB and added that abdicating the responsibility to consult the community and leave it with the government was appalling. DRB claimed the policy was drafted in secret and highlighted that all other Sub-Committees were run by Village Chairs. However the PLG was run by CM. DRB said to the paper implied COC had discussed this however refuted that suggestion and considered it appalling that PLG brought this up this way.</p> <p>CYY clarified the PLG was not Chaired by the CM. DRB clarified it was PRT who represented a subsidiary of HKR. FC alleged DRB did not attend any PLG or send any representative from the village and that was why DRB lacked information which everyone else had. KB said the presentation given at PLG was edited and different to the presentation held today. FC agreed it had been modified to account for additional recommendations.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>MLK had not attended the PLG meeting when this was raised however in his opinion was in favour of any potential proposals that increased and enhanced overnight services and delayed any fare increase.</p> <p>SM referred to DRB's comment that the presentation request had not been minuted, and clarified it was minuted under item 7.5 at the end of the discussion, on page 13. DRB apologized to FC.</p> <p>GWL agreed with the points raised by KB and advised members that the Beach VOC concurred there should be a consultation by the community before any decision was made. GWL referred to the presentation point which implied increase in property value however argued that the general perception of a vibrant community was partly to do with an overnight ferry service. GWL also noted the unrealistic travel times and referenced the Chinese Chamber Building which was 38km away and the estimated travel time was nonsense. VR asked why these points were not raised previously. GWL stated his objections were ignored and there was no vote or request for show of hands. PRT responded that the journey time was an estimation and there would be additional trials. The purpose of showing the journey time was for comparison.</p> <p>CC had asked for a vote at the time but there was no time and no general sense of disagreement to bring the presentation to the COC. CC reminded members the purpose of the COC was working towards a better DB and questioned if the objections were for the sole purpose of objecting.</p> <p>ER mentioned the majority of Hillgrove village would be against the idea highlighting the unique 24-hr ferry service that DB was known for. ER said transport by ferry was very different to transport by bus, especially after a night of drinking. ER had a representative at the PLG but had not received any indication that there would be a presentation at the COC strongly proposing the cancellation of the overnight ferry service. ER proposed a major consultation with residents was needed before endorsement.</p> <p>CC said that the PLG minutes had already been circulated to Siena One VOC for comments. CC remarked that at the COC there were no comments about the actual presentation rather the objections were to challenge the procedure. CC reminded members of the responsibility to listen and ask questions to understand better the proposal and then use collective wisdom to decide what was best for the community.</p> <p>BH reiterated that she did not attend the PLG August meeting and therefore was not aware of what had been discussed. She rebutted ER'S insinuations that VR, FC and BH had been briefed while the other members did not understand anything and therefore approved the proposal.</p> <p>DRB agreed with CC that members should be working for the betterment of Discovery Bay but argued the first stage began with asking the people that live here. DRB stated there may be merit in replacing the late or early ferry service however the current proposal was an all or nothing with no discussion. DRB stressed the proposal must meet the needs of the people not just HKR.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>KB noted that the PLG does not report to the COC and reiterated the importance of carrying out a public consultation exercise upfront and not just rely on the TD public consultation exercise.</p> <p>CKC replied that members spent their own time in sub-committees and working groups to improve DB and it was unfair for ignore the efforts in their participation. CKC added that the PLG minutes were sent to all COC and PLG members and there was no indication there was a strong objection to the scheme from anyone. CKC proposed to check the audio to verify any objections and if there were objections they should have been raised strongly at the PLG and therefore the conversation at this COC would be less controversial.</p> <p>KB said it was not simply objections to the proposal but more dissatisfaction with the exaggerated impression given of PLG support for such affirmative action based on a non-existent vote without the upfront public consultation implied in the August PLG meeting.</p> <p>FC retorted it was a procedural issue and asked if HKR survey results would be trusted. KB replied there was no trust or mistrust. KB added that unfortunately HKR was currently now represented a toxic brand.