

DISCOVERY BAY CITY OWNERS' COMMITTEE
Minutes of Meeting No.3 2019/20 Held on 27 May 2020
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
Ms. Kathy Lui- Landheer	(KYL)	Chairlady, Chianti VOC
Ms. Vivien Lau	(VL)	Chairlady, Greenvale VOC
Mr. Murray Stuart Craig	(MSG)	Chairman, Neo Horizon VOC
Mr. Darren Barton	(DRB)	Chairman, Parkridge VOC
Mr. Kenneth Bradley	(KB)	Chairman, Parkvale VOC
Mrs. Baby Hefti	(BH)	Chairlady, Peninsula VOC
Mr. Peter Whalley	(PW)	Chairman, Siena 1 VOC
Dr. Francis Chiu	(FC)	Chairman, Siena Two B VOC
Mr. Kent Rossiter	(KR)	Chairman, La Costa VOC
Mr. Christian Chasset	(CC)	Vice-Chairman, Amalfi VOC
Mr. Edwin Rainbow	(ER)	Chairman, Hillgrove VOC
Mr. Simon Tu	(ST)	Representative, Registered Owner
Ms. Beatrice Lee	(BL)	Representative, Registered Owner
Mr. Mike Lee	(ML)	Representative, Clubs
Ms. Elena Cheung	(EC)	Representative, Hotel
Mr. Ernest Lee	(EL)	Assistant Director, DBSML
Mr. F.K. Wong	(FKW)	Chief Manager, Estate, DBSML

Apologies:

Dr. Jennie Lee	(JL)	Chairlady, DB Plaza VOC
Mr. Michael Law-Kun	(MLK)	Chairman, La Vista VOC

In Attendance:

Mr. G.H. Koo	(GHK)	Senior Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. W.S. Yau	(WSY)	Senior Manager, Contract Management and Works, DBSML

Secretary:

Mr. Eddie Heung	(EH)	Manager, Community Relations, DBSML
-----------------	------	-------------------------------------

Staff of City Management:

Observers:

Dickert Hans	Owner, Midvale
Da Rocha, AM	Owner, Parkridge

	<p>SM informed members of the death of Mr. Vic Riley, the Chairman of Headland VOC and one minute's silence was held out of respect.</p> <p>KB strongly objected to the Chairman's omission of DRB motions on the agenda, which had been submitted on time following proper procedure. SM responded that there had been an offer to put them on under AOB where there was room for discussion. DRB asked for an explanation of why the vote was blocked. DRB objected to the claim that it singled out an individual owner and forced an action. FKW referenced members to the PDMC which states the Manager has the right to decide which subjects would be discussed. SM emphasised the decision to add the items under AOB had been made.</p>	19:30
--	--	--------------

1.0	<p>Apologies Apologies from JL and MLK.</p> <p>Members agreed to finish the meeting at 10:30pm.</p>	
2.0	<p>Confirmation of Minutes of Previous Meeting (No.2–2019/2020) KB requested item 3.1 regarding toll charge should be adjusted from 10% to 12.5% in annum, and noted the paper from the Transport Division should have been attached. EH confirmed the paper would be attached once received.</p> <p>ER expressed that it would be easier to have links included in the Minutes rather than attachments. EH noted and would investigate if it is possible.</p> <p>Minutes were approved, proposed by BH and seconded by FC.</p>	
3.0	Matters Arising from Previous Meetings	19:42
3.1	<p>Appointment of Contractor for Cleaning and Recyclable Collection Service Contract 2020/22 (COC Paper No. T1728/20) FKW thanked COC members that attended the interview and requested members approve the appointment of Winson Cleaning Service Company, as per the submitted paper.</p> <p>PW shared that Siena One had only been receiving one rubbish collection per day, although they had paid for two collections per day. PW would approve to appoint the contractor but a request was made for a rebate. FKW highlighted once approved the VOC would work with CM regarding the scope of work.</p> <p>SM asked for clarification that VOCs could amend cleaning services throughout the contract term. FKW explained there were separate costs for different services and each VOC could budget for each service. However, the schedule of work agreed after consultation with VOCs was fixed.</p> <p>KB acknowledged the work carried out by members involved in the interview process and confirmed Parkvale VOC's approval for recommended appointment. KB asked if PW was requesting a rebate for the past twelve months of work not carried out and PW said yes, noting their VOC had not been vigilant in monitoring work. In addition, the recycling bins were not collected daily and PW asked that Winson be reminded to collect daily. KB stated the monitoring of performance was not the duty of VOC members rather CM. BH said there was a WhatsApp complaint hotline number 90116190, for reporting any cleaning problems.</p> <p>KB highlighted the significant amount PW was referring to as the service cost was 130K per month for Siena One. PW also raised the unfair allocation and would raise this outside the COC meeting. FKW acknowledged receipt of PW's email related to the aforementioned concerns and CM were currently investigating.</p>	

