

**Minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Southern District Council (SDC)**  
**(2008-2011)**

---

**Date : 14 July 2011**  
**Time : 2:00 p.m.**  
**Venue : SDC Conference Room**

**Present:**

Ms MAR Yuet-har, SBS, MH (Chairlady)  
Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr AU Lap-sing  
Mr CHAI Man-hon  
Mr CHAN Fu-ming  
Ir CHAN Lee-shing, William, JP  
Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying  
Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung  
Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung  
Mr FUNG Se-goun, Fergus  
Mr FUNG Wai-kwong  
Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH  
Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH  
Mr LEUNG Ho-kwan, MH  
Mrs MAK TSE How-ling, Ada  
Mr MAK Chi-yan  
Mr TSUI Yuen-wa  
Mr WONG Che-ngai, MH  
Mr WONG Ling-sun, Vincent

**Absent with Apologies:**

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN (See paragraph 1)

**Secretary:**

Miss LIN Ming Senior Executive Officer (District Council),  
Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department

**In Attendance:**

Miss LEUNG Tsz-ying, Almaz	Acting District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department	
Miss WONG Choi-yan	Assistant District Officer (Southern) (Designate), Home Affairs Department	
Ms LAI Yuet-ye, Elaine	Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department	
Ms TAM Chi-man, Doris	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Southern), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	
Mr IP Yu-sun, Sunny	Ch Mgr/M (KWH), Housing Department	
Miss KWONG Lai-fong, Ora	Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Southern, Leisure and Cultural Services Department	
Mr CHAN Bun-pui, Bosco	Chief Engineer/HK (2), Civil Engineering and Development Department	
Ms CHU Ming-po, Shirley	District Commander (Western), Hong Kong Police Force	
Mr WONG Wan-yip	Police Community Relations Officer (Western District), Hong Kong Police Force	
Miss AU YEUNG Yuet-wah, Alice	Principal Transport Officer/Urban, Transport Department	
Mr FUNG Wing-yip, Wilson	Executive Director, Corporate Development, Airport Authority Hong Kong	} for Agenda Item 1
Mrs CHAN POON Yuen-man, Ivy	General Manager, Corporate Development, Airport Authority Hong Kong	
Mr LEUNG Cheuk-fai, Jimmy, JP	Director of Planning, Planning Department	} for Agenda Item 2
Ms AU Kit-ying, Brenda	District Planning Officer/HK, Planning Department	
Mr NIP Tak-kuen, Patrick, JP	Director of Social Welfare, Social Welfare Department	} for Agenda Item 3
Ms PANG Kit-ling	District Social Welfare Officer (Central Western, Southern & Islands), Social Welfare Department	
Ms Wendy TSANG	Assistant Director, Hong Kong Youth Arts Foundation	for Agenda Item 6
Mr CHING Yuet, Clarence	Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 5(Acting), Leisure and Cultural Services Department	} for Agenda Item 7
Mr Albert WONG	Senior Engineer (Acting)/South Island Line (East), Highways Department	
Mr Bernard WONG	Senior Liaison Engineer, MTR Corporation Limited	
Ms Jennifer TAM	Assistant Public Relations Manager – Projects & Property, MTR Corporation Limited	
Mr Ken LEE	Senior Design Management Engineer – Civil, MTR Corporation Limited	

Mr Dennis CHIU	Design Management Engineer I – Civil, MTR Corporation Limited	For Agenda Item 7
Mr NG Ka-shu	Senior Town Planner/HK 5, Planning Department	for Agenda Items 7 & 9
Mr TAM Chung-on, Alan	Senior Engineer/Southern & Peak, Transport Department	for Agenda Item 8
Mr SHIU Chun-shui	Officer-in-charge (Community Building), Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department	for Agenda Item 12
Mr LIE Ngai-wa	Liaison Officer (ALC/LT), Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department	for Agenda Item 14

**Opening Remarks:**

1. The Chairlady welcomed Miss WONG Choi-yan, Assistant District Officer (Southern) (Designate), to the meeting, and said that Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN was unable to attend the meeting because of other commitments. According to Section 51 of the Standing Orders, Mr ZIMMERMAN's application for absence was not accepted.

2. The Chairlady also welcomed regular government representatives to the meeting, and advised that since the meeting was packed with a lot of agenda items, it would be conducted in accordance with the established arrangement, under which each Member would be allotted a maximum of two 3-minute slots to speak in respect of each agenda item, however, Members were advised to speak as concise as possible. The Chairlady reminded that the Secretary would ring the bell once at 2 minutes 30 seconds of each speaking slot, and twice when it reached 3 minutes.

(Mr FUNG Wing-yip and Mrs CHAN POON Yuen-man joined the meeting at 2:02 p.m.)

**Agenda Item 1: Hong Kong International Airport Master Plan 2030**  
**(SDC Paper No. 49/2011)**  
**[2: 07 p.m. - 2: 41 p.m.]**

(Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr WONG Ling-sun, Mr FUNG Wai-kwong and Mr TSUI Yuen-wa joined the meeting at 2:06 p.m., 2:12 p.m., 2:34 p.m. and 2:37 p.m. respectively.)

3. The Chairlady said that this agenda item was put forward by the Airport Authority Hong Kong (AA), and welcomed Mr FUNG Wing-yip, Executive Director, Corporate Development, and Mrs CHAN POON Yuen-man, General Manager, Corporate Development of AA, to the meeting.

4. The Chairlady said that the meeting was rescheduled earlier because AA had scheduled 2 meetings with other DCs on the same day to present the “Hong Kong International Airport Master Plan 2030” (the Master Plan). Since this was the last meeting of SDC before the current term expired, and that no other feasible time could be arranged, the Secretariat had no choice but to advance the meeting by 30 minutes to 2:00 p.m., so that the representatives of AA could explain the plan and collect Members’ views. It was hoped that the discussion of this item could be finished in 30 minutes. It was believed that Members were familiar with the Master Plan, and to save discussion time, on 30 June 2011, the Secretariat had issued a paper on the subject, notified Members on the aforesaid arrangements and invited advance comments or enquiries. The advance questions raised by Mr CHAI Man-hon on the day before had been relayed to AA via the Secretariat.

5. The Chairlady advised that since the 2 representatives of AA had to leave the meeting at 2:30 p.m., Mr FUNG Wing-yip would brief Members on the contents of the paper first, then Members could make good use of the time and raise their views for discussion.

6. Mr FUNG Wing-yip, with the aid of PowerPoint presentation (Supplementary Information – 1), briefly introduced the contents of the consultation paper and its proposed options. His responses to the enquiries raised by Mr CHAI Man-hon were summarised as follows:

- AA had no particular preference between the 2 options. The consultation document set out the pros and cons of the 2 options and the questionnaire could enable members of the public to fully express their opinions on the 2 options.
- If the investment of HK\$86.2 billion could generate a total of HK\$912 billion in economic net present value (ENPV) over a 50-year lifespan for Hong Kong, the rate of return was very good indeed, especially when the figure only reflected the value directly related to the aviation industry without calculating the economic benefits brought about by downstream business (e.g. logistics services and tourism) supported by the Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA).
- Some might argue that with the annual government expenditure at HK\$300 billion, the investment required for the proposed project took up a relatively large share and was considered inappropriate. Actually, the investment arrangement proposed was not to spend all the money within a year but spread over a period of 17 years from 2013 to 2030, with an annual expenditure between HK\$4 billion and HK\$13 billion as set out on page 48 of the consultation document. AA would further study the financing arrangement and its related details of the proposed project.
- The difference in construction cost between the proposed project and the existing HKIA was mainly due to inflation. The construction cost for the 10 airport core projects was HK\$150 billion, of which about HK\$55 billion was spent on the airport, while the rest was used for the provision of other infrastructure, including Tsing Ma Bridge and the Airport Railway. Taking into account the inflation rate on the price level, the total expenditure would be over HK\$87 billion (in 2010 dollar). On the other hand, although only one additional runway would be built under Option 2, the scale of the project was not just equal to half of the previous dual-runway system as rumors said. The previous HKIA project required reclamation of 980 hectares of land, while the proposal under Option 2 suggested 650 hectares, which was about two-third of the previous airport project. HKIA had only 89 aprons when it first came into operation, while Option 2 would provide 94, which was far more than the provision in the previous project. Besides, under the proposed project, the automated people mover system would be 4 km in length, with the existing one only measuring 1.2 km. As the new system would be connected to the third runway

and the SkyPier, its signalling system would be far more complicated than the existing two-way system. The new project was also more complicated and expensive because of the following 3 factors: (a) no dredging would be carried out to minimise the effects on the environment. The marine sand for reclamation would be imported from outside Hong Kong. The additional cost involved was HK\$4.5 billion; (b) deep cement mixing would be adopted to replace the traditional method of dredging in reclamation, another HK\$14.6 billion would be added as a result; and (c) as the operation of HKIA would be maintained when the construction of the new airport facilities nearby was underway, an additional expense of HK\$5.1 billion would be required for the necessary deployment and arrangement to ensure the existing level of airport services. The total additional expenditure associated with these 3 factors was about HK\$20 billion or so. Deducting these items from the HK\$86.2 billion, the actual cost for Option 2 would be about HK\$60 billion or so only, which was rather reasonable when compared with the construction of the existing HKIA at some HK\$80 billion at the time.

- Regarding the 141 000 direct jobs to be generated, presently most of the airport related services were outsourced and the actual establishment of AA was about 1 000 staff. AA would not take this opportunity to expand its establishment significantly and would endeavour to provide service with lean manpower. Basically, the manpower required by various franchisees on the airport island was proportional to the passenger and cargo throughput of the airport. For example in 2008, the passenger and cargo throughput then were 48 million and 3.6 million tonnes respectively, it was anticipated that by 2030 passenger throughput would be almost double to 97 million, while cargo throughput would grow 147% to 8.9 million tonnes. It was estimated that the manpower requirement would rise from the then 62 000 to 140 000, i.e. an increase of 137%.
- The estimated ENPV for Option 2 was HK\$912 billion, calculated by deducting the proposed investment of HK\$136.2 billion from the total economic value added generated by the aviation industry over a span of 50 years from 2010 to 2061 (data from Census and Statistics Department) and then discounting by 4% annually to 2009.

7. The Chairlady proposed that since the time assigned for discussion of this

agenda item was limited, while Mr CHAI Man-hon had put forward 12 questions, AA should provide a written reply later so that other Members could have the chance to raise their comments and enquiries.

8. Mr CHAI Man-hon would like AA to respond to only some of his enquiries, including the question on airspace, reasons for not using the Required Navigation Performance System (RNP system) and the plan to train up sufficient air traffic controllers.

9. The Chairlady reminded Members that they should submit their advance questions as soon as possible so that the departments concerned could have reasonably sufficient time to prepare their written responses.

10. Mr FUNG Wing-yip responded that the Civil Aviation Department (CAD) had already adopted RNP system but the aircraft itself would have to be equipped with GPS navigation system to make the system work. RNP system could not increase runway capacity but only provide guidance for aircrafts to enter flight path more accurately. Therefore, the adoption of RNP system had no effect on the enhancement of runway capacity. On the other hand, Tai Mo Shan was not the reason for not using a descent approach design for the proposed third runway. Basically, aircrafts could use the proposed runway for landing and taking off, it was just that AA expected the runway would be used only for landing for the next 20 years, which could already meet the actual need. The consultation document had clearly explained that both the centre and the north runways would be used for air traffic movements (ATMs) at night. Regarding the enquiry on airspace, the proposed third runway could handle a maximum of 102 ATMs per hour. This figure had already been confirmed by CAD.

11. Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP commended AA's consultation document and the recommendations it contained. He further said that given the high returns projected for Option 2, it seemed to have no reason to object to it. However, the construction of express railway and the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge would be completed soon, they would provide passengers with a wider choice of airports such as those in Zhuhai and Macau, and these airports would probably become strong competitors of HKIA with their offer of cheaper air tickets. He asked whether factors affecting the returns of the airport project had been examined when assessing the economic viability of the planning. Also, he would like to know if the planned transport supporting facilities could cater for the drastic growth in passenger throughput of the

future airport.

12. Mr FUNG Wing-yip responded that apart from economic growth, the consultant company had also examined many other factors including development of express railway link, policy on tourism, granting of air traffic right, and the competition from and development of nearby airports, etc when forecasting the future need for the new airport. After making reference to overseas experiences, the consultant company noted that in Europe and Japan, wherever there was airport and railway interchange, the demand of short-haul passengers for domestic flights would be affected, especially when the flight routes overlapped railway networks. However, since over 80% of the flights using HKIA were international, it was believed that the effects of such would be minimal. Indeed, if linked with express railway networks, the airports concerned would extend its catchment area to cover more passengers using express railways to reach the airports. As the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge would be located close to HKIA and with the Tuen-Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link, HKIA would under the Government's plan, slowly become a major traffic interchange and would be highly accessible by different types of transportation. As the Airport Railway still had ample space capacity, it would not be a problem for the transport supporting facilities to meet the growth in passenger demand. On the other hand, a traffic impact assessment for Lantau Island would be undertaken, subject to the final adoption of the proposed option.

13. Dr YANG Mo, PhD supported the airport development and believed that it could enhance the competitiveness of Hong Kong. HKIA was facing fierce competition, especially from the expansion of airports in Guangzhou and Shenzhen. Also, with the opening of Guangzhou Bridge, people would find it more convenient to go to Zhuhai Airport. The strength of HKIA was its function as a hub for many international flights, however, following the commissioning of express railway, competition from airports in Shanghai and Beijing was inevitable. Therefore, it was essential for Hong Kong to enhance its competitive edge in this respect. Regarding the proposal in Option 2, he opined that an additional runway was not the answer since ATM was subject to air traffic control. The new runway could not operate separately, it would only make more flights wait for their turns.

14. Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung enquired AA if an environmental impact assessment had been conducted for the sea. Under the proposed option, reclamation of about 650 hectares of land would be carried out north of the existing airport near the mouth of Pearl River, and it was inevitable that the marine ecosystem in the whole

area would be seriously affected.

15. Mr CHAI Man-hon thanked the Airport Development Concern Network, especially for the enquiries raised by Mr MO. He also thanked AA for its comprehensive reply earlier and hoped that a written response could be followed later to clearly explain the way forward in respect of airport development. At the meantime, the public was mostly concerned about the airspace. They maintained that an additional runway would not help much as the landing and take-off routes of flight movements still remained at 2 o'clock direction, which meant that the proposed runway would not be fully utilised. He enquired AA's position towards the control of airspace by the Liberation Army and asked about any plans for opening the airspace. Also, he pointed out that the representatives of AA had yet responded to his question on recruiting more air traffic controllers for increasing the utilisation of runway. He asked if AA could fully utilise the existing runways in the immediate future, and according to a previous report, the capacity of the existing runways could cater for 70 or so ATMs per hour, while they only handled a bit over 60 at the moment.