</p> <p>ER considered it a good idea for CKC to listen to the audio of the PLG meeting but not to simply report a consensus. ER found it hard to believe that the PLG were representing a large body of owners.</p> <p>KYL shared that the majority of Chianti VOC were against the proposal. KYL was unable to attend the last PLG meeting and felt that things were moving too fast and questioned the need to push this forward today so that more time was given for a thorough dialogue.</p> <p>MLK agreed with KYL that more time was needed to explore options and choice. MLK [very clearly] stated that he supported the overnight bus solution admitting that it was only his own opinion and he had not consulted his VOC.</p> <p>VR said ER's comment was very poor and reiterated there was no consultation prior the meeting. VR noted that each VOC could send a representative to advise their VOC. If no villages attended they cannot complain that they did not know what was happening. As an environmentalist, VR stressed the impact on the environment when the ferries were running empty. VR also highlighted the rising costs to families stressing PLG came up with an idea to address this and then brought it to the COC.</p> <p>KB stressed there was no blame and always acknowledged the time given by members to the PLG. KB emphasized again the bigger picture which was the ferry license renewal.</p> <p>DRB acknowledged merit to some of the ideas represented in the paper and the overnight ferry service should be reviewed, however DRB stressed the importance of looking at it and not voting on it.</p> <p>FC reminded everyone the service was more frequent and reduced carbon emissions and should be endorsed.</p> <p>Proposed and seconded by FC and VR</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>In favour: FC, CC, MLK, MC, DK, VR, CKC, BL, LHL, JK, FKW, WSY Against: BH, ER, SL, DRB, KYL, MSG, GWL, KB Abstain: KR, SM The resolution was passed.</p> <p>CKC assured members that even though the resolution had passed it was subject to approval which would involve a public consultation. CKC would provide information about the scheme so that all residents had a clearer picture to help them know how to respond in the consultation.</p> <p>DRB highlighted that the motion was approved because of the six votes that represent HKR.</p> | |
| | <p>Motion: to resolve that savings derived from using buses to replace midnight sailings be applied to the reduction of ferry fares. AY proposed the above motion. KB commented that there had never been any financial information given by the transport operators and AY responded that the second resolution covered this.</p> <p>CYY reminded Chairman and COC members that there was no paper received for the above motions, however SM responded that it was agreed at the start of the meeting to allow the motions. CYY clarified again the procedure and that no paper was received for these motions. SM asked members for any objections in this instance. VR reiterated that there was a procedure and the motion was late so forget it. MLK asked for clarification of the “special helping measures” and questioned how to monitor savings against reduction of fares. AY advised that special helping measures were a government subsidy for 6 outlying island ferry services.</p> <p>CKC commented that if the overnight ferry service was replaced with a bus there should be a ferry fare saving however CKC stressed the recent June fare increase only helped to reduce the deficit debt in running the ferry service. CKC claimed that if there was significant savings from stopping the overnight ferry sailings it was believed that the transport department would protect all DB residents’ interests and request the ferry company adjust the fare level.</p> <p>CKC proposed that the motion should say it was subject to returning a deficit to a surplus. AY said that the second motion was a request for transparency and if that was provided then the information would show a deficit or surplus. However, AY questioned the accounts for the ferry company and claimed they were inaccurate on two occasions. AY cited the \$9M for the burnt-out ferry. AY emphasized the need to monitor the company finances.</p> <p>DRB suggested that the word “midnight” should be replaced with “overnight”. It was agreed.</p> <p>CYY reiterated the need for procedures and stressed the need to adhere to deadlines and schedules to ensure efficiency. CYY respected members decision to allow the additional motions presented by AY, however remind members that they were arguing the voting procedures of the overnight ferry issues earlier whereas this practice negates rules and regulations. CYY considered this as a double standard.</p> <p>KB agreed with CYY about keeping to deadlines etc. SM stressed that</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | <p>due to public interest and as it was agreed at the start of the meeting by members it would go ahead.</p> <p>SM confirmed there were no objections.</p> <p>Proposed by AY and seconded by ER. In favour :FC, KR, ER, SL, DRB, KYL, MSG, AY, KB Against: CKC, BL, LHL, JK, FKW, WSY Abstain: BH, CC, MLK, MC, DK, VR, SM The motion was passed and SM asked for someone to take responsibility for further follow up and action. SM suggested CM/HKR.</p> | |