	<p>AY stated it was CM's primary responsibility to monitor the performance of the cleaning company and suggested that the complaint number be affixed to the garbage bins. AY also raised the issue about the overflowing bins in public recreation areas, especially over weekends and public holidays, and requested HKR look into this.</p> <p>SM asked members to vote on the appointment of Winson Cleaning Service Company Ltd for the provision of cleaning and recyclable collection service in DB.</p> <p>In favour: FC, BH, ER, VL, PW, ML, EC, DRB, KR, KB, CC, EL, FKW, ST, BL Against: N/A Abstain: SM, KYL, AY</p> <p>The contract was approved.</p> <p>SM asked members to approve selection renewal of 2-year (1+1).</p> <p>In favour: FC, BH, ER, VL, PW, ML, EC, DRB, KR, KB, CC, EL, FKW, ST, BL Against: N/A Abstain: SM, KYL, AY</p> <p>The 2-year selection renewal was approved.</p>	
3.2	<p>Renewal of Short Term Tenancy (STT) No. CX 1333 (COC Paper No. 641/20)</p> <p>FKW said that HKR and COC both considered the government rent of three STTs was unfair and requested members discuss, as outlined in the paper.</p> <p>AY referred members to the last meeting minutes, item 6.6.1 which recorded AY's claim that the STT was originally initiated between HKR and the government, without consulting the COC. The agreement was in the name of HKR and the government issued a demand note to HKR. After a few years the CM notified COC of the arrangement when the rental amount was increased significantly, and charged a 5% Manager's fee. AY added all accountants would understand that CM was acting as an agent for the principal, HKR as their parent company, and therefore COC should not pick up HKR's bill and pay it out of the City Owners Fund. AY explained this behavior was a criminal offence and any owner could take legal action. AY said it was the sole responsibility for HKR to find a solution and then forward a proposal, and in addition rebate the 5% commission to the City Owners Fund as a gesture of good will.</p> <p>FKW clarified that according to past records HKR and CM consulted COC in 1995 about the introduction of the government water and discharge of sewage outside DB and it was approved in principle. HKR sought legal advice regarding the responsibility of CM to pay the STT and this advice was circulated to all COC members. FKW added that it would be good to come up with a viable solution.</p> <p>AY responded that in 1995 the COC agreed in principle but there was no further discussion about the extent of the tenancy and costs, and therefore no proper consultation or approval. AY reiterated HKR should take the initiative to find a solution as there was no transparency and no</p>	20:00