16. Mr FUNG Wing-yip responded that the number of flights in HKIA using the Pearl River Delta (PRD) airspace was less than 23% and most of the international flights did not need to fly over the PRD airspace. In fact, airspace would not create a bottleneck for HKIA, not in the short run nor in the medium term. At present, HKIA handled 61 ATMs per hour and the number would be increased to 68 by 2015, which could be easily accommodated by the existing airspace. With the new facilities of CAD setting up at the airport and more manpower recruited, the number of ATMs could be gradually increased. CAD already had a concrete plan in place to deal with the airspace congestion issue. CAD had also initiated discussions on the related matters with the civil aviation authorities in the Mainland and Macau, which included the aforementioned ATM issue in future. As for the report cited by Mr CHAI Man-hon about the capacity at 78 ATMs per hour, the assessment was conducted in 1992 based on the assumption of an unconstrained environment. The present assessment was commissioned by AA and conducted by overseas experts with reference to flight procedure and the physical conditions of Hong Kong as a whole, and the results were confirmed by CAD. 68 ATMs per hour was the limit for a dual-runway system and had nothing to do with airspace. As a matter of fact, with the surrounding mountainous area, the present dual-runway system at HKIA could not handle more than 68 ATMs even without airspace restriction.

17. The Chairlady thanked Mr FUNG Wing-yip and Mrs CHAN POON Yuen-man for joining the meeting, and announced a recess of 3 minutes.

(Mr FUNG Wing-yip and Mrs CHAN POON Yuen-man left the meeting at 2:45 p.m.)

(Mr LEUNG Cheuk-fai, JP and Ms AU Kit-ying joined the meeting at 2:47 p.m.)

**Agenda Item 2: Meeting of Director of Planning with SDC Members**  
**[2:44 p.m. – 3:48 p.m.]**

18. The Chairlady welcomed Mr LEUNG Cheuk-fai, JP, Director of Planning, and Ms AU Kit-ying, District Planning Officer/HK of the Planning Department (PlanD), to the meeting. She advised that the meeting would allot an hour for the discussion of this agenda item, so Members should make good use of the time and take turns to raise their enquiries for discussion. The Secretariat had already passed the enquiries made by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN and Mr FUNG Wai-kwong before the meeting to the Director. The Director's replies were tabled for Members' reference.

19. Mr LEUNG Cheuk-fai, JP, with the aid of PowerPoint presentation (Supplementary Information –2), briefly introduced the work of PlanD and the future planning for the Southern District.

20. Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP stated that SDC had passed a motion earlier requesting the Government to consider a waterfront promenade connecting Kennedy Town and Aberdeen. He asked whether some of the road sections in the proposal would require a change of the present land uses. On the other hand, the Food and Health Bureau (FHB) had briefed the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of all District Councils on the proposed locations for the provision of columbarium facilities in various districts. The possible location selected in the Southern District was in Pok Fu Lam, which was only 500 meters away from the one proposed in the Central and Western District. He hoped that FHB could pay due attention to the resultant traffic burden in the area when conducting the related feasibility study and considering the number of niches in the 2 columbarium facilities.

21. Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP continued that although the Aberdeen Tourism Project was allocated HK\$280 million for the beautification works, it did not help

much for tourism development. Aberdeen was characterised by its unique ambience of a fishermen's village, and many Members would like to see development of a seafood cuisine hotspot within the district. Given that the works sites of the South Island Line (East) (SIL(E)) would be returned to the Government in 2015, it was hoped that PlanD could consider the request for developing a seafood cuisine hotspot when planning the future land uses of these sites.

22. Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying commended the mobile exhibition centres of PlanD, saying that they could encourage students to learn more about the town planning of Hong Kong. For the long-term planning, she hoped that PlanD could consider providing more schools in Stanley since many children now had to go to schools in other districts, and that more car parks could be provided as the one in Redhill Plaza was very crowded. She further commented that the suggestions for providing an additional driveway in Tai Tam Upper Reservoir and constructing a multi-storey carpark in Stanley had yet to be realised.

23. Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH wished the Director could clarify that the completion date of SIL(E) should be in 2015 instead of 2016. He pointed out that in the wholesale of fish, 70% to 80% of seafood in Hong Kong came from the Southern District. However, when tourists and local people wanted seafood cuisine, they would only think of Sai Kung and Lei Yue Mun. He hoped that soon after the completion of SIL(E), PlanD could designate a location in the Southern District for the development of seafood restaurants. Also, the Tourism Commission had promised to develop the area in Main Street, Ap Lei Chau beneath the bridge of Shum Wan Tower into a dining place specialised in seafood cuisine. He believed that inter-departmental cooperation and study would be needed to address various problems arising from such a proposal. To promote tourism in the Southern District, it was very important to highlight its unique feature as a fishing village, which PlanD should keep in mind when designing the land use zoning for the Southern District.

24. Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung expressed concern over the designation of the site at Ap Lei Chau Drive and Ap Lei Chau Praya Road for residential purpose. He pointed out that such a planned land use was designed 30 years ago when Yue On Court and Lei Tung Estate had not even existed, and the overall situation on Ap Lei Chau was very different now. In view of this, it was necessary for PlanD to review if the site was still suitable for residential development. Owing to the strong opposition from the local residents, he had written to the Development Bureau (DevB) in June 2011 to reflect their views. DevB then replied that residential development

in the said location would not affect the traffic in the surrounding area. Actually, there were many households in Yue On Court, Lei Tung Estate, Shum Wan Towers and Larvotto. Ap Lei Chau Drive was like the mouth of a bag, and it was very unlikely that additional residential developments in the area would have no effect on traffic flow. He said that the staff of PlanD should conduct a site inspection to find out the real situation there. Also the proposed development would have visual impact on the existing residents, in particular for those living in Yue On Court. In fact, the construction of Larvotto had already affected the visual amenity of the residents in Lei Tung Estate. SDC had moved a motion to develop the said site into an open space and hoped PlanD could consider the request of the local community. On the other hand, he opposed to re-zoning the shipyard sites on the waterfront of Ap Lei Chau as Open Space because both the shipbuilding and fishery industries depended the service of shipyards, and also the proposal would make the shipyard workers lose their jobs.

25. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong would like to raise further questions in respect of the written enquiries put forward previously. He enquired under what circumstances the Government would consider changing the original land use. He said that when researching for information on the oil depots in the South Horizons several years ago, he discovered that according to Guinness World Records, Ap Lei Chau with a population of about 100 000 at the time, was probably the most crowded island in the world. Therefore, he did not understand why under the present planning standards, more residential buildings could still be planned on Ap Lei Chau. Although it was very likely that luxury housing would be developed on the site in question, and the number of households and residents would not be too many, it was just beyond common sense to further increase the number of dwellings on the most crowded island in the world even if it could bring revenue to the Treasury. On the other hand, he wondered why the Transport Department (TD) was of the opinion that a new residential development on the site would have no traffic impact. PlanD might not be able to respond on TD's behalf, but it should have consulted other related departments and considered various relevant factors beforehand when planning for such use. He invited the Director for a site visit to see for himself the actual condition there. Regarding the proposal of SDC on re-zoning the site as Open Space, the reply of the related government department stated that according to the current planning standards, the provision of open space in the district was sufficient. With the inclusion of places like Stanley and the Repulse Bay, the provision of open space in the Southern District was indeed quite a lot. However, for the small community of Ap Lei Chau, the provision might not be adequate. He asked if PlanD had

considered the individual needs of small communities when formulating the planning standards.

26. Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung said that the Director who was also a resident in the Southern District, should be very familiar with the situation in the District, especially the traffic congestion in Aberdeen. On the other hand, she hoped that PlanD could re-consider whether it was suitable to proceed with new residential development projects on Ap Lei Chau. As Mr FUNG Wai-kwong had said, Ap Lei Chau would probably be the most populous island in the world. Therefore, when consulting the departments concerned such as TD, PlanD should prudently consider the impact of such planning on traffic flow. Members of the local constituency on Ap Lei Chau had jointly issued a letter to PlanD to express residents' expectation on rezoning the site to Open Space. In addition, she requested that PlanD should, as soon as possible, initiate the future planning of the MTR works site beneath Ap Lei Chau Bridge for the development of a seafood cuisine hotspot.

27. Mr CHAI Man-hon said that the site opposite to Sham Wan Towers being included in the Application List should be the subject of utmost concern by Members. The root of this issue came from the fact that District Councils (DCs) did not have the autonomy in district planning, and that the procedure and practice of the Town Planning Board (TPB) was outdated and could not keep abreast with the development needs nowadays. Many people who were concerned with the property market in Hong Kong were of the view that the existing real estate market was merely a members-only property hegemony. He opined that the improvement measures introduced by the Government in 2005 were not adequate to rectify TPB's procedure and practice. As such, he asked whether the Director would reform the mechanism during his tenure. Taking the aforesaid site as an example, the Democratic Party had submitted an application to PlanD for rezoning the site together with the shipyard sites in the neighbourhood as Open Space, and TD asked for a traffic impact assessment report in the end. However, TD deemed it not necessary to carry out a traffic impact assessment when the Government implemented a use that had been planned 30 years ago. So, he asked why it was not necessary for the new residential development project to undergo traffic impact assessment, while deemed it necessary to do so for development of a regular open space mainly for use by local residents. Moreover, he queried that the Government persisted in adhering to the established procedures for a gain in government revenue. The procedures of TPB were full of loopholes and simply outdated. Even if people could submit a rezoning application, it was futile without the professional knowledge and resources to carry out a traffic

impact assessment. He also asked in the course of putting the site opposite to Sham Wan Towers in the Application List, whether it had contravened any procedures.

28. Mr TSUI Yuen-wa said that previously SDC had discussed several rezoning applications submitted by social welfare organisations, such as the Ebenezer School & Home for the Visually Impaired (Ebenezer) and the St. Mary's Home for The Aged at Welfare Road, under which the sites concerned could be sold to property developers for exchange of resources to improve facilities and services. Despite that PlanD had served as a gate keeper in the course of scrutinising the rezoning applications, property developers still constantly tried to use this tactic to procure valuable land for residential development. He hoped that PlanD could impose strict control on this practice to avoid property developers rezoning the sites as Residential for constructing luxury flats for profits, by taking advantage of the procedures to reap sites intended for social welfare purposes. This was in breach of the intended purpose of the sites granted to the social welfare organisations. Moreover, it seemed that the Government had adopted a laissez-faire attitude towards the rezoning of the land in Wong Chuk Hang industrial area. In the light of the transformation of Wong Chuk Hang into a commercial hub, he opined that the Government should grasp this opportunity to play a more active role in the planning of the area, especially in the provision of supporting transport facilities (such as road widening) in order to cope with future needs.

29. Mr LEUNG Ho-kwan, MH said that in his recent visit to a home for the aged at Welfare Road, it was found that wall effect was phenomenal amidst the buildings in the vicinity. He hoped that under the rezoning exercise, PlanD could introduce relevant mechanism to address this issue. With the development of Wong Chuk Hang into a commercial hub in the district, the height restriction of building had increased from 100 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) to 140 mPD, which would have a great impact on the district as a whole. To complement with the continuous development of the Southern District, PlanD should impose restrictions to avoid wall effects of buildings in the overall planning.

30. Mr LEUNG Cheuk-fai, JP gave a consolidated reply as follows:

**South Island Line (East)**

It was clarified that the construction of SIL (E) would be completed in 2015.

### **Development of Waterfront Promenade**

There was an ongoing study of this nature on Hong Kong Island regarding the harbourfront developments of Victoria Harbour with a view to providing a waterfront promenade for public use. PlanD had noted the needs of the Southern District in this respect. As a matter of fact, there were already footpaths along the waterfront in some areas of the Southern District, but it was difficult to connect them all due to some technical issues and private property right that should be resolved first. PlanD welcomed SDC to carry out a study on this subject and would give support as far as possible.

### **Site Selection for Columbarium Facility**

FHB would conduct feasibility studies on the sites selected for columbarium facilities, including traffic impact assessment, to ensure that the number of niches proposed would commensurate with the traffic capacity in the district.

### **Creation of a Seafood Cuisine Hotspot**

The proposed site was noted. There were already some seafood restaurants at Main Street, Ap Lei Chau. However, to take forward the proposal to develop a seafood cuisine hotspot, it would not only rest with Government's decision, suitable business environment and market incentive were also important. It was difficult at this stage to determine if a specific site was suitable for such purpose.

### **Mobile Exhibition Centres of the Planning Department**

The Director thanked Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying for her compliments on the mobile exhibition centres, and said that PlanD would continue this service to facilitate people living in the remote and inconvenient area, or the elderly and children who did not have access to the internet.

### **Request to Provide Schools in Stanley and a Road Access at Tai Tam Upper Reservoir**

The planning for the provision of schools was mainly under the purview of the Education Bureau (EDB), but PlanD would keep in view the needs in

various districts and reserve suitable land for such purpose. For example, according to the cross-boundary travel survey undertaken by PlanD once every 2 years, it was found that the number of cross-boundary school children was on the rise with a daily turnover of around 7 000 persons. This situation was serious in the North District while the effect on the Southern District was minimal. The traffic issue at Tai Tam Upper Reservoir was under the purview of TD. PlanD would provide input on the land use planning aspect as necessary.

### **Residential Development on Ap Lei Chau**

The Government had included the site concerned into the Application List to maintain a stable supply of housing sites to meet the housing demand of the community rather than for increasing government revenue. In fact, the Legislative Council (the LegCo) had mentioned on many occasions about the need to increase housing land and flat supply. According to the current data, the existing and planned provision of open space in various sub-areas (including Ap Lei Chau) in the Southern District was sufficient. In determining the planning parameters for the site in question, the departments concerned including TD had already confirmed that the proposed development would not have adverse traffic impact in the area. Although traffic congestion occurred regularly at Aberdeen Tunnel in peak hours, the situation should be improved with the commissioning of SIL (E) in 2015.

As an international financial centre, the demand for housing in Hong Kong not only came from local residents, but also from expatriates of foreign companies. A new residential development might inevitably affect the view of the neighbouring buildings, but from the macro perspective, Hong Kong had an imminent need for increasing housing supply.

### **Procedure and Practice of the Town Planning Board**

Every system might have room for improvement and TPB was no exception. The Town Planning Ordinance (TPO) had been amended in 2004 and since then, transparency had been increased significantly. The public consultation procedure for planning applications had already been explained during the briefing on the work of PlanD. In submitting applications for amendment of plan under TPO, applicants were required to provide

sufficient justifications for the consideration of TPB. In case DCs had any comments on land uses or planning concerning their respective districts, they could discuss with the respective District Planning Officer of PlanD. PlanD would also initiate amendments to outline zoning plans based on the circumstances and needs. In fact, PlanD had been updating outline zoning plans from time to time to make sure that the planning could keep abreast of the circumstances.