| | <p>Motion: to resolve that in the next 10-year ferry license renewal, clauses should be built in the license for more transparency on the accounts and operation of the ferry in line with the information released by other licensed ferry operators and the “special helping measures” scheme be applicable to Discovery Bay ferry fares.</p> <p>AY proposed the above motion. SM asked what the other license ferry operators produced and AY replied they provided more financial information. FC highlighted that over the past few years many COC members had been contacting the Transport and Housing Bureau and the Transport Department, and with the help of a counselor from the legislative council and as a result the Bureau agreed to include Discovery Bay in the review for special helping measures.</p> <p>KB said the Special Helping Measures (SHMs) included six outlying islands ferry services and were due for renewal in 2020 and DB was part of a group of eight further island services which government said would be included in the next review of the SHMs scheduled for the first half of 2019. KB said he would submit a paper on the future of the ferry service to the next COC and hopefully the subject would be discussed at a PLG (to which all C/VOCs should be encouraged to attend) prior to the COC meeting. KB added that Peter should be invited to make a presentation. KB stressed the importance of the COC discussing the future of the ferry service as the ferry license was due to expire. AY agreed and elaborated on the SHMs explaining that apart from the \$120M grant subsidy to the island ferries in 2014 and the \$190M in 2017 there was another helping scheme (government subsidy) for individuals that spent more than \$400 per month (on all forms of transport). SM asked if there were no objections for the motion to go ahead. VR stated it was impossible to insist that this would happen. KB said his paper to the next COC would include this subject. SM reread the resolution.</p> <p>Proposed by AY and seconded by FC In favour: FC, BH, KR, ER, SL, DRB, KYL, MSG, AY, KB, MC Against: N/A Abstain: CC, MLK, DK, VR, SM, CKC, BL, LHL, JK, FKW, WSY The motion was passed. SM suggested that KB take the lead on follow up action.</p> | |
| 6.2 | <p>To approve retrospectively the appointment of Mannings for the consultancy service of rehabilitating eroded sewer in an amount of \$455,000 from the account of City Reserve Fund (COC PaperT1532/18)</p> <p>WSY opened that because of urgency, a Paper recommending the appointment of the consultant Mannings was circulated to Members with majority support. No comments were received from Members. Endorsed</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|---|-------|
| | <p>by COC members with no objections.</p> <p><i>CC excused himself.</i></p> | |
| 6.3 | <p>The COC supports purchasing a wood stripper/chipper and asks CM to study a suitable model to be purchased within this fiscal year (COC Paper 585/18)</p> <p>BH referred to the number of trees affected by the typhoon and the climate change affecting weather patterns. BH asked how many trucks and bags were used for the clean up after the typhoon however it was not possible for CM to answer that.</p> <p>KB asked CM to look at how often it could be used and where it would be located and which one would be the most suitable.</p> <p>DRB asked CM what happened to the wood from the clean-up.</p> <p>FKW supported the purchase of wood chipper but shared that the main concern was where to put the machine, especially during operation, it was quite noisy and emission also a concern. The nursery was not ideal and therefore CM would discuss with HKR the suitable location and report back to the COC. Having said so, FKW advised that it would be more practical to purchase a wood chipper in next financial year.</p> <p>FKW further reported that CM had already separated which trees would be transported out of DB and which tree trunks could be re-used in DB. Regardless requests had been received from schools, the trunks which would be converted into seats would firstly allocate to villages.</p> <p>BH opinioned there were a lot of places the chipper machine could be located and highlighted the need for the trees to have nutrient compost which the wood chip could provide. BH further stressed the responsibility not to create more landfill.</p> <p>DRB clarified that the scout groups were not competing for large logs to be used as stools rather the small 5-10cm pieces.</p> <p>SM asked members if there was any disagreement for CM to research further and there was no objection.</p> | 22:06 |