	<p>proper discussion or approval. AY questioned the reliability of legal advice received by CM, and referenced the case with DRB. AY also suggested that there was a conflict of interest with CM acting on behalf of HKR. FKW clarified the legal advice was solicited by HKR not CM.</p> <p>SM requested the COC papers in 1995, a copy of the brief (if any) and legal advice given to HKR for review.</p> <p>KB referred to the historical action taken by a previous COC member which did not result in any resolution, and KB suggested the simple solution was for HKR to pay the bill. AY agreed and added there should be back payment of 5% Manager Fee as well plus interest.</p> <p>PW requested FKW to provide a short summary of the issue. FKW explained the quality of the reservoir water was poor and therefore the potable water booster pumping station, and water pipe was constructed. In addition, sewage facilities were improved. The construction costs were covered by HKR and the future maintenance costs agreed to be paid by the City Owners Fund. After it was agreed in principle by the COC, HKR and the government worked out the details. FKW said that as far as he was aware HKR did not know there would be rental charges. FKW continued that AY's main argument was that the maintenance costs did not include the STT, and the pipe was outside the boundary of Discovery Bay and therefore not the responsibility of the City Owners fund. Based on this argument HKR solicited legal advice which reported that the location of the pipe was not important rather if the residents used the supply of water and sewage discharge. The STT was regarded as part of the maintenance responsibility. FKW said the COC was consulted when the first bill for STT was received and there was no objection then.</p> <p>AY stressed there should not be an STT as the government was bound to provide these facilities within a residential boundary, but it was not known why the construction took place outside the boundary. In addition, HKR did not disclose the payment of the tenancy for a few years and details of the arrangement was not made known. It was expected that the reservoir would be able to provide potable water for twenty-five thousand people and therefore to say it was not sufficient was contrary to what was promised to the government. 99% of residents that responded to a survey about changing to government water were against it, due to the rust. Members were reminded that AY received a legal letter from HKR threatening to sue for defamation.</p> <p>KR asked for the total figure annually that was being charged. FKW said that he would provide the information after the meeting. KR enquired if there was a problem receiving water from the government, would the reservoir be usable and what would the costs be to revert back.</p> <p>DRB requested a shared drive for all the documents.</p> <p>FC noted there were two levels of unfairness. The first was the government charging for their water and residents having to pay twice, and secondly HKR also charging and/or HKR not being transparent at the beginning. FC asked AY what the issue was with HKR, transparency or the charges. AY did not consider it necessary to respond.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>KB explained HKR and the government knew to make the connection there would need to be STT otherwise there would need to be amendments to the land grant and masterplan, which would have taken a long time, therefore it was an expedient measure. KB disagreed that the issue was only raised a few years ago as a member of the FSC had raised this a number of years before. KB stressed HKR should pay the bill.</p> <p>SM requested documents to be made available before the next meeting.</p>	
3.3	<p>Update on Change of the LPG supplier in Discovery Bay and San Hing to report progress on the refund of San Hing deposits to customers</p> <p>FKW updated members with a presentation that updated the progress.</p> <p>KB thanked CM for providing more management notices to inform residents of the change. KB noted there were outstanding items that should have been included, for example the DSG report for the COC. KB also asked for confirmation that the health check included the underground system. KB agreed to prepare a paper for the next meeting as there were a number of concerns residents had over the gas infrastructure.</p> <p>BH asked about residents that were unable to return to HK due to the COVID-19 situation. FKW reassured members that DSG would continue to follow up residents not yet registered and the gas supply would not be affected.</p> <p>KYL clarified that the owner/tenant had to actively apply for the deposit refund. FKW confirmed that if the original deposit receipt was lost a declaration could be made.</p>	20:31
	<p>KB enquired about the position of the City Owners Fund which FKW had agreed to provide, and said it should have been in the <i>Matters Arising in Previous Minutes</i> so members could ask questions.</p> <p>FKW replied the report was sent and CM requested members to follow up directly with CM if there were any questions. If discussion was needed it could be raised in the COC meeting. FKW said no questions/request had been received.</p> <p>KB said no paper was received that provided the financial position of the City Owners Fund, only the budget.</p> <p>PW said the request to FKW was the justification for the reserve transfer, which was addressed during the FSC meeting. The second request related to transactions which FKW also explained. FKW said the movement of the fund was caused by the Hillgrove renovation and summarized the City Owners Fund was healthy.</p> <p>SM requested FKW prepare a paper to be added to the agenda for the next meeting.</p>	20:39
4.0	COC Sub-committees/Working Groups Update	

4.1	<p>Finance Sub-Committee</p> <p>FC referred members to the meeting minutes and highlighted two points.</p> <p>1) Insurance Services provided by HKR. FKW reported that in light of the members' comments on the insurance service charge, CM would work with HKR to try to review and revise the scope of service in order to reduce the service charge. FKW agreed to report back to the next FSC meeting.</p> <p>2) The inclined lift. PW advised COC members that a resolution by the FSC members had been drafted as follows:</p> <p><i>All home owners in DB contribute to the running costs of the inclined lift, which is a facility that has potentially added value to and improved the selling price of the new developments in Amalfi village. The inclined lift does not benefit all villages, particularly those villages not in the North Zone and such non-benefitting villages comprise more home owners and housing units than those that benefit. Charging each village for the running costs of the inclined lift is unfair causing dissatisfaction, disappointment and opposition by many villages for such cause of action, and in this regard HKR and CM are both asked to reconsider the fairness of charging all villages for the contribution of the costs of the inclined lift.</i></p> <p>Questions were also prepared to assist the discussion process:</p> <p>1) Can the owners of villages other than Amalfi assert a legal right of access to the upper terminus of the Inclined Lift?</p> <p>2) How does HKR explain its compliance with Clause 8(b) of the PDMC which stipulates that Sub DMCs for new villages should not impose financial obligations on the owners of existing villages?</p> <p>3) How did HKR rationalize Clause 1 page 3 (Definitions) of the PDMC, which states that "any transportation device designated as a City Common Facility shall be for the use and benefit of the City" given that throughout the PDMC a clear distinction is made between what is for the benefit of a specific village or villages versus what is of benefit to the wider city in DB?</p> <p>FKW replied that CM carried out duties according to the PDMC and as the questions raised to HKR were about the designation of the lift, CM was not in a position to respond to the questions.</p> <p>KB thanked FC and PW for raising the issue and suggested the best deal would be for the owners to fund the operating costs and HKR to cover the maintenance costs.</p> <p>ST agreed to relay the opinions expressed to HKR but would not comment further.</p> <p>PW reiterated the unfairness of the charges and stressed the need for someone from either CM or HKR to take responsibility for the justification of the charges. In addition, PW agreed the pragmatic solution raised by KB, would allow people to agree to disagree, and suggested an arrangement could be made to discuss the possibility of maintaining the current costing ratio.</p>	20:51
-----	---	-------