### **Sites for Social Welfare Organisations**

PlanD disagreed to the comment that the Government had not fully discharged its duties in controlling sites for social welfare uses. Every case had its own background, and TPB would consider each application on its individual merits. Taking Ebenezer as an example, the site was procured by the institution itself instead of a concessionary grant from the Government, and that its rezoning application had been rejected by TPB several times. Ebenezer subsequently amended its application and justified its need for relocation on grounds of insufficient space and facilities. TPB agreed with the application in principle provided that the institution could find a suitable site to continue its services. Ebenezer was a non-profit-making organisation serving the visually impaired for many years, and its request was considered reasonable. This case had proven that TPB had not shown favouritism towards property developers. Otherwise, there should not be so many judicial reviews raised by property developers. For some cases allowed after judgment, the Government had to reconsider the cases according to the judgment. PlanD was of the view that TPB was impartial and considered each and every application with the same yardstick. If any person felt aggrieved with the decision of TPB, he could request for a judicial review. If a case involved planning application, there were review and appeal mechanisms. No system was perfect, but TPB had already tried to do its best.

### **Wall Effect of Buildings**

When planning the land use of a site, PlanD would consider a number of factors including the surrounding environment, air ventilation and visual amenity in formulating planning parameters. On maintaining air ventilation, property development projects were subject to planning

parameters such as height restrictions to ensure that the proposed developments would not cause wall effect on the surroundings. At present, there were several judicial review cases on this issue pending for hearing and judgment. This indicated that TPB sometimes had to face judicial challenges when protecting the rights and interests of the general public. As a matter of fact, different organisations often had their own considerations and requests, for example, environmental groups considered the existing restrictions inadequate while property developers found the requirements of TPB too stringent. It was hoped that SDC and the public could understand the difficulties in striking a balance between various interests, and that it was necessary to consider the overall development and interest of the districts and Hong Kong as a whole. As such, the decision of TPB might not always meet the expectations of DCs.

31. Mr CHAI Man-hon said that he and his fellow party members had tried to submit a rezoning application on the residential site on Ap Lei Chau, but it was replied that the Government was in the process of amending the plan and asked them to submit the application later. However, when they submitted a formal application, the Government had announced that the site had been included in the Application List. He opined that the established procedures had prevented people from submitting rezoning applications, which indicated that the TPO had a lot of drawbacks, and also it was unreasonable to ask the applicant to provide a traffic impact assessment report. On the contrary, the Government just approved the development project that had been planned 30 years ago without asking for any assessment study. He understood that all along PlanD had tried its best to handle various applications in an impartial manner, the problem was the Hong Kong Government lacked the credibility of a democratic political system.

32. The Chairlady asked Mr LEUNG Cheuk-fai, JP to note Mr CHAI's views.

33. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong asked PlanD to provide the figures of judicial reviews put forward by property developers in the past 4 years so that the general public could have a better understanding of the situation. He pointed out that TPB had always given the impression of lacking dissident voices and thus was considered being inclined to influential or pro-government authorities. This had made the public query its decisions constantly. If PlanD wished to balance the interests of different parties but did not rectify the structural setback in any way (such as publishing the figures concerned), it was difficult for the public to change their

opinion on TPB.

34. Due to time constraint, the Chairlady suggested that PlanD could provide a written reply on Mr FUNG's request after the meeting.

35. Mr LEUNG Cheuk-fai, JP responded that the figures requested would be provided after the meeting. According to the existing practice, in case a TPB member had potential conflict of interest on a case, he/she would refrain from the discussion and deliberation of that item. In addition, he encouraged Members to listen to the broadcast of TPB meetings so as to have a better understanding of the actual consideration process. As a matter of fact, TPB did not endorse every recommendation put forward by PlanD and it was the same for the applicants' proposals. PlanD would continue to strengthen its exchange with SDC in future.

36. The Chairlady thanked Mr LEUNG Cheuk-fai, JP, and Ms AU Kit-ying for joining the meeting, and announced a recess of 3 minutes.

[Post-meeting note: On 25 August 2011, TPB replied to the Secretariat by e-mail that TPB had received 16 judicial review cases since 2008, 4 of them had been withdrawn by the applicants, while the remaining 12 cases were yet to be heard.]

(Mr LEUNG Cheuk-fai, JP and Ms AU Kit-ying left the meeting at 3:48 p.m.)

(Mr NIP Tak-kuen, JP and Ms PANG Kit-ling joined the meeting at 3:52 p.m.)

**Agenda Item 3: Meeting of Director of Social Welfare with SDC Members**  
**[3:52 p.m. – 4:46 p.m.]**

37. The Chairlady welcomed Mr NIP Tak-kuen, JP, Director of Social Welfare (DSW), and Ms PANG Kit-ling, District Social Welfare Officer (Central Western, Southern & Islands) of the Social Welfare Department (SWD), to the meeting. She advised that in the light of the many agenda items for discussion today, Members should make good use of the time and take turns to raise their enquiries for discussion.

38. Mr NIP Tak-kuen, JP, with the aid of PowerPoint presentation (Supplementary Information – 3), briefly introduced the services of SWD and collaboration with the Southern District in its work.

39. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling showed concern on the support service for children with special needs. She said that at present, children with special needs had to undergo pre-admission assessment for referral to pre-school education and training services, however, it was found that the whole process seemed to slow down recently. She opined that counselling and education in the early stage were very important, and in many cases, timely assistance was essential to recovery. Taking children with autistic tendency as an example, early detection with relevant counselling could enhance the chance of recovery. Recently, her kindergarten admitted a student with mild autistic symptoms. His parents were very satisfied with the support from the kindergarten and found it very helpful. This case showed that education and counselling at early stage were essential to children with special needs. On the other hand, she was very concerned with the support to persons with disabilities. Many of them were now living with their families in a crowded accommodation and had an urgent need to apply for suitable housing units. However, the waiting time for allocation of a housing unit was generally long. As a matter of fact, persons with disabilities were easily disturbed by the nuisances made by children at home and thus preferred to hang around on the street. She requested SWD to expedite processing the housing applications of the disabled, the elderly and the infirm with a view to improving their quality of life.

40. Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung said that despite an increase of 1 046 places in residential care homes for persons with disabilities (RCHDs), it was still a far cry from the demand, and a majority of places would be allocated to cases of severe disability. Information showed that the current waiting time was 6 to 10 years, indicating that supply had far lagged behind demand. She hoped that SWD could increase the number of bought places from private RCHDs in order to support the needy families with disabled persons. In addition, day care services could also alleviate the problem of applicants staying in over-crowded accommodation. On the other hand, she thanked the District Social Welfare Officer (Central Western, Southern & Islands) of SWD for the assistance in a case referred by her recently. She hoped that SWD could allocate more resources to shorten the waiting time of the needy families or persons.

41. Mr AU Lap-sing said that he was a member of the District Coordination Committee on Elderly Service, and at a SWD meeting last week, when an organisation introduced its services mentioning that “people should die in dignity”, he was deeply touched. In the Southern District, there were some elders whose health were so deteriorated that they could not even take care of themselves and some of them were hidden cases unattended by social workers. Since they had no one to visit or take care of them, tragedies were prone to happen when they might eventually die at home owing to lack of timely medical care. He hoped that SWD could pay more attention to the hidden elderly who lived alone, and asked how Members could help if they learned about the information and needs of these elderly.

42. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong was concerned about whether the programme to create temporary jobs for youths from 15 to 29 years old just mentioned by the Director could be continued. There was only 8 months to go before the current fiscal year came to an end (that is, the expiry date of the programme), he asked whether resources would still be available in future for providing work placement opportunity for youngsters. Moreover, he asked whether SWD could secure resources for provision of emergency alarm system for the elderly in need, so that in case of accidents or urgent matters, the locations of the elders could be identified and help could be given in a timely manner. He had purchased an emergency alarm bell for the elders in his family, but many elders might not have family members to make the arrangement for them. It was said that family members or social workers could still trace the whereabouts of the elders carrying emergency alarm bells even if they were outdoor.

43. Mr LEUNG Ho-kwan, MH said that the disabled and the elderly had difficulties in using suitable public transport when going out to see a doctor. Although there were rehabilitation buses, the service was limited and the fare was high. He had raised this issue a few years ago. He understood the resource constraint of SWD, but it was the responsibility of the department to take care of the underprivileged in the long run. Recently, he had organised a community safety survey in the district, and found that it was quite hard to arrange outdoor activities for the physically disabled due to unavailability of rehabilitation bus.

44. Mr CHAN Fu-ming shared the view of Mr LEUNG Ho-kwan, MH and said that the existing rehabilitation bus service did not include bringing the physically disabled to clinic/hospital for a follow-up consultation. Moreover, many people with physical disability could not take a taxi because of their impairments, and they could

not afford the high transportation costs too. He asked whether SWD could allocate more resources to support the physically disabled.

45. Mr TSUI Yuen-wa said that at present, student concessionary fares were provided by MTR only, but there was no sign the bus companies would follow suit. He had raised this issue on different occasions but the Transport Department (TD) said that this was a matter of social welfare. On the other hand, the society at large had shown discrimination against the new arrivals, therefore, he hoped that SWD could step up publicity to make people understand this social phenomenon. He also said that discussion forums on the internet had targeted the new arrivals, and this would complicate the issue and become political if this situation turned for the worse.

46. Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying noted that in response to the views of various parties, SWD had introduced many services, but an increase of 30% to 40% in resources allocation seemed inadequate to address the need. With the rapid growth of population and surging inflation, SWD should explore ways to secure more financial resources. The medical and health care need of the elderly was great, and the elders at 70 or 80 years old might not wish to stay at the homes for the elderly, and even if they wanted to, there might not be hostel places available for them. On the other hand, the elderly had to wait for a long time to make an appointment for follow-up consultation. There seemed to be inadequate provision of various kinds of services to meet the demands. She asked SWD which department was responsible for handling the issue of ageing population and where the resources came from.

47. Mr NIP Tak-kuen, JP said that SWD had attached great importance to providing rehabilitation services and support to the disabled, and was aware that in the face of an ageing population, the demand for elderly service would surge drastically. He gave a consolidated reply on Members' enquiries and comments as follows:

### **Support for the Disabled and the Elderly**

SWD had endeavoured to help the disabled to enhance their self-care capability, and to provide training and employment assistance to facilitate their integration into the community. In the provision of daily care service for persons with disabilities in the community, SWD would provide support services to the family carers, and residential places would also be provided if necessary. Recently, the LegCo had passed a legislation to regulate the operation of all RCHDs through a statutory licensing system. In addition,

SWD had measures to assist private RCHDs in complying with licensing requirements. On the other hand, SWD had just launched a Pilot Bought Place Scheme to purchase places from private RCHDs. Despite that there was not a large supply of places in the market that complied with relevant requirements, this Scheme should encourage the private sector to provide this service, and the privately-run facilities had been on the rise in the past couple of years. To date, there were 71 private homes for the disabled in Hong Kong, and it was believed that the number would continue to increase in future.

As for home care for the severely disabled, SWD had launched a pilot scheme under which integrated tailor-made service would be provided to people with severe disabilities and were waiting for allocation of subvented residential places. On the other hand, to help the physically disabled to integrate into the community, SWD would, as far as possible, provide them with aftercare support, including accommodation and other support services. SWD staff had been collaborating with the Housing Department (HD) and the Hospital Authority (HA) in providing support services to the physically disabled. For public housing estates where more persons with disabilities resided, SWD would liaise with relevant self-help groups to understand what kinds of services and support were needed in the estates concerned.

SWD would identify the needy elderly, especially singleton or hidden groups, in the community through local District Elderly Community Centres or Neighbourhood Elderly Centres in a proactive manner. SWD opined that neighbourhood support network in the community was essential for the needy. The Elderly Commission had also sponsored some neighbourhood support services such as Neighbourhood Active Ageing Project with a view to strengthening support network in the community. The Community Investment and Inclusion Fund had also provided similar programmes, such as the “Loving Care Estate” in the Southern District and designation of floor representatives in the respective buildings or floors, so as to actively identify persons with needs. It would be more effective if professional social workers or paramedics could support the services for hidden or singleton elderly.

At present, rehabilitation bus service was the major transport mode for the physically disabled. The Labour and Welfare Bureau (LWB) had allocated

more resources for procurement and replacement of rehabilitation buses in the current fiscal year, with a view to stepping up the support in this area. The LWB would also discuss with TD for enhancement in transport support.

### **Support for Children with Special Needs**

Early identification and intervention were very important in the treatment for children with special needs. In the current financial year, the government had already increased allocation for enhancing identification and services to autistic children, and more resources were granted to HA for such purpose and for the enhancement of medical social services provided by SWD as well. SWD would continue to increase the places of pre-school education and training service. Apart from these, funding was allocated under the Community Care Fund to provide pre-primary programmes and pilot schemes for children with special needs.

### **Student Travel Scheme**

The student travel scheme was not under SWD's purview. But SWD would give support to families with financial needs. Moreover, SWD had assisted MTRC in implementing the concessionary scheme for the disabled.

### **Support for the New Arrivals**

SWD was committed to enhancing an inclusion society and had been providing a wide range of support for the new arrivals such as family service. Various kinds of programmes had also been organised by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and local groups and organisations with the aim to promote caring and social inclusion. Although Comprehensive Social Security Assistance was provided for people residing in Hong Kong for at least seven years, in some special cases, SWD would exercise discretion to provide financial assistance for the needy.

### **Shortage of Social Welfare Resources**

The recurrent expenditure on social welfare programmes for the past 10 years had increased by HK\$10 billion in total and was the second largest

government expenditure item. This showed that social welfare received great attention on policy level. SWD would continue to seek more resources for providing the current services and expanding new service areas as appropriate. As the service required by the elderly was mainly that of medical and health care, both SWD and the Department of Health had provided community support service through public health and education, and would actively increase the number of residential places and enhance the relevant support services.

Community support was essential for the promotion of social welfare service, especially in locating suitable sites for the related facilities. SWD had been actively seeking suitable sites for setting up social welfare facilities in the community and hoped DCs could give support and cooperate in this respect. For long-term development, SWD would, through its planning, continue to request new public housing estates or private development projects to reserve space for the provision of social welfare facilities. In the medium term of development, SWD would work closely with the EDB and HD to utilise the existing vacant school premises or units, while in the short-run, would look out for vacant premises available in the local community. Members or local personalities were welcomed to suggest any suitable places for the consideration of SWD.

48. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling supplemented that the problem of young night drifters in the Southern District was quite serious and many times youngsters were seen hanging around in the district at night. She knew that venues were provided in both the Warehouse and Stanley for youngsters to have a place to hang out together and have a leisure time. However, since these youngsters did not like to travel far, the young night drifters in the vicinity of Wah Fu and Wah Kwai Estates would not use the facilities at the Warehouse in Aberdeen Main Road. She said that there were quite a number of vacant places in Wah Fu Estate and wondered if they could be used for setting up such facilities for youngsters. She attributed the failure to address the persisting problem of young night drifters in the Southern District to the shortage of social workers specialised in this field. She continued that there was a sign showing that the youth patronage of the Warehouse was dropping in recent years, while the situation in Stanley was better. She hoped that SWD could pay attention to the problem, especially in the vicinity of Pok Fu Lam where residents always complained that the noise made by young night drifters disturbed their sleep.

49. Mr NIP Tak-kuen, JP responded that apart from establishing contacts with young night drifters through overnight outreaching teams at night, SWD had also set up Integrated Children and Youth Services Centres to serve youngsters during daytime. SWD had been keeping close communication with various NGOs and hoped to establish contacts with youngsters for early identification of those requiring welfare services.. Integrated Children and Youth Services Centres would collaborate with district youth outreaching social work teams to provide necessary support, while school social workers also play a very important role in the provision of youth service. Regarding the proposal to open venues for youngsters to hang around, SWD would consider the suitability of the proposed locations with a view to striking the balance between meeting the needs of these young people and the impact on the whole community. SWD hoped to provide the high risk youths with counselling through outreaching service as appropriate and efforts would also be made via internet to reach out to them.

50. The Chairlady said that the problem of young night drifters existed in every district and hoped that SWD could increase the number and manpower of outreaching teams.

51. The Chairlady thanked Mr NIP Tak-kuen, JP and Ms PANG Kit-ling for joining the meeting, and announced a recess of 3 minutes.

(Mr NIP Tak-kuen, JP and Ms PANG Kit-ling left the meeting at 4:46 p.m.)

**Agenda Item 4: Confirmation of the draft minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> SDC meeting held on 12 May 2011**  
**[4:50 p.m. - 4:50 p.m.]**

52. The Chairlady said that prior to the meeting, the draft minutes had been passed on to Members and representatives of the departments concerned, and the Secretariat had not received any amendment proposals.

53. SDC endorsed the minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> SDC meeting.

**Agenda Item 5: Matters Arising from the Last Meeting  
(SDC Paper No. 50/2011)  
[5:00 p.m. - 5:01 p.m.]**

54. Members noted the contents of the paper.

(Ms Wendy TSANG joined the meeting at 5:27 p.m.)

**Agenda Item 6: Application for SDC Fund: Southern District Literary Trail –  
Announce the Landmark Designs by Wall Sticker inside the  
Aberdeen Pedestrian Tunnel and Organise “Creative Writing  
and Flower Plaque Making Programme”  
(SDC Paper No. 56/2011)  
[5:27 p.m. - 5:57 p.m.]**

55. The Chairlady welcomed Ms Wendy TSANG, Assistant Director of the Hong Kong Youth Arts Foundation (HKYAF), to the meeting.

56. The Chairlady asked Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, the Chairlady of the Community Affairs and Publicity Committee (CAPC), to brief Members on the contents of the paper.

57. Ms LAM Yuk-chun said that at its 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 11 April 2011, CAPC endorsed the proposal to organise the “Southern District Literary Trail – Creative Writing and Flower Plaque Making Programme”. It was also preliminarily agreed that the creations of students be showcased around the “World Book Day” (23 April) in 2012 and a major promotion activity be organised to further promote the literary trail. Before seeking funding from SDC, CAPC had invited the Working Group on Promoting the Development of Tourism (the Working Group) to follow up the subject with the organiser and come up with further details based on Members’ views. On the other hand, at the 24<sup>th</sup> CAPC meeting held on 23 May 2011, it was agreed to announce the results of the Southern District Literary Trail Landmark Design Competition by means of wall sticker inside the Aberdeen Pedestrian Tunnel. The Working Group was tasked to follow up on the subject. Having called for initial quotations, it was recommended that SDC should allocate \$40,000 for such purpose.

As the awardees would assist in designing the layout, no design fees were required.

58. The Secretary supplemented that following the resolution made by CAPC, the Secretariat had further discussion with HKYAF with respect to the Committee Members' suggestions, including adding lighting effect to the flower plaques, searching a local site as workshop for flower plaque masters to prepare different components of the plaques (e.g. vacant shops in the Cyberport or Tin Wan Shopping Centre), and staging a major event in parallel with the exhibition of students' artwork for widespread publicity. After site visits and negotiations with the management of the shopping centres, the Secretariat and representatives of HKYAF decided that the vacant shop premises at Tin Wan Shopping Centre were most suitable for this purpose. Besides, preliminary agreement was obtained from The Link Management Limited to sponsor the rent, still the organiser had to pay the management fee, and water and electricity charges. Since such fee and charges were not cheap, the organiser had confined the lease period to around 4 months as far as practicable. As for the proposed activities, the performances and art stalls as recommended by the responsible writers and artists were detailed at Annex 1. The Secretariat would commission a contractor to take care of the overall production. Since the programme was scheduled for late April next year and the flower plaques would be displayed for 2 weeks, this meant the whole project would be carried forward to the next financial year. In this connection, it was recommended that Members should approve the budget for 2011-12 first, and consider giving in principle support to the activities on the exhibition day as listed at Annex 1, and letting the next SDC decide on the allocation of fund together with the budget required for production of the exhibition day in 2012. The material costs for flower plaques and the related installation/dismantling fees could be covered by District Minor Works Fund. Detailed budget breakdown was at Annex 2.

59. Ms Wendy TSANG, with the aid of PowerPoint presentation (Supplementary Information – 3), briefly introduced the “Southern District Literary Trail – Creative Writing and Flower Plaque Making Programme” and the background of the participating writers and artists. She advised that as at the meeting day, 2 secondary schools in the Southern District had indicated interest in joining the programme, one of them was St. Stephen's College. In case the programme did not attract sufficient number of schools in the Southern District, HKYAF would extend the invitations to secondary schools in other districts, and those on the Hong Kong Island will be invited first.

60. As the proposed location for displaying flower plaques was at the waterfront, Mr WONG Ling-sun expressed concern whether the whole structure could stand strong winds.

61. Mr CHAN Fu-ming enquired about how long the flower plaques would be displayed.

62. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling said that it would be for the best if secondary schools in the Southern District instead of from other districts could join the programme. She said that there were a lot of secondary schools in the Southern District, but many of them were quite passive in joining such kind of activity, so she asked the organiser to approach and invite local schools to participate.

63. Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying asked whether the abovementioned St. Stephen's College was the one in Stanley. If yes, she wished to know more about the workshop to be held at the school.

64. Ms Wendy TSANG responded to Members' enquiries as follows:

- HKYAF paid great attention to the structural safety of the exhibits. To this end, metal frames would be installed under the flower plaques, and qualified persons would be appointed to certify the structural safety of the plaques. Since the flower plaque itself was not too heavy, the metal frame should be able to carry the weight of the flower plaque as well as sustain under windy situation. In addition, HKYAF would hire qualified electricians to provide lighting installation to ensure safety;
- as the flower plaques were made of non-durable materials, it was expected that the flower plaques would be displayed outdoor for around 2 weeks. Afterwards, the exhibits would be handed over to the participating schools at their wishes for retention;
- priority would be given to secondary schools in the Southern District. HKYAF would invite secondary schools outside the district on the Hong Kong Island (such as Eastern District and Central/Western District) only when there were inadequate participating schools from within the district. Last year when organising the "Southern District Public Art Project", only 3 or 4 local secondary schools participated in such kind of workshop. If SDC could help and issue invitations, it

might encourage participation of local schools; and

- the “St. Stephen’s College” mentioned previously was the one situated at Stanley. As the school had a very spacious art room, the responsible instructor would bring the materials to the school and conduct the workshop at the school premises. The completed works would be displayed at the Aberdeen promenade.

65. The Chairlady said that local schools were not familiar with this kind of activity, and believed that with SDC issuing letters to the principals of local schools and the Southern District Joint Schools Conference, it should encourage their participation in this programme.

66. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong hoped that regarding the workshop on CAI Yuan-pei, the focus should not be on the design of school emblem and the like. He commented that schools today had imposed too many restrictions on students but giving them little respect. The education philosophy of CAI Yuan-pei advocated support to youth development which should be the focal point of the workshop.

67. The Chairlady thanked Ms Wendy TSANG for joining the meeting.

(Ms Wendy TSANG left the meeting at 5:46 p.m.)

68. The Secretary supplemented that the detailed budget for the whole programme was set out at Annex 2. However, since 10% of the total expenditure would be payable to the organiser as administration costs, in case there were any changes in the activity items on the exhibition day, the administration costs would be adjusted correspondingly. She invited Members to scrutinise the details and decide whether to accept all of the proposed items including performances, guided tour service and art stalls on the exhibition day as recommended by HKYAF.

69. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling asked what the target participants of the 4 guided tours were.

70. The Secretary replied that visitors and spectators on the exhibition day would be the target participants of the guided tours. The tour guides would introduce the exhibits and explain the background of the Southern District Literary Trail to the participants.

71. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling was concerned that only 4 tour groups could hardly meet the demand of the many visitors.

72. The Secretary said that a production company would be commissioned next year for organising the exhibition day, the number and arrangements of guided tours could be further discussed then. She believed that if Members deemed it necessary, the number of guided tours could be increased but the expenditure would have to increase too.

73. The Chairlady asked whether Members agreed to the budget as set out at Annex 2.

74. SDC endorsed the budget as set out at Annex 2, and agreed to:

- allocate \$291,800 under the Community Involvement Projects Fund for 2011-12 to meet the expenditure under items 1, 2 and 4;
- give in principle support to the expenditures of art stalls and performances on the exhibition day, and let the next SDC decide on the allocation of fund together with the budget required for production of the exhibition programme in 2012; and
- endorse the fund application for items 2 and 3 under the District Minor Works Fund.

75. The Chairlady asked whether Members agreed an allocation of \$40,000 for the display of the results of Southern District Literary Trail Landmark Design Competition on the inner walls of the Aberdeen Pedestrian Tunnel.

76. SDC endorsed the aforesaid funding allocation.

(Mr Albert WONG, Mr NG Ka-shu, Mr Bernard WONG, Ms Jennifer TAM, Mr Ken LEE and Mr Dennis CHIU joined the meeting at 5:18 p.m.)

**Agenda Item 7: The Latest Development of the Initial Proposal for Constructing a Park at the Site Previously Reserved for Route No. 4 in Tin Wan**

**(SDC Paper No. 51/2011)**

**[5:18 p.m. - 6:10 p.m. and 6:58 p.m. – 7:12 p.m.]**

77. The Chairlady welcomed the following representatives from government departments and MTR Corporation Limited (MTRC) to the meeting, and advised that Mr CHING Yuet, Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 5 (Acting) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), was unable to make it on time due to other commitments, and hoped that Miss KWONG Lai-fong, regular representative of LCSD, could respond to the enquiries on Mr CHING's behalf.

- Mr Albert WONG, Senior Engineer /South Island Line (East) (Acting), Highways Department (HyD);
- Mr NG Ka-shu, Senior Town Planner/HK 5, PlanD;
- Mr Bernard WONG, Senior Liaison Engineer, MTRC;
- Ms Jennifer TAM, Assistant Public Relations Manager – Projects & Property, MTRC;
- Mr Ken LEE, Senior Design Management Engineer – Civil, MTRC;  
and
- Mr Dennis CHIU, Design Management Engineer I – Civil, MTRC.

78. The Chairlady said that the development of the site previously reserved for Route No. 4 in Tin Wan (the reserved site) had been discussed at the 18<sup>th</sup> SDC meeting held on 16 September 2010. It was unanimously agreed that the site should be developed into a park under the Public Works Programme (PWP). Given that the application procedure for PWP funding was complicated and time-consuming, SDC subsequently requested and MTRC agreed to convert part of the site into a park with simple amenities at the same when the land was being used as a temporary nursery for the South Island Line (SIL) (East) project, so that residents could enjoy the open space as soon as possible. The construction cost would be borne by MTRC, which also agreed to responsible for the repair and maintenance of the park for the first 10 years. The construction of SIL(E) project had commenced recently, and MTRC had drawn up a preliminary design for the park, which would be presented at the meeting later for Members' comments.

79. Mr Albert WONG said that based on the construction plan for SIL(E), the reserved site near Wah Kwai Estate would be used as a temporary nursery for the railway project. In response to SDC's request, MTRC agreed to convert the nursery into a park with basic amenities for use by the public. On 3 June 2011, TPB gave in-principle approval to rezone the site as Open Space. However, since there were still other sites previously reserved for Route No. 4 in Pok Fu Lam area required excision, TPB considered that the application of re-zoning should not be implemented until the overall planning review was completed. Therefore, PlanD would review the overall planning of Pok Fu Lam area based on the advice of TPB, and then report to SDC for consultation in due course before the long-term use of the site was implemented.

80. Mr Bernard WONG said that he hoped a consensus could be reached with SDC on the design of the proposed park for the early commencement of the works. He explained that a simplicity approach would be adopted for the design of the park with greening and leisure as the main themes, and would highlight the natural beauty of the waterfront landscape.

81. Mr Ken LEE briefly introduced the preliminary design of the park with the aid of PowerPoint presentation (Reference Information – 5). The proposed park would be close to Wah Kwai Estate and have 3 entrances. The main entrance would be located near Wah Lai House and the existing football field, and a second entrance would be located near the basketball court and Ka Sing House. The third entrance would be located near the tennis court. A variety of facilities for leisure activities would be provided, such as a jogging path along the seawall, an elevated timber deck overlooking the sea and sitting benches along the path. The trees affected by the SIL(E) project would be transplanted to the park also. Since the site was unsewered, visitors had to use the toilet near the entrance of the park.

82. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling said that MTRC agreed to construct a park at the site was good news to the residents but the design was too simple. There was no cover over the sitting benches and practically nothing in the entire park that could allow people to take shelter from the rain, which was very inconvenient for people who visited the park. At a consultation meeting held recently, Mr CHAN Fu-ming had suggested a cover over the elevated deck, but it seemed MTRC did not follow up on the proposal. Nevertheless, she welcomed MTRC to take the advice of Members to increase the number of entrances of the park to 3, but hoped that more amenities could be provided, such as a nursery for Chinese herbs and a children's playground.