| 6.4 | <p>DB Residents Service (RS) Since the Resident's Service (RS) contract was entered into by Discovery Bay Transit Service Limited (the bus company) and Discovery Bay Services Management Limited (CM) who acts on behalf of DB owners and residents, could CM disclose the contract to the COC?</p> <p>AY said that CM was acting as an agent on behalf of residents and owners in DB and therefore COC had every right to ask for the disclosure of the agreement. AY also stressed the difference between RS and other housing estates because everyone can get on the buses with their octopus cards. AY remarked that even though CM promoted the resident's octopus card with a resident's rate all visitors were paying the same. AY would like to make it available to all COC members and compare it to other housing estates and highlighted the need for transparency.</p> <p>FKW confirmed that CM would provide a support letter from the</p> | 22:18 |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| | <p>Discovery Bay Transit Services Department Ltd for the application of the RS permit for the bus operating in DB.</p> <p>AY asked for clarification on the support letter if it was the original application letter. FKW explained the support letter was available for the COC members however CM was unable to comment on an application that was made directly by the bus company. AY requested that the PLG follow up to obtain a copy of the application from the bus company. SM noted the Chair of the PLG represented HKR, and therefore AY agreed to write to the bus company directly.</p> <p>CKC offered to relay the message to Peter to ask for disclosure of the application letter. AY agreed and reminded CKC that the residents card was intended to provide benefits however the fees being paid by visitors and residents' were the same. AY asked about a reduction for the users of the DB residents' card.</p> <p>CKC noted the question.</p> <p><i>CYY reminded COC members of the time and that representatives from the Uncle Russ Junior Challenge had been invited to the meeting to give a short presentation. It was agreed to allow the presentation.</i></p> | |
| 7.0 | COC Sub-Committees/ Working Groups | |
| 7.1 | <p>Finance Sub-Committee (COC Paper 589/18)</p> <p>The discussion would be carried forward to next meeting.</p> | |
| 7.2 | <p>Environmental Protection Sub-Committee</p> <p>The discussion would be carried forward to next meeting.</p> | |
| 7.3 | <p>Sports and Leisure Sub-Committee Presentation from Organizers of Junior Challenge</p> <p>Chris Mackreth (CMK), Chair of The Uncle Russ Coffee Adventure Challenge and Steve Corbin (SC), the Founder, presented a video presentation to the members emphasizing the value of the community event which had been running for the past seventeen years. As a not-for-profit organization it provided a unique opportunity that encouraged children to get outside and experience nature. CMK reported there were 900 competitors from 8-18 years old.</p> <p>CMK acknowledged the support of CM and the community relations team.</p> <p>The event would be held on Saturday 25th November and CMK invited COC members to attend the event and be available to present prizes after the event to allow the organizers to thank everyone formally.</p> <p>KB thanked BH for rebuilding bridges after the presentation in January 2018 and BH acknowledged everyone worked very hard to iron out all the problems and to ensure there were no issues this year. KB noted the route descending the rocks would not be possible in a couple of years due to the open sewage running down after the development of 1A and 1B.</p> <p>CYY accepted that the previous concerns had been addressed and CM</p> | |

| | | |
|------------|---|--------------|
| | <p>were satisfied with the proposed measures and fully support the event.</p> <p>CMK emphasized the organization was self-funded and received no donations or funding from CM or COC.</p> <p>CYY reminded CMK that it was their duty to inform the relevant VOCs that would be affected by the route. CMK confirmed this had been done and referred to the information in the presentation notes provided to members. CMK further highlighted a large number of children from DB. (SC) added it was started within DB for his son and friends and now there were 900 competitors, which was capped due to the infrastructure and safety aspects. CMK noted a goal was to increase diversity of the competitors especially with local kids. BH thanked CMK and SC for their hard work.</p> | |
| 7.4 | <p>Security Liaison Group</p> <p>The discussion would be carried forward to next meeting.</p> | 22:34 |
| 7.5 | <p>Senior Citizens Working Group (COC Paper 590/18)</p> <p>The discussion would be carried forward to next meeting.</p> | |
| 7.6 | <p>Update on Taxi Drop-off Point (COC Paper 587/18)</p> <p>The discussion would be carried forward to next meeting.</p> | |
| 8.0 | <p>AOB</p> <p>BH asked about the golf cart licenses that were up for renewal and expressed some residents' concerns. CYY said that in the past there were three time slots for renewal of RUL for administrative purposes and to allow sufficient time for fulfill the criteria of inspection by qualified mechanics. The Transport Department of HKSAR introduced a similar inspection requirement two years ago for the renewal of VVP. Therefore it would be more appropriate to have this required annual exercise to put together for the convenience of the administrative work.</p> <p>BH also reminded members to advise on their chosen outdoor equipment by November 15th or the equipment would be chosen for them.</p> | |
| | <p>SM closed the meeting.</p> <p>Date of the next meeting is 5th December 2018.</p> | 22:37 |