	<p>BH agreed with KB and requested HKR provide assurance that they would continue to cover costs for the maintenance of the lift, and the running costs would remain under the villages.</p> <p>ST agreed to relay the comments to HKR.</p> <p>KB asked about the efficiency of the insurance process in order for claims related to the super-typhoon to be paid quickly. It was noted that some villages had not submitted their claims which could penalize the rest of the villages. FC agreed it had taken too long and would follow up with FKW.</p> <p>EL raised that CM and the broker were reviewing to see if those villages with sufficient information could be handled first. The claim procedure would also be reviewed to speed up the process.</p> <p>PW highlighted that the point on the insurance was not the salary cost-recharge, rather it was because of a profit-element.</p> <p>KB asked for clarification over the reserve fund figure quoted at \$29M, when in the budget the figure was \$55.8M. FKW replied it included the reserve fund and surplus of the road fund. KB asked for the reconciliation to be explained after the meeting.</p> <p>FKW also confirmed that the government subsidy on employee salary had been applied for and the budget would be revised accordingly.</p>	
4.2	<p>Environmental Protection Sub-Committee</p> <p>BH updated members on the arrival of the new food composter which processes 150 kg, as well as a new polystyrene compressor machine. The wood-chipper was also being used regularly. BH reported that restaurant owners were being encouraged to use environmental food containers for takeaway options.</p> <p>BH requested CM purchase an electrical car to promote a greener environment in DB.</p> <p>BH informed members that FC was in discussion with the ferry company about the installation of recycling bins. FC would report back at the next meeting.</p>	21:14
4.3	<p>Sports and Leisure Sub-Committee</p> <p>BH confirmed the Dragon Boat festival would be cancelled this year due to COVID-19. North Pitch was still closed despite a lot of pressure to open, however BH was confident the government would release restrictions and they would be able to open soon. The basketball court in Club Siena also remained closed and when it opens would be available for public use for a three-month trial period.</p> <p>AY reminded members that the tennis courts were also on public land, and the club charged \$230 per hour. AY noted if there was a more aggressive approach to negotiating the use of the sports facilities, especially for the teenagers, it would reduce a lot of problems. AY agreed there should not be stringent rules imposed by the club and we should encourage people to play. AY asked BH to follow up with club. BH agreed to follow up.</p>	21:18

4.4	<p>Security Liaison Group – Appointment of Convener GHK reported there was no SLG meeting before the COC meeting however the police provided crime figures which show there were ten cases in March and five cases in April. Details were highlighted in the presentation.</p> <p>BH asked about the possession of an offensive weapon but GHK did not have the details and would need to check with the police department.</p> <p>EH asked if there were any nominations for the Convener of the SLG. BH nominated FC, and FC accepted.</p> <p>There were no further nominations and FC was appointed convener for the SLG.</p>	21:25
5.0	Items for Discussion	
5.1	<p>Resolution of Tender Award for WR2 Defect Rectification at the Plumbing Plant next to Valley Road (COC Paper No. T1710/20) WSY requested members approve the tender award to the lowest bidder Sang Lik as detailed in the paper.</p> <p>There were no objections and SM approved the recommendation.</p>	21:28
5.2	<p>Resolution for appointing contractor for the provision of landscape casual labour (COC Paper T1729/20) FKW requested members approve the tender to Hing Fat Garden as detailed in the paper.</p> <p>BH emphasized the difference in the take-home pay and said it was COC duty to be responsible in these matters. KB suggested the company apply for the government rebate to benefit the workers. FKW remarked CM was not in a position to demand the service provider to pay more salaries to their staff.</p> <p>There were no objections and SM approved the recommendation.</p>	21:30
6.0	CM Report	
6.1	<p>COC Papers Endorsed WSY reported on two papers endorsed. 1) Cleansing Work of Air Conditioners and 2) Annual Inspection of the Reservoir and Condition Survey for the Obsolete Water Treatment Plant.</p>	21:35
6.2	<p>Upcoming Tenders WSY reported on seven tenders in progress 1) WR2 defect rectification in plumbing plant next to Discovery Valley Road, 2) Provision of Landscape casual labour, and 3) Insurance Provision, 4) Cleaning Services, 5) Water Tank Cleansing Works, 6) Water Pump Maintenance Services, and 7) Corrective Maintenance on ELV System.</p>	