She noted that there was a toilet near the second entrance of the park, which had been closed for years and was managed by HD at the moment. However, the toilet was not a proper one with only 1 cubicle and 1 changing room, and was dilapidated because of improper maintenance all these years. If it were to be re-opened for public use, HD should remodel it to provide more cubicles so as to bring convenience to the users of the park. Furthermore, a driveway separated the toilet near the football field and the park entrance. It would take 5 minutes to make a detour to the toilet without crossing the driveway, thus many people would probably just choose to walk across the driveway, which was quite dangerous.

83 Ir CHAN Lee-sing, JP said that the whole design was too simple. Since the park was on the waterfront, if wind-solar hybrid power LED lightings were used, it could save the trouble of laying cable, thus the cost could be reduced.

84. Mr CHAI Man-hon thanked MTRC for adding another entrance leading to the tennis court since the location would be linked to the waterfront promenade under study by SDC. He pointed out that this location was strategic for linking Aberdeen with Pok Fu Lam. He asked HD whether the toilet near the second entrance could be opened for public use. It was noted that the toilet had not been used for years and many people regarded this as a waste of resources. He further enquired that if the toilet were to be opened for use, would HD continue to manage it; if not, would MTRC take over its management. He saw no reason to spend extra money to build a new one when there was already a ready-made toilet. On the other hand, he asked MTRC if it would make the facilities in the park more convenient to people in response to the requests of some Members, for example, installing benches with cover and building rain shelter or pavilion. Indeed, all these did not cost much.

85. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong proposed that: (a) without increasing the cost too much, MTRC should consider setting up a fitness area which was a standard facility in most open areas; (b) as the waterfront of the park overlooked the Pacific Ocean and South China Sea, directional signs could be designed like some tourist spots, showing information on the waters ahead. This could strengthen national education and enable visitors of the park to learn something about the territorial waters of China, such as the locations of Nansha and Tungsha; and (c) the ratio of female lavatories based on the standard set by the Architectural Services Department was usually too low, it resulted that a long queue was formed outside female lavatories in many places. As the park was relatively remote, the department concerned should give more consideration in this aspect.

86. Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung enquired if MTRC would consider providing more diversified facilities at the park, including a fitness area for the elderly and children's playground. She further asked if HD would restore the vacant toilet and provide more facilities.

87. Mr LEUNG Ho-kwan, MH welcomed the greening design of the park. In tree planting, he suggested that more flowering varieties should be selected to give more different shades of colour to the park, and pointed out that flowering seasons could attract visitors. He also hoped that more amenity lawns could be provided to make the landscape of the park more spectacular.

88. Mr CHAN Fu-ming was satisfied with the design of the park and hoped that a cover could be constructed over the elevated deck.

89. Mr TSUI Yuen-wa expressed concerned over tree management, saying he learned at the previous SDC meeting that some of the trees affected by the clearance works at Wong Chuk Hang would be transplanted. Subsequently, he received a lot of complaints about MTRC cutting down trees inside Wong Chuk Hang area and at the temporary bus terminus without prior notification to the Members of the constituencies concerned and SDC. Many trees of 20 to 30 years old were felled and meanwhile, the works to cut down the remaining trees was continued. He criticised that the course action of MTRC was a typical example of presenting the accomplished facts without prior notification, and suspected that with most of the trees being cut down, there would be no tree required transplantation to the proposed park. He pointed out that SDC was practically cheated and such an act was in breach of the environmental impact assessment report submitted previously. He asked MTRC how to explain its action and what measures would be taken to compensate the misdeed. He demanded MTRC to stop cutting down the trees immediately and a consultation should be conducted with the Members of the constituencies concerned and the local residents first.

90. Mr MAK Chi-yan thanked MTRC for taking up the responsibility to construct the park and to maintain it for the following 10 years. He enquired about the management mechanism of the park and wanted to know if MTRC would co-manage it with other government departments.

91. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH welcomed MTRC to present the design of the proposed park at SDC. She said that with an area of 60 m<sup>2</sup>, the elevated deck should

be provided with a rain shelter.

92. Mr Bernard WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- In transplanting trees affected by construction works, the process would be handled according to the established mechanism as laid down by the Government, which included identifying the affected trees, determining if the trees should be removed or preserved in-situ, and if the trees were to be removed, should they be preserved. In principle, trees that had conservation values and high survival rate would be preserved for transplanting, while those had low conservation values or of poor health would be removed. Basing on these principles and mechanism, MTRC submitted its design proposal to the government department concerned and approval had been obtained before the commencement of works. The tree removal being carried out at Wong Chuk Hang Estate had obtained approval according to established procedures.
- Since the site of the aforesaid park had not been opened for use yet, the trees preserved for future transplantation had been transported to the nursery in Chung Hum Shan for conservation.
- MTRC would actively consider Members' suggestions, including adding covers to benches, installing LED lightings and providing fitness area, and would try to meet the local expectations with its limited budget. The proposals put forward would not affect the general design of the park.
- MTRC had already invited tenders for the construction of the park and would submit a report later to explain the construction details.
- As for the question whether MTRC could take over the management of facilities under the purview of HD or The Link, MTRC normally would not manage non-railway projects, while the arrangement to manage the aforesaid park for 10 years was a first for the corporation. In practice, it would be difficult for MTRC to manage other facilities that did not belong to the park. MTRC was now working with related departments on a suitable management mode for the park and hoped to come up with the simplest procedure for managing the park properly.

93. Mr Ken LEE supplemented that on tree varieties, the Queen's Crape Myrtles as shown in the PowerPoint just then was only a small part of the trees to be transplanted. In fact, the number of trees required transplanting was considerable

and their varieties were plenty. MTRC would discuss the overall landscape design with the design company and would try to provide as many amenity lawns as possible.

94. The Chairlady said that the suggestions of Members were to perfect the design of the park, and hoped that MTRC could do a good job on it. Regarding the tree removal in Wong Chuk Hang, the issue could be followed up by the District Development and Environment Committee.

95. Mr TSUI Yuen-wa said that the tree removal works of MTRC was already underway and the situation was urgent. He was very dissatisfied with MTRC for not consulting SDC first and demanded the works to be stopped immediately.

96. The Chairlady asked MTRC to hold the works first and liaise with Members of the contingencies concerned after the meeting to resolve the problem properly.

97. Mr IP Yu-sun advised that the toilet was closed for quite some time at the request of local residents because of a sex offence case happened there years ago. In response to the suggestion of Members, HD would consult the residents of Ka Lung Court and Wah Kwai Estate on re-opening the toilet. At present, the toilet was jointly owned by The Link and HD, with two-third of ownership belonged to The Link, while HD was mainly responsible for its management. As the toilet was closed for years, renovation works would be needed and consent from The Link was required before it could be re-opened for public use. At present, the area outside the park was managed by a property management company hired by HD.

98. The Chairlady said that as the public toilet was located near Ka Lung Court, HD should consult the residents in Ka Lung Court beforehand.

99. Mr IP Yu-sun thanked the Chairlady for her suggestion, and proposed that the changing room inside the toilet could be converted to provide more cubicles.

100. The Chairlady said that the toilet should be remodeled according to the specifications as set out in the current standard before it could be opened for public use. However, the residents in Ka Lung Court should be consulted beforehand.

101. Mr IP Yu-sun agreed with the Chairlady's view, and said that a consultation on the opening hours of the toilet would be conducted.

102. Noting that the toilet in the water feature plaza was closed due to an incident occurred there, Mrs MAK TSE How-ling said that with the commissioning of the park in future, it would bring more people flow to the area and the surroundings should not be so desolate, thus the problem should be solved easily. She hoped that The Link could give support to this proposal to benefit the residents.

103. The Chairlady said that the matter should be discussed with The Link, and believed that Mr IP Yu-sun would help solve this problem. MTRC had promised to maintain the park for the first 10 years, after that, LCSD should take over its management. She asked Mr Albert WONG about the arrangements for the park 10 years later.

104. Mr Albert WONG said that LCSD and the departments concerned had noted the matter, and would discuss the long-term arrangements for developing the site with respect to the progress of the rezoning exercise.

105. The Chairlady asked Mr NG Ka-shu about the timetable for rezoning the site.

106. Mr NG Ka-shu said that at its meeting dated 3 June, TPB had indicated that in principle, it had no objection to rezoning the site concerned as Open Space, however, as the site was part of the reserved land for Route No. 4, it was opined that the related plan should be amended as a whole. PlanD had been reviewing the land use planning for the site, and it was expected that the results would be published and implemented next year. HyD and LCSD would further discuss the arrangements for the park after its commissioning 10 years later.

107. The Chairlady hoped that LCSD and HyD would not wait 10 years to start discussion on the arrangements for the park. She also asked MTRC to note Members' views on park facilities.

108. Mr Bernard WONG said that, he would discuss with Mr TSUI Yuen-wa on tree removal in Wong Chuk Hang after the meeting. He emphasised that the arrangement for trees affected by construction works had already been covered in the environmental impact assessment report, details of which had been uploaded to the MTRC website and mentioned at SDC meetings last year. MTRC would make its best possible efforts to retain the existing trees and minimise the impact of

transplanting on trees.

109. The Chairlady suggested that to relieve Mr TSUI Yuen-wa's concern, MTRC should explain the matter to him in detail.

110. Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP said that the Focus Group on the South Island Line Scheme (the Focus Group) had requested MTRC to bear the repair and maintenance fees for the first 10 years after the commissioning of the park, so that LCSD could have sufficient time to apply for Public Works Fund for provision of a proper park at the request of SDC recently. At that time, LCSD representative estimated that it would take 10 years to procure the fund. As such, LCSD should take over the management or development of the park after the 10-year period. On the other hand, in paragraph 4 of the written reply of LCSD, it was stated that after the land zoning review for Pok Fu Lam area had been completed, depending on the progress and result of the review on land rezoning, LCSD would discuss with relevant government departments for the proper arrangements on the long-term development of the site. He asked LCSD to clarify and respond whether it would proceed work according to the conclusion at the previous meeting of the Focus Group.

111. Since Mr CHING Yuet had not yet arrived, the Chairlady asked whether Miss KWONG Kai-fong could respond to the enquiries on Mr CHING's behalf.

112. Miss KWONG Kai-fong said that Mr CHING Yuet of the Planning Division was late for this meeting because he had to attend another meeting in Kwun Tong. She asked if the Chairlady could wait for him to respond to Members' enquiries.

113. Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP said that this meeting was the last one for the current DC term and that it might not be possible for the Focus Group to convene another meeting by 15 September. Therefore, it was important for SDC to clearly reiterate its stance in this meeting and request LCSD to proceed application for Public Works Fund for provision of the park as soon as possible, thus ensuring a smooth handover 10 years later.

114. The Chairlady asked the Secretary to write to the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS) to request LCSD to proceed fund application for provision of a park at the site, and ask for a reply.

115. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong shared the view of Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP that the

meeting was the last one for the current DC term, and the enquiries were put to LCSD for a response, it was unreasonable to say that it could not give a reply because the department representative was absent. Even if a written request was forwarded to DLCS, there would be no further meeting to follow up on this matter, which was very undesirable. He criticised LCSD for showing disrespect to SDC, and felt extremely disappointed and dissatisfied.

116. The Chairlady asked the Secretary to write to LCSD regarding the concerns and enquiries of the Member concerned, and that its reply should be appended to the minutes of the meeting for follow up in future.

117. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong held that even if the responsible officer had not arrived yet, the other department representative could also obtain the information over the phone. He did not understand how a department could operate this way. The issue in question was a very important district matter, the way LCSD handling that subject was unacceptable.

118. Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP also opined that the way LCSD handled this agenda item was improper, and that the responsible officer had been late for more than an hour without calling the other colleague at the meeting to respond to the enquiries on his behalf which had affected the entire progress of the meeting.

119. Miss KWONG Lai-fong apologised for the arrangement on the day and explained that Mr CHING Yuet could not join the meeting on time because he had another meeting at Kwun Tong DC on the same day. Mr CHING had just phoned in that he was on the way.

120. The Chairlady stated that the discussion on the matter would be put on hold until Mr CHING's arrival.

121. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling supplemented that residents had suggested that the opening hours of the park should be confined to 6:00 a.m. till 11:00 p.m. to avoid young night drifters from hanging around in the park, thus causing nuisances to residents in the neighbourhood.

122. The Chairlady announced a recess.

(Mr CHING Yuet joined the meeting at 6:58 p.m.)

123. The Chairlady said that Mr CHING Yuet had arrived, and asked him to respond to the discussions on Agenda Item 7 and Members' enquiries.

124. The Chairlady said that MTRC had already agreed to develop a temporary park at the reserved site and to be responsible for its repair and maintenance for the first 10 years. She asked Mr CHING to respond to matters concerning the arrangements of the park after the expiry of the 10-year period, the plan of LCSD on the provision of the park under PWP, and the enquiries put forward by Members.

125. Mr CHING Yuet apologised to Members for his late arrival because of other engagement in the Kwun Tong DC meeting. He understood Members' concern on the planning of the site, and MTRC had already agreed to bear the construction costs and operation and maintenance fees for the first 10 years. As PlanD was reviewing the land use planning in Pok Fu Lam area, LCSD would consider the long-term development of the site after the completion of the planning review. MTRC would be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the site for the next 10 years. LCSD was of the view that it was premature at this stage to consider the planning of a park and its amenities which would only come on stream 10 years later. LCSD would discuss with other departments concerned on suitable land use planning for the site in due course, having regard local demand for open space at the time.

126. The Chairlady said that it generally took a long time to apply for Public Works Fund from the Government. If preparatory work started too late, project schedule would be very tight, and also in case fund allocation was not approved in time, the park would be left unattended.

127. Mr CHING Yuet responded that an established mechanism was in place for funding application of Capital Works Programme, and the timing for submission may not necessarily determine the priority of funding application. LCSD understood that planning work took time, and would start the planning work at an appropriate time.

128. Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP said that DC had already resolved to provide a park at the site under PWP, therefore, LCSD should have proceeded with the preparation for fund application immediately. Since it happened that SIL(E) would utilise the site as a temporary plant nursery, SDC took this opportunity to ask MTRC to construct a park with simple amenities so that the public could enjoy the open space as early as possible. Probably Mr CHING Yuet had not participated in the

previous discussions with MTRC on the construction of a park with simple amenities. At these meetings, SDC had made it clear that MTRC was requested to bear the responsibility of repair and management of the park for the first 10 years, in order that LCSD could have sufficient lead-time to apply for Public Works Fund to provide a standard and full-scale park for public enjoyment. The stance of SDC was very clear and LCSD representative at the meetings had no objection to it at that time. He did not understand why now LCSD had replied that fund application would not be proceeded until a few years later. He pointed out that if fund application was delayed, the park would be let unattended during the transitional period, and there would be no easy way to handle the situation. He was discontented with the reply of LCSD and said this was not what a responsible government should do.

129. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong was in support of Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP's views. He said that residential development under the Home Ownership Scheme only took 7 years to complete, it had just gone too far if SDC had to take 10 years to construct a park. Unless LCSD had no intention to take over from the very beginning, and had wanted to surrender the site to PlanD to rezone for other purposes 10 years later, otherwise LCSD should commence work according to the established practice. He understood Mr CHING had a busy schedule, but it was simply unacceptable that SDC had to wait for such a long time just to get this reply. If LCSD and its representative had no idea that SDC had already had a clear stance on the long-term development of the site, then he was afraid that after the meeting, Members would have to carry out a sit-in outside the office of DLCS to make DLCS take note of the expectations of SDC. He criticised Mr CHING for showing disrespect to SDC and did not have a thorough understanding of the matter.

130. The Chairlady said that Mr CHING Yuet was late for the meeting because of hold-ups in another DC meeting, so Mr CHING should be excused. However, as SDC had already resolved to construct a park on the site, LCSD should not commence follow-up work too late to avoid taking over the site from MTRC in a hasty manner.

131. Mr CHAI Man-hon said that at the moment, the biggest problem now was that the Government had centralised its power without knowing how to use it - the Government delegated its authority to individual departments but in the end did not know which departments were responsible for respective work areas. He opined that the construction of the park could have been resolved on district level, however, there was no more Urban Council and it was not possible to ask LCSD to take care of this matter. He said that the Government's decision to abolish Urban Council was wrong,

which made SDC had to bear the consequences in the end, which was unreasonable. What could be done now was to consider the next step based on the source of authority. In fact, 10 years were a long time, and LCSD could use the first 2 years to work out the overall design of the park, engage in public consultation, draw up a timetable detailing the commencement time for each action item (including the lead-time for fund application and so on), and see if 10 years were enough to accomplish all targets. The most fundamental thing was LCSD should clearly respond whether it would agree to SDC's recommendation that the park at the site should be constructed under PWP. SDC had asked MTRC to convert the plant nursery into a temporary park and be responsible for its management for the first 10 years, on the premise that LCSD would take over its management subsequently. If LCSD did not plan to take over the management 10 years later, the park would be left unattended. The park site was a public asset and an open space for the public, it should not be left waste. He requested LCSD to provide a timetable for commencement of related work and relevant procedures, including which aspects SDC should lend its support, so as to achieve the target schedule within 10 years. If 3 DC terms had passed without making any progress, then alternative ways would be explored to achieve the objective.

132. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling said that Members hoped to reflect their concerns to LCSD. MTRC had already agreed to construct an amenity park with provision of jogging track, viewing deck and so on, however, all these facilities and trees should be taken care of properly so that the general public could enjoy a scenic and relaxing open space. To this end, she asked Mr CHING Yuet to reflect the local needs to LCSD and apply for Public Works Fund as soon as possible, so as to further revitalise and develop the park.

133. Noting that the meeting had just thoroughly discussed the agenda item and a conclusion had been drawn, Mr WONG Che-ngai, MH asked if LCSD representative would give a supplementary response now.

134. The Chairlady wished that apart from responding to Members' enquiries, Mr CHING could listen to the views and expectations of SDC. Since the Government had a mechanism in place for fund application for the construction of park, she hoped that LCSD could commence the related work according to the established procedures. The Chairlady reiterated that the park built and managed by MTRC would be handed over to LCSD in future. If its planning work and fund application started too late, there might be a possibility that it could not tie-in with the handover period. She

urged Mr CHING to commence preparatory work as soon as possible, and reflect the expectations and concerns of SDC to DLCS.

135. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong suggested requesting LCSD to provide a written reply within 2 weeks.

136. Mr CHING Yuet said that although he had not participated in the previous discussions, he was very clear about the expectations and views of SDC. In order to avoid abortive work, LCSD was of the view that the Park to be designed and constructed by MTRC should be implemented in the first step. Then, at a suitable time, LCSD would propose the scope of works for long-term development of the Park in accordance with the prevalent mechanism. As such, LCSD wished to study and work out the planning according to a timeline that the new park would be provided 10 years later. On the other hand, LCSD had all along attached great importance to the care of trees, and would have close liaison with MTRC to prevent any negligence in this aspect.

137. In closing, the Chairlady said that the park would definitely be handed over to LCSD for operation in future, and believed that LCSD would discharge its duties fully, so Members should not be so worried about it and give LCSD enough time for the preparatory work.

(Mr CHING Yuet joined the meeting at 6:58 p.m.)

(Mr Albert WONG, Mr Bernard WONG, Ms Jennifer TAM, Mr Ken LEE, Mr Dennis CHIU and Mr CHING Yuet left the meeting at 7:12 p.m.)

**Agenda Item 8: Motion Debate: Request the Government to Actively Consider Building a Second Passageway between Ap Lei Chau and Aberdeen**  
**(SDC Paper No. 52/2011)**  
**[6:11 p.m. - 6:55 p.m.]**

138. The Chairlady welcomed Mr TAM Chung-on, Senior Engineer/Southern & Peak of the Transport Department (TD), to the meeting.

139. The Chairlady said that Mr WONG Che-ngai, MH had moved the following

motion which was seconded by 5 Members, namely Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung and Ir CHAN Lee-shing, JP:

“The population of Ap Lei Chau is already over 100 000 and the traffic flow has been increasing. To cater for the huge traffic burden of Ap Lei Chau Bridge, this Council requests the Government to actively consider building a second passageway between Ap Lei Chau and Aberdeen.”

140. The Chairlady asked Mr WONG Che-ngai, MH to briefly introduce the reasons for raising the motion, and reminded that the presenters of the motion (including the seconders) would be allotted a total of 5 minutes to speak. The Secretary would ring the bell once at 4 minutes 30 seconds of the speaking slot, and twice when it reached 5 minutes.

141. Mr WONG Che-ngai, MH said the first Ap Lei Chau Bridge had come into operation 31 years ago since 28 March 1980. As the bridge had only one lane for each direction and was incapable of meeting the traffic needs, the residents in Ap Lei Chau then formed a joint committee to demand for the construction of a second bridge. Subsequently, the Government, having considered various factors including economic ones, decided to widen the then Ap Lei Chau Bridge in-situ in 1994, which was 17 years ago. In the past 30 years, Ap Lei Chau had undergone great changes and its population had grown significantly. According to statistics, there were nearly 92 000 people living in Ap Lei Chau, and its population density was recorded in the Guinness World Records as the most densely populated island in the world, and its population was still growing. The recent luxury housing project Larvotto provided 715 residential units. It was expected that when all the households moved in, the residential development would increase the traffic burden of Ap Lei Chau by 500 to 600 private cars. As an elected Member of Ap Lei Chau constituency, Mr WONG said that the Government should prepare well ahead of time and actively explore the construction of a second passageway between Ap Lei Chau and Aberdeen. Past experience showed that it usually took a very long time for the development of major transport facilities as requested by SDC to materialise. For example, it took almost 10 years for the SIL(E) project to bear fruit. Because of this, although this was the

last meeting for the current DC term, he and several of his fellow Members still took this opportunity to put forward this motion to ask the Government to actively explore the construction of a second passageway between Ap Lei Chau and Aberdeen. In the motion, it did not state the type of passageway to be built, the purpose of which was to allow more room for the Government to explore the most suitable option to take forward the proposal. He hoped Members could support this motion.

142. Ir CHAN Lee-shing, JP said the second passageway was not necessarily a flyover for vehicles and its main function was not to cope with the traffic volume. Ap Lei Chau Bridge was currently the only vehicular passageway in Ap Lei Chau, and whenever traffic accidents occurred on the bridge, they caused serious traffic congestion irrespective of the time period. If the schedule of public transport could not run normally, the traffic in Aberdeen and other districts would be affected as a result. Thus, considering it from risk management, it was very important to provide an alternative route to address or relieve the traffic congestion during traffic accidents, even though the existing Ap Lei Chau Bridge had not reach its full capacity.

143. Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung said that with this motion, she hoped to draw the attention of relevant departments on the traffic congestion problem in Ap Lei Chau and urged them to consider another passageway to minimise the effects of traffic accidents on Ap Lei Chau.

144. The Chairlady advised that she had just received a motion for amendment put forward by Mr FUNG Wai-kwong, Mr CHAI Man-hon and Mr TSUI Yuen-wa. Saved for the first sentence, the contents were very different from the original motion:

“The population of Ap Lei Chau is already over 100 000 and the traffic flow has been increasing. **This Council requests the Government to assess the traffic volume and the effectiveness of area traffic control system in coping with traffic problems after the commissioning of the South Island Link, explain the reasons why the previous plan for a second Ap Lei Chau bridge was abandoned, and explore various options to minimise the traffic impacts brought about by the traffic congestion on Ap Lei Chau Bridge.**”

145. The Chairlady commented that the contents of the original motion were more direct and precise, while the motion for amendment was quite complicated.

146. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong said that the core of this agenda item was to address the traffic problems and the spirit of the original motion was also targeted at traffic problems, so he wanted to clearly elaborate this point.

147. The Chairlady considered that the contents of the original motion were direct and precise, which were quite different from the contents of motion submitted just then. Therefore, she suggested treating it as a provisional motion instead of a motion for amendment. She further asked the Members concerned why they did not submit their amendment proposal before the meeting and whether they agreed to treat it as a provisional motion.

148. Mr TSUI Yuen-wa said that they had not assumed that the Chairlady would turn down their motion for amendment, and even if its contents were long and elaborated, the motion should not be rejected because it was cumbersome.

149. The Chairlady said that the contents of the motion for amendment were very different from those in the original motion, and asked if the 3 Members would agree to regard it as a provisional motion.

150. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong, Mr CHAI Man-hon and Mr TSUI Yuen-wa agreed to change the above “motion for amendment” to provisional motion.

151. The Chairlady accepted the provisional motion put forward by the 3 Members.

152. Mr WONG Che-ngai, MH said that SDC had recently endorsed the proposal of the Chairlady that all motions should be submitted within a prescribed period prior to the meeting in accordance with the Standing Orders. Even if it was a motion for amendment, Members still had to submit it to the Secretariat beforehand instead of raising it at the meeting. In fact, the motion he put forth for this meeting had been included in the discussion papers, so if other Members wished to submit a motion for

amendment, they should do so by notifying the Secretariat prior to meeting for the necessary arrangement. By accepting the provisional motion as raised by the 3 Members, the Chairlady was in breach of the previous judgment. He understood that according to the Standing Orders, the Chairlady had the right to decide if a provisional motion were to be accepted. However, based on the contents of the motion, it seemed that the motion newly proposed was very different from the original one, so he agreed with the Chairlady's decision to treat it as another motion instead of a motion for amendment.

153. Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH said that recently when seeking to address the situation in which many provisional motions were put forward at meeting, the Chairlady ruled that provisional motions raised at meeting would not be accepted unless they concerned with matters which were reasonably urgent in nature. As far as the general contents were concerned, the provisional motion put forward just then was quite different from the original motion. Basically, it was a totally different proposal, so he regarded it as a new motion. Based on the earlier judgment, a provisional motion would be accepted only if the matter concerned was urgent.

154. The Chairlady said that according to the Standing Orders, all agenda items or motions should be submitted to the Secretariat at least 12 working days prior to the meeting, and Members should not submit provisional motions at the meetings constantly. The Chairlady agreed that the aforesaid provisional motion was not an urgent matter and therefore should be turned down according to the established code of practice. If the purpose of SDC raising this motion was to request the Government to study the feasibility of providing a second passageway connecting Ap Lei Chau, it appeared that there was no need to amend the motion.

155. Mr TSUI Yuen-wa said that although the Chairlady had already stated the aforesaid arrangement but it had never been actually implemented, as at the last meeting, the Chairlady had accepted a provisional motion submitted jointly by him, Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN. As such, he opined that the judgment just made was inconsistent with the past practice. Moreover, he hoped that Members should not jump to the conclusion that the aforesaid amendment was a new motion because they intended to amend the motion only.

156. Mr CHAI Man-hon said that Order 17 of the Standing Orders only

mentioned that motions should be submitted 12 working days prior to the meeting, and did not stipulate a deadline for putting forward a motion for amendment. Putting aside the issue whether the Chairlady should strictly enforce the code of practice, he opined that the most important question was whether the aforesaid proposal could be qualified as a motion for amendment. He had put forward the motion with a view to requesting the Government to assess the traffic volume and the effectiveness of area traffic control system after the commissioning of SIL(E), and explain why the proposal on a second bridge in Ap Lei Chau was abandoned. Such information could enable the Government to explore the feasibility of various options to address the traffic problems caused by traffic congestion at Ap Lei Chau Bridge, such as building a second bridge, construction of an immersed tunnel, provision of ferry services and so on. He wished that Members should consider carefully whether the proposal had really deviated from the direction of the original motion. He also said that he would object to the Chairlady's judgment if the proposal as set out in the motion for amendment was one of the options to solve the traffic problem.

157. The Chairlady asked the 3 Members concerned to clarify whether the proposal was a motion for amendment or a new motion.

158. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong said that the proposal was a motion for amendment, and explained that he agreed to treat it as a new motion because he did not want the Chairlady to reject it.

159. Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP asked Mr FUNG Wai-kwong to read out the motion for amendment again.

160. Mr CHAI Man-hon read out the motion for amendment again.

161. Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH opined that the motion for amendment had fundamental drawbacks and its contents had deviated greatly from the original motion, therefore, he did not agree, without justifications, to regard a proposal that totally diverged from its original subject an amendment. He asked whether the Chairlady accept the motion for amendment as put forward by the 3 Members concerned.

162. Mr MAK Chi-yan held that it was up to the Chairlady to judge whether the aforesaid motion was an amendment or a new one. If it was deemed a motion for amendment, the Chairlady should ask Members to vote for it, otherwise she could just reject it.

163. The Chairlady considered that the proposal put forward by the 3 Members concerned was a motion for amendment which should be voted together with the original motion.

164. As the presenter of the original motion, Mr WONG Che-ngai, MH objected to treating the proposal as an amendment. However, he would respect the Chairlady's judgment and vote against it.

165. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong said that the spirit of raising a motion for amendment was to consider effective solutions to issues. In this case, it was essential to consider 2 points: (1) the completion of SIL(E); and (2) in the past, some Members had objected to constructing a second bridge, and it was necessary to prudently consider whether it would be a waste of public money to provide a second passageway in the face of the commencement of SIL(E). He opined that traffic control would probably be more effective in managing the traffic conditions in the Southern District. He understood that the traffic problem was serious, but it was not possible to add infrastructure endlessly, which would be a waste of public money.