	<p>It was noted that 1) and 2) and 4) had been approved in the COC meeting.</p> <p>There were two upcoming tenders 1) WR2 defect rectification in SHW pumping station, and 2) Replace deteriorated underground flushing isolating valve near Seabird Lane No. 27.</p>	
6.3	<p>Update of Safety Measures against COVID-19</p> <p>EL reported there were eight total confirmed cases so far in residential area of DB and the patents of seven cases out of those had now been discharged from hospitals. EL updated members on the actions taken when cases were confirmed, as highlighted in the CM presentation.</p> <p>Preventative measures continued to be enforced, and CM promoted the importance of personal hygiene. EL reminded everyone that CM kept remaining on high alert especially as schools would reopen and there was the possibility of a second wave. Details of the measures in place were shown in the presentation.</p> <p>DRB acknowledged the amazing job that CM had done in the response to confirmed COVID-19 cases, in particular the cleaners who sanitized the areas. It was also noted the overall messaging on the posters had improved and were clearer. DRB remarked that there had been no response to the request for mandatory mask wearing on buses and distanced seating area in the plazas. EL acknowledged the request and said the ideas had been conveyed to the relevant parties, as it was not under the authority of CM. DRB reminded CM that they were the owners' representatives who should impose a level of service. EL emphasized the bus company made final decisions related to the measures and it would be inappropriate for CM to enforce measures. CM did convey the message and would let the transport company decide on implementation.</p> <p>BH suggested that in case of a second-wave the bus company should make mask wearing mandatory. EL would continue to liaise closely with the bus company should the situation change. BH acknowledged the incredible effort of HK in containing the virus.</p> <p>KB also recognized the work of the CM staff and said it was a shame they were not getting a pay-rise. KB asked about what measures and improvements the Auberge Hotel were taking.</p> <p>EC responded that the hotel had put in preventive measures which included health declaration for guests and temperature checking. No bookings would be received from those that had travelled overseas within fourteen days, and would not take quarantine guests. KB specifically asked if Auberge would consider a 24-hr gap period between room bookings. EC said public areas and rooms were sanitized regularly. KB suggested HKR look at the 24-hr gap adopted by other hotels during this time.</p> <p>KYL asked about the hotel occupancy and if the hotel was taking group bookings for events. EC replied 30% occupancy and there were no events.</p>	21:37

6.4	Community Events EH reported there were no events in the past two months.	21:50
6.5	Biennial City Management Services Survey Result 2017-2019 Update EH explained the survey results and provided a detailed summary that would be sent to COC members. It was also noted there would be an improved survey system next time. DRB thanked EH for the summary and requested a similar breakdown from the previous survey so that a comparison could be made. EH agreed to send to members afterwards.	21:51
6.6	Update on Other Services, if any. No update.	21:57
7.0	AOB	
7.1	Report on Progress of the renovation of DB Plaza, opening date of the ice rink and re-opening of the escalators to the bus terminus. SM noted the escalators had now been reopened. GHK updated members that the occupation permit had been issued and the interior refurbishment was in progress. Some new shops had been opened. The dates of mall opening and ice rink were yet to be confirmed. KR reminded HKR of the length of time that the renovation and opening of the mall was taking and that it continued to be an inconvenience to residents. Specifically, KR asked about when the main escalator that would go through the mall would be opened. GHK was unable to update on timing but would get back to members. KB expressed frustration over the lack of information on timing and noted how atrocious it was for those in wheelchairs. KB requested better responses on access. SM reminded HKR on the promise of lifts for those physically unable to use the escalators, and concerns over the licensing operator for the ice rink. A more thorough update was requested for the next meeting.	21:57
7.2	Report on the progress of the new golf cart parking area adjacent to the tennis courts. SM noted the golf cart parking area was now open for a 3-hr parking time. PW raised the issue that the main golf cart park was often full and there was not enough long-term parking. PW suggested the golf cart committee should be represented at COC. AY raised the point that a lot of people were riding bicycles and the government was also reviewing making electric bicycles legal, and therefore suggested space near the pier should be created for those to leave their bicycles. BH added electric scooters/bicycles were encouraged across the world. KB said consideration would need to be given to access from cyclists for safety reasons and clear designation before space was given. BH added that all transport should follow the same road rules.	