166. Mr CHAI Man-hon found it strange about the proposal to build a second bridge in Ap Lei Chau, as Ap Lei Chau Bridge, being built long ago, had not shown any signs of great changes. In the 1980s to 90s, the Southern District had a hot debate on whether Ap Lei Chau Bridge should be widened or a second bridge should be provided. At that time, the views were represented by 2 camps: one of which opined that Ap Lei Chau Bridge should be widened, while the other camp suggested that a second bridge should be provided in the vicinity of South Horizons connecting to Aberdeen. Because of various reasons, the option of widening Ap Lei Chau Bridge was adopted. At the end of 1990s, there was a second chance to provide a second bridge, on the premise that Ap Lei Chau Waterfront Promenade should be converted to a carriageway connecting the shipyard area and Shum Wan. Subsequently, the proposal was again shelved because of reclamation issue, public expectation for the provision of a park in the northern promenade, construction of SIL(E) and disputes arising from shipyards. As proposed, if a second bridge were to be provided at Ap Lei Chau Praya Road, probably Shum Wan Road would be used as a junction, thus affecting the traffic there. He opined that the provision of a second bridge could not necessarily alleviate traffic congestion in Ap Lei Chau, and therefore suggested assessing the traffic conditions and the effectiveness of traffic control system after the commissioning of SIL(E) first before pursuing the subject further. He emphasised that the motion for amendment did not intend to reject the proposal of

a second bridge in Ap Lei Chau, he just hoped to conduct a thorough study before drawing a conclusion, thus avoiding coming up with a proposal out of unconstrained imagination. With the upcoming DC Election, he felt that many topics were put forward for electioneering purpose. He thanked the Chairlady for accepting the aforesaid motion for amendment and the agenda item on reviewing the effectiveness of district work carried out by SDC, and hoped Members could support the motion for amendment.

167. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling said that the original motion was precise and concise, and expressed explicitly that the motion was moved because of the over-burdened traffic at Ap Lei Chau Bridge by increasing traffic flow. She opined that whether the traffic control system was directly related to traffic congestion was not the crux of the problem. In addition, the original motion aimed at requesting the Government to actively study whether a second passageway should be provided for connecting Ap Lei Chau and Aberdeen. She drew Members' attention to the difference between the 2 motions.

168. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH said that a lot of time had been spent on this topic, and hoped that the Chairlady could proceed voting on the original motion and motion for amendment as soon as possible.

169. Mr TSUI Yuen-wa said that from the technical aspect, it was not easy to search a suitable site for building a second bridge, and even if the original motion was endorsed by SDC, it could probably take 20 years to implement the proposal, and by that time, SIL(E) had already commenced operation, and the traffic conditions would be greatly different. In addition, some large-scale residential developments, such as Marina Habitat, Larvotto and Sham Wan Towers, had a total population of 8 000 residents only, accounting for 10% of the total population in Ap Lei Chau. SDC should consider whether it was reasonable to build a second bridge just because the population increased by 10%. Without knowing the transport needs and conditions of Ap Lei Chau in future, he doubted whether the request for building a second passageway could be justified. Lastly, a Member had said that Ap Lei Chau Bridge had already burdened with traffic, however, it was always mentioned that traffic congestion happened at Aberdeen Tunnel instead of Ap Lei Chau Bridge, but seldom about traffic accidents in Ap Lei Chau causing serious traffic congestion inside the district. In this connection, he asked Members to carefully consider the aforesaid issues before making a decision.

170. The Chairlady invited Members to vote for the motion for amendment first. The motion for amendment was rejected with 3 votes for it (namely Mr FUNG Wai-kwong, Mr TSUI Yuen-wa and Mr CHAI Man-hon), 6 votes against it (namely Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung, Mr WONG Che-ngai, MH, Ir CHAN Lee-shing, JP, Mrs MAK TSE How-ling, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH and Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH) and 11 abstentions (namely Ms MAR Yuet-har, SBS, MH, Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP, Mr AU Lap-sing, Mr CHAN Fu-ming, Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, Mr FUNG Se-goun, Mr MAK Chi-yan, Mr LEUNG Ho-kwan, MH, Mr WONG Ling-sun and Dr YANG Mo, PhD).

171. The Chairlady invited Members to vote for the original motion. The motion was carried with 17 votes for it (namely Ms MAR Yuet-har, SBS, MH, Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP, Mr AU Lap-sing, Mr CHAN Fu-ming, Ir CHAN Lee-shing, JP, Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung, Mr FUNG Se-goun, Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Mr LEUNG Ho-kwan, MH, Mr MAK Chi-yan, Mrs MAK TSE How-ling, Mr WONG Che-ngai, MH, Mr WONG Ling-sun and Dr YANG Mo, PhD) and 3 abstentions (namely Mr FUNG Wai-kwong, Mr TSUI Yuen-wa and Mr CHAI Man-hon).

172. The Chairlady invited Mr TAM Chung-on to note the endorsed motion and briefly reply on this matter.

173. Mr TAM Chung-on said that TD understood Members' concerns and would provide some data for SDC's reference – the design capacity of Ap Lei Chau Bridge is around 2 600 vehicles per hour but the highest traffic volume recorded is around 1 500 vehicles per hour, in the northbound journey during the morning peak hour. In the past 3 years, that is, in 2008, 2009 and 2010, the figures had not changed too much, with the peak traffic volume kept being around 1 500 vehicle per hour. TD would closely monitor the traffic conditions in Ap Lei Chau and adopt corresponding measures as appropriate. It was believed that after the commissioning of South Island Line (East), the traffic conditions in Ap Lei Chau would be further enhanced.

174. The Chairlady thanked Mr TAM Chung-on for joining the meeting.

(Mr TAM Chung-on left the meeting at 6:55 p.m.)

**Agenda Item 9: Motion Debate: “Suggest the Government to Include Themes in Display of the History of Hong Kong’s Marine and Fishing Industries when Developing the Site North of Ocean Park MTR Station Previously Reserved for Railway-related Property Development”**  
**(SDC Paper No. 53/2011)**  
**[7:13 p.m. - 7:20 p.m.]**

175. The Chairlady welcomed Mr NG Ka-shu, Senior Town Planner/HK 5 of PlanD to the meeting.

176. The Chairlady said that Mr CHAN Fu-ming and Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung had moved the following motion which was seconded by 3 Members, namely Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Ir CHAN Lee-shing, JP and Mr FUNG Se-goun:

“This Council suggests the Government to include themes in display of the history of Hong Kong’s marine and fishing industries when developing the site north of Ocean Park MTR Station previously reserved for railway-related property development, with a view to further promoting and conserving the fishermen culture in Hong Kong, and enhancing the image of the Southern District as a major fishing harbour and a base of shipbuilding.”

177. The Chairlady asked Mr CHAN Fu-ming and Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung to briefly introduce the reasons for raising the motion, and reminded that the presenters of the motion (including the seconders) would be allotted a total of 5 minutes to speak. The Secretary would ring the bell once at 4 minutes 30 seconds of the speaking slot, and twice when it reached 5 minutes.

178. Mr CHAN Fu-ming said that after SDC had strived for years, the construction of SIL(E) had commenced in this year eventually. The commissioning of the Ocean Park Station and the shopping mall and hotel development in the vicinity of Wong Chuk Hang Station would spur the overall economic development of the Southern District, bringing in more population and tourists. In response to the views of SDC, the Government had recently confirmed that the site north of Ocean Park Station would not be granted to MTRC for railway-related development. In this connection, he and Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung opined that SDC should grasp this opportunity to work out the long-term development and positioning of the Southern District as soon as possible. Among the attractions of the district, the ambience of a

fishing harbour of Aberdeen and its shipbuilding industry were the most unique, symbolic and well-known. Therefore, they suggested that SDC should express its views on the planning direction of the site north of Ocean Park Station for the Government to consider when planning the development of the site.

179. Mr CHAN Fu-ming continued that to attract tourists from the Mainland and overseas, the theme of the aforesaid site development should combine the unique characteristics of Hong Kong and the cutting edge of the Southern District. When searching for the word “Aberdeen” on the internet, a city of the same name in Scotland would come up, and many of the search results would also link to the tourist spot in Hong Kong. This reflected that Aberdeen represented Hong Kong in the eye of foreigners. In this regard, they hoped that SDC could adopt the aforesaid motion, and propose to the Government to include themes in display of the history of Hong Kong’s marine and fishing industries when developing the site north of Ocean Park Station previously reserved for railway-related property development. This would help further promote and conserve the fishermen culture in Hong Kong, and enhance the image of the Southern District as a major fishing harbour and a base of shipbuilding.

180. Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung said that the history of Hong Kong was nothing without the sea, and the history of Hong Kong would miss a page without record of fishermen activities. As these two elements were also the unique features of the Southern District, the advantages should be fully utilised in developing the Southern District and highlighting the history of Hong Kong at the same time. On the other hand, the site concerned was located near the Ocean Park which attracted many tourists every year. If facilities filled with historical elements of marine and fishing industry were provided at the site, it could help promote the history of Hong Kong and the unique features of the Southern District.

181. The Chairlady invited Members to vote for the motion. The motion was carried with 19 votes for it (namely Ms MAR Yuet-har, SBS, MH, Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP, Mr AU Lap-sing, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr CHAN Fu-ming, Ir CHAN Lee-shing, JP, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung, Mr FUNG Se-goun, Mr FUNG Wai-kwong, Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Mr LEUNG Ho-kwan, MH, Mr MAK Chi-yan, Mrs MAK TSE How-ling, Mr TSUI Yuen-wa, Mr WONG Che-ngai, MH, Mr WONG Ling-sun and Dr YANG Mo, PhD).

182. The Chairlady thanked Mr NG Ka-shu for attending the meeting.

(Mr NG Ka-shu left the meeting at 7:20 p.m.)

**Agenda Item 10: Application for DC Fund: Carnival in Celebration of the 62<sup>nd</sup> National Day of the People's Republic of China in the Southern District**  
**(SDC Paper No. 54/2011)**  
**[7:21 p.m. - 7:24 p.m.]**

183. The Chairlady reminded Members to fill in the “Registration Form on Personal Interests of Members of a District Council or Its Committees”, if applicable. She also said that as the Chairlady of the event organiser, she would abstain from expressing views on the application concerned. Among the Members present, only Mr CHAI man-hon, Mr FUNG Wai-kwong and Mr TSUI Yuen-wa did not participate in organising the activity.

184. The Chairlady asked Mr MAK Chi-yan, Secretary of the Southern District National Day Celebration Organising Committee (the Organising Committee) to introduce the contents of the paper.

185. Mr MAK Chi-yan said that the Organising Committee had planned a series of activities from the afternoon to the evening on 25 September, and publicity materials would be hoisted starting from late September. Noting that SDC had sponsored the activity every year, he hoped that SDC would also grant its support this year.

186. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong suggested that when planning the activity, more information on the Mainland, such as its territory boundary, should be incorporated.

187. The Chairlady commented that the effect might not be satisfactory if the information was displayed on the activity day only.

188. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling supplemented that the booths on the activity day would also feature quiz on national and civic education.

189. The Chairlady asked responsible Committee Members to note the views of Mr FUNG Wai-kwong.

190. SDC endorsed the fund application of \$400,000 and agreed to advance half of the payment to the Organising Committee for staging the “Carnival in Celebration of the 62<sup>nd</sup> National Day of the People’s Republic of China in the Southern District”.

**Agenda Item 11: Application for SDC Fund: Community Involvement Projects in Promotion of Tourism in the Southern District  
(SDC Paper No. 55/2011)  
[7:25 p.m. - 7:27 p.m.]**

191. The Chairlady said that at the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting on 12 May 2011, SDC had endorsed to reserve \$500,000 to subsidise local organisations for organising projects with budget ranging from \$100,000 to \$150,000. Subsequently, CAPC had confirmed that the theme for the aforesaid allocation should be “Promoting Tourism in the Southern District”. In addition, CAPC had decided that the Working Group should follow up on the vetting of the funding allocation.

192. The Chairlady asked Mr FUNG Se-goun, Chairman of the Working Group, to report on the vetting results of fund applications.

193. Mr FUNG Se-goun said that as of 30 June, the Secretariat had received a total of 4 fund applications. The Working Group had convened a special meeting on 8 July to vet the aforesaid funding applications and invited the organisers to present project details. Eventually, the Working Group had recommended that the 3 proposals scoring the highest marks should receive full provision and the remaining amount of \$50,000 would be granted to the project with the lowest scores. The funding allocation recommended by the Working Group was listed below:

<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Recommended Allocation</u>
- Experience Aberdeen: Fishing Harbour Cultural Tourism	\$150,000
- Southern District Lion Dance Exhibition Match 2011 for 4 Places in 2 Countries	\$150,000
- Creative Contest on the Unique Features and Ambience of a Fishing Harbour of Aberdeen	\$150,000
- Southern District Pop Up	\$50,000

194. SDC endorsed the fund applications as set out at Annexes 1 to 4.

(Mr SHIU Chun-shui joined the meeting at 7:28 p.m.)

**Agenda Item 12: Application for SDC Fund: Festive Lightings 2011-12**  
**(SDC Paper No. 57/2011)**  
**[7:28 p.m. - 7:35 p.m.]**

195. The Chairlady asked Mr SHIU Chun-shui, Officer-in-charge (Community Building) of the Southern District Office (SDO), to present the paper.

196. Mr SHIU Chun-shui said that at the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting on 12 May 2011, SDC had endorsed an allocation of \$500,000 to install festive lightings in the district during Christmas 2011 and Lunar New Year 2012. As the 2 festivals would happen in consecutive months, it was proposed that lightings should be installed continuously for 2 months, from mid-December 2011 till mid-February 2012, along the Aberdeen Promenade, Ap Lei Chau Waterfront Promenade, Ap Lei Chau Wind Tower Park and Stanley Main Street. The proposed budget for lightings design, installation, dismantling, electricity charges and insurance and so on was \$500,000.

197. Mr CHAI Man-hon commended the excellent lighting effect in the previous year, which received a lot of compliments. He said that as the budget for this year was larger than that of the previous year, it was expected that the effect should be even better. He also suggested adopting a simple design like the previous year and advised that no dummy lantern lightings should be included.

198. Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung said that due to limited budget, the festive lightings did not cover the northern shore of Ap Lei Chau in the previous year. If the resources allocated for this year so allowed, she hoped that the festive lightings could be extended to the aforesaid area. She commented that the lightings at Stanley Main Street last year were excellent, and wished that the scale and effect could be kept the same this year.

199. Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying said that the lightings at Stanley in the previous year had attracted many tourists and wished the same scale could be maintained this year. However, due to inflation in recent years, it might be difficult to maintain the standard of the previous year with the current level of budget. In this regard, she hoped that SDC could consider increasing the budget for such purpose. She learned that the contractor of the previous year had provided quality lightings irrespective of

costs.

200. Mr SHIU Chun-shui said that the proposed area for festive lightings this year included Kwun Hoi Path (downstairs of Ocean Court) to the floating berth, and the northern shore of Ap Lei Chau. Moreover, SDO had planned to add lightings in Ap Lei Chau Wind Tower Park.