	BH agreed to follow up on the suggestion within the EPSC.	
7.3	<p>Report on the development near Chianti and how long the piling contract of the construction site will take and next steps.</p> <p>EL reported that the main contractor of the construction site had taken measures to minimize noise nuisance. The piling work would start from 9am on weekdays, and the work was targeted to be completed by end of August. Any adverse weather may affect the completion time to end of September.</p> <p>KYL said that having information on the whole project would help with managing expectation. EL advised that HKR should be contacted for the information.</p> <p>SM confirmed that the piling work should begin 9am Monday – Friday and 10am Saturday.</p>	
7.4	<p>Conclusion of Court Case</p> <p>DRB updated members that the court agreed with the ruling and confirmed the power to decide the timing and the manner of a poll vote for any Owners’ meeting, before Siena development, rests with the Chairman and not CM. There was no requirement that votes were taken immediately at a meeting and votes could be taken at a separate time and place, over a period of days to allow a greater number of people to participate in voting. DRB remarked this was a victory and a definitive answer that the wording in the DMC was correct and the power to decide the manner of a poll vote rests with the Chairman for many of the villages in DB.</p> <p>SM thanked DRB for what had been done.</p> <p>SM reminded FKW to provide advice for Chairpersons on this matter. FKW confirmed they would review the final judgement and provide guidelines as soon as possible.</p> <p>BH asked if a poll vote would incur more costs to the village. FKW replied extra staff would be deployed and explained there would be more costs. The complexity of poll votes was highlighted and different examples were given.</p> <p>DRB remarked that the judge noted complexity but it did not justify of not doing a poll vote and DRB queried why a poll vote would be more expensive. DRB believed that if both sides were willing to work together poll voting was not a complicated process.</p> <p>ER added there would be obvious savings as no extra people were required to count the votes. The meeting would also be short and sharp. ER noted the CM staff were very enthusiastic for the AGM in Hillgrove, and suggested a working group be created to look at how meetings could be conducted. BH reminded a quorum was still needed.</p> <p>PW clarified that when a meeting was finished it was adjourned so votes could still be taken outside of the meeting. PW raised to DRB the legitimacy of vote by WhatsApp. DRB replied that was outside the scope of his understanding.</p>	

	<p>FKW said the poll vote was a continuation of the meeting and the owner was still required to register their identity before voting and that is why there was extra cost. With regards to the WhatsApp vote the owner was not present and therefore does not align with the procedure of the meeting.</p> <p>KB congratulated DRB and stressed renovation decisions should have physical people present to vote.</p> <p>AY distinguished that WhatsApp was to collect people's views and there was no provision in the Sub-DMC to prevent people from using different means to collect views for expression.</p> <p>DRB was supportive of a working group that suggested formats for meetings but reminded members time and manner of a poll vote would be made by the Chair of the meeting, and would not be bounded by any format or guidelines created. ER agreed. KB said it was a waste of time for a working group.</p>	
7.5	<p>An owner has applied to the lands tribunal for information on allocation of management units in Discovery Bay.</p> <p>SM raised the above and asked if CM would like to update COC members. FKW said CM received an application and would follow up.</p> <p>AY requested CM to circulate the final judgement on DRB case, and the lands tribunal application so residents were informed. FKW only agreed to circulate the judgment of DRB case to the COC but not the application on allocation of management units as CM was not obligated to do so.</p> <p>AY said all legal cases were unnecessary and residents should be informed. Senior management for CM should be aware of the hostile attitude. AY referred to an additional case that would be submitted shortly and all these would affect the reputation of CM. CM and HKR should consider certain attitudes. In addition, AY referenced a letter that had been sent to owners about DRB that was impolite and FKW should apologize in writing.</p>	
7.6	<p>Revised timetable for the rest of the COC meetings in year 2019/20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 August (Wednesday) • 23 September (Wednesday) • 25 November (Wednesday) <p>The meeting was closed.</p>	