201. Mr CHAI Man-hon reiterated that SDO should not adopt dummy lantern because the limited budget would not be sufficient to achieve the same effect as those of the commercial shopping mall. He therefore considered it more appropriate to concentrate the resources on enhancing the lighting effect along the waterfronts.

202. Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung agreed not to use dummy lantern because the cost was high but the effect was not satisfactory. With reference to the arrangement in the previous year, she suggested adopting lighting signs which could achieve a good effect at a low cost.

203. Mr SHIU Chun-shui clarified that what SDO suggested was not dummy lanterns but lighting signs made of full-color LED light tubes, just like those in the previous year.

204. SDC agreed to allocate \$500,000 for hoisting festive lightings during Christmas 2011 and Lunar New Year 2012 in the Southern District.

**Agenda Item 13: Application for SDC Fund: Design and Production of SDC  
Publicity Items  
(SDC Paper No. 58/2011)  
[7:36 p.m. - 7:38 p.m.]**

205. The Chairlady asked Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, the Chairlady of CAPC, to introduce the contents of the paper.

206. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH said that at the 25<sup>th</sup> CAPC meeting held on 4 July 2011, it had been decided that SDC should produce 2012 calendars, *fai chuns* and red packets as usual, and Members should distribute them to local community in one go at the end of 2011. It was recommended that SDC should approve allocation of \$330,000 for such purpose as previously agreed when drawing up the budget for

2011-12.

207. SDC endorsed the fund application of \$330,000 for the production of 2012 calendars, *fai chuns* and red packets, and Members should distribute them to local community in one go at the end of 2011, that is, after the DC Election.

208. The Chairlady said that the distribution of calendars, *fai chuns* and red packets to local residents was tentatively scheduled for 16 December 2011 (Friday). In this regard, she asked Members to arrange distribution points beforehand. The Chairlady emphasised that SDO would not assist in distributing the publicity materials this year.

**Agenda Item 14: Application for SDC Fund: Procurement, Replacement and Replenishment of Fire Fighting Equipment for Fire Watch Patrol Teams in the Southern District**  
**(SDC Paper No. 59/2011)**  
**[7:39 p.m. – 7:41 p.m.]**

209. The Chairlady asked that Mr LIE Ngai-wa, Liaison Officer (ALC/LT) of SDO, to introduce the contents of the paper.

210. Mr LIE Ngai-wa said that the existing fire fighting equipment used by the fire watch patrol teams in the Southern District had been procured or replaced in the previous financial years, some of which were due for replacement in the current financial year. On the other hand, many squatter villagers had expressed concern about the adequacy of the existing fire fighting equipment, and some considered it necessary to procure additional items to safeguard the villages from fire hazards. To upgrade the existing fire fighting facilities in the villages, it was recommended that SDC should increase the allocation for the procurement/replacement of fire fighting equipment and replenishment of fire extinguishers in 2011-12 from \$8,800 to \$11,290, representing an increase of \$2,490 or 28%. The stock record of the existing fire fighting equipment of individual patrol teams as well as the recommended acquisition list were set out at Annexes 1 and 2 respectively for Members' reference.

211. SDC agreed to increase the allocation for the procurement/replacement of fire fighting equipment to the fire-fighting organisations in the district in 2011-12 from \$8,800 to \$11,290, and endorsed the aforesaid fund application.

**Agenda Item 15: Review on the Effectiveness of District Work put forward by SDC in 2008-2011**  
**(SDC Paper No. 60/2011)**  
**[7:42 p.m. - 8:04 p.m.]**

212. The Chairlady informed the meeting that the agenda item was put forward by Mr CHAI Man-hon, and asked Mr CHAI to briefly introduce the subject.

213. Mr CHAI Man-hon wished to put forward this subject in order to leave a historical record, and at the same time, Members could take this opportunity to appraise the performance of SDC and all government departments concerned to path way for future. He invited Members to discuss this subject in a relaxed manner.

214. Mr CHAI Man-hon opined that Members had the capabilities to handle administrative work of the Southern District, hence Members should not belittle themselves. He hoped that SDC could have a greater autonomy in implementation of district work. Taking the colleagues of his political affiliation as an example, their academic qualifications and administrative capabilities were comparable to those of Administrative Officers or other technocrats, yet they were authorized by the citizens. The Hong Kong Government had an interesting system with government interference in everywhere from the central down to district level. Since Members were capable of handling district affairs, they should strive for greater autonomy. He said that the delegation of government authority was too dispersed, leading to the situation that departments could raise agenda items at DC meetings at will without the need to be accountable for the consequences. In fact, every problem, such as street hygiene, lost trip situation of buses and so on, was the fault of the Government because government departments were responsible for everything whether large or small, thus they were susceptible to making mistakes naturally. He hoped HAD could explore ways to rectify this situation. He also said that the Appointed Membership system was obsolete and should be reformed as soon as possible, so that DC Members could be granted more power to implement district work. The administrative system adopted by the Hong Kong Government was mostly developed in the 70s and was outdated. Despite the Government's allocation of \$300 million for district administration, SDC was only awarded no more than \$50 million a year, and it could not even have the authority to commission a works contractor. And also the staff who assisted in project implementation often found it difficult to interfere with the work of other departments outside the Home Affairs establishment. The responsible officers concerned should have known the difficulties very well. On the

other hand, he opined that the transport system had also become obsolete, and the rules of district administration had been violated repeatedly, but no one was paying any attention. However, he emphasised that Members still had channels to forward their complaints on traffic matters, and ask for an explanation from the responsible departments. In the long run, the Transport Advisory Committee under the LegCo had greater authority in monitoring the aforesaid matters, yet it was difficult for it to look into matters every large and small matter at district level. At present, SDC could barely counterbalance the authority of TD and it was necessary to take a step further to enable SDC to discharge its functions more fully. As for the work of LandsD, the case of the oil filling station in Aberdeen had best exemplified its performance, and the residents in the Southern District had to tolerate the oil filling station for at least another 20 years. On the contrary, the oil filling station near Prince Edward Station had been converted to a park for public enjoyment. The crux of the entire problem was LandsD was inflexible in handling the matter and just followed the established procedures. It never took the initiative to conduct public consultation but only relied on District Offices to gauge public views, which was simply inappropriate.

215. Mr CHAI Man-hon thanked fellow Members for their cooperation and concerted efforts in working for the well-being of the district all these years. Although Members might have different political stands, they all were committed to serving the residents in the Southern District. However, if a democratic political system were in place, they might have a closer working relationship. Lastly, he thanked the Chairlady for leading SDC in the past 7 years and wished her an enjoyable life.

216. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong thanked the Chairlady, Vice-Chairman and Chairpersons of the Committees under SDC, especially Mr LEUNG Ho-kwan, MH, Chairman of the Traffic and Transport Committee, and commended their performance in chairing the meeting because it was not easy to balance the interests of various parties with diverse views. In addition, he wished to put forward some recommendations to facilitate the implementation of district work, and said that the department representatives at the meeting might not be able to change the existing situation, he hoped that the Chairlady and Vice-Chairman could consider raising the following recommendations when they met with principal officials of higher rank:

### **Increase in Fund Allocation to District Councils**

After all it would be easier to work things out with sufficient resources. Now the 18 DCs were only allocated some 30 million dollars, which was inadequate. In fact, with the overall constitutional structure remained unchanged, some 400 DC Members would be elected after the constitutional reform. The DCs subsector would return around 100 elected DC Members to be members of the Election Committee (EC) for nomination and election of the Chief Executive. As 5 functional constituency (FC) seats would be allocated to a new DC FC, plus an original FC seat by mutual election, which meant that out of the 70 seats in the LegCo, 6 would be occupied by DC Members. With this background, DCs had a genuine need to procure more resources. Personally he opined that it was still justifiable even if each DC was allocated \$100 million every year. At present, when DCs wished to put forward views or improvement measures, often it might have to wait for the LegCo to allocate a schedule for vetting the fund applications, thus impeding implementation of the work.

### **SDC to Play a More Active Role in Overall District Planning and Coordination Work**

SDC should play a more active role in the overall district planning and coordination work. To this end, it had to rely on the support of colleagues from various government departments. Just then, he was quite agitated when talking about the construction of the park because he was dissatisfied with the reply of the department concerned that it had to take 10 years to construct a park, and the performance of the responsible officer in handling this matter had shown complete disrespect to SDC. As a result, SDC could not commence the planning and coordination work smoothly.

### **Appointment of District Officers and Assistant District Officers**

He hoped that the Chairlady could reflect to senior government officials and strive for political appointment for the posts of District Officer and Assistant District Officer for various districts, with a view to enhancing the coordination of the work of various departments. He opined that these 2 posts were not necessarily to be taken up by DC Members, and politically-appointed officials could also fill the posts. It was believed that

this arrangement could facilitate the work of DCs.

217. Mr FUNG Wai-kwong thanked the Chairlady again for her contribution in presiding over SDC meetings and apologised if his speech in the past had given offence.

218. Mr TSUI Yuen-wa thanked the Chairlady for her mentoring and direction had facilitated the smooth functioning of SDC. When he first joined SDC, he had thought it would not be difficult to implement district policies. However, after the experience in these last few years, he realised that implementing district work was hundred times harder than he had ever imagined, as there were many procedures to go through, many government departments and other Members and members of local community had to be involved, and the varied views of residents would need to be addressed. Nevertheless, he had learned many valuable lessons during this process. On the other hand, his opinions on some issues might be different from his fellow Members present, which was very normal, but the way he voiced out his views left room for improvement and review. In addition, he felt helpless when it needed to spend a lot of time to go through all these red tapes just to launch one very minor work, and said that this might due to the system of the Government itself. Mr CHAI Man-hon and Mr FUNG Wai-kwong had just mentioned that the power of DC was too limited. Since the abolition of the Urban Council, all the power was concentrated in the central government, which led to the shrinking and decline of power of DCs and District Offices. This also contributed to the huge obstacles in implementing district administration. The Government had started to gradually delegate its power on district administration again, but personally he thought the progress was far too slow. He opined that the direction on reforming the political system should be rested on expanding the power of DCs as DC Members could really represent the views and voices of the general public. To better implement district administration, the only way was to enhance the power of DCs and government agents at district level such as District Offices. Lastly, he reiterated his gratitude to the Chairlady, all Members and government representatives.

219. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling sincerely thanked the Chairlady for her contributions in leading the discussions in SDC and widening the vision of Members in the past 4 years. Apart from the Chairlady, the Vice-Chairman and all Members who had done a valuable service to SDC, she said that the patience and understanding as shown by various Members were also very important. She hoped that when discussing various issues in future, Members could concern with the matters and not

with the persons, since they all wanted the best for their respective constituencies. On the other hand, she appreciated the excellence performance of Mr WONG Che-ngai, MH in presiding over meetings. She would also like to thank her friends in the district for their advice in the last few years and the Secretariat for its support and advice.

220. Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH said that this agenda item should be renamed as “Motion of Thanks”. He said that though their political views were varied, the concerted efforts of the Chairlady and Vice-Chairman of SDC and various Committee Chairpersons, together with support of SDO, had enabled the current term of SDC to turn a very important page for the long-term development of the Southern District, such as the commencement of SIL(E) project and the beautification works on the promenade along Aberdeen Typhoon Shelter. Although the representatives of various government departments had to face severe questioning, and sometime the speech of Members were quite fierce and offensive, they still kept their patience and were receptive to the comments for continuous improvement, which resulted in the betterment of the work of SDC. He would like to extend particular compliment to FEHD for its work in the Southern District. With the end approaching, he hoped the Members of the next DC term would continue to work hard for the benefits and well-being of the Southern District.

221. Dr YANG Mo, PhD agreed with the views expressed by Members just then, especially on the difficulties encountered by DCs and District Offices owing to limited power and resources. In his opinion, he felt that the political structure in Hong Kong should be reformed and the approach to manage everything centrally could not be continued. He suggested that a district administrative agent, such as a district chief executive, should be added between the central and the basic level of the governing hierarchy to facilitate effective governance and enable local resources to be used for the benefit of local community. On the other hand, Hong Kong lacked political talents and whenever an office of Bureau Secretary left vacant, it usually took a long time to identify suitable candidate to fill the post. The reason for this was Hong Kong did not have a platform for political talents to turn their political aspirations and visions into action. He suggested that a district chief executive should be created in each of the 18 districts so as to provide a pool of talents for selection of future Bureau Secretaries and Chief Executives. Lastly, he said that his service in SDC was not long but still he wanted to thank the Chairlady for her leadership and that he had learned a lot from the Chairlady.

222. The Chairlady thanked Mr CHAI Man-hon for putting forward this agenda item. She said that this was the last meeting she presided over and would like to take this opportunity to thank all Members for their support and assistance, without which, it would be impossible to conduct each meeting so smoothly. Also, the work of SDC could not be carried out so well if not for the support of various government departments including the Police, TD, HD, LCSD, FEHD, Civil Engineering and Development Department and other departments that did not have their representatives present at the meeting. Although the speech of some Members might be relatively harsh, they did this for the right and interest of the public, so she hoped the department representatives could understand this. The Chairlady expressed gratitude to various departments and Members for their support and hoped that the next SDC would continue to work for the right and interest of the residents in the Southern District. She further hoped that if the Members present had a chance to win a seat in the LegCo, they would make their best efforts to realise the political reform they envisaged.

**Agenda Item 16: Any Other Business**

**[8:05 p.m. – 8:15 p.m.]**

**Nomination for “Building Management Professional Advisory Service Scheme”**

223. The Chairlady said that with a view to strengthening support to owners of old buildings, the Home Affairs Bureau and Home Affairs Department (HAD) would implement the Building Management Professional Advisory Service Scheme (the Scheme) under which property management companies would be commissioned to provide owners of old buildings with free professional advice and follow-up services on property management in the next 3 years. It was expected that the Scheme would service a total of 1 200 buildings (around 24 000 units) in the period. Under the Scheme, target buildings/cluster of buildings would be identified via the following 2 ways – Type 1: self-application by owners who were interested in joining the Scheme; and Type 2: clusters of buildings nominated by DC Members or local DOs. All applications would be vetted by a task force designated by HAD. For information on the objectives, service scope and eligibility of the Scheme, Members could refer to the briefing note and nomination form tabled at the meeting. Moreover, 2 briefing sessions would be held by HAD at Lai King Community Hall and Henry G. Leong Yaumatei Community Centre from 8:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. on 26 and 27 July respectively, and invitation letters had been distributed to Members at the meeting.

224. The Chairlady continued that to facilitate nomination of clusters of building for submission to HAD, it was suggested that Members should make nominations according to their respective constituency boundary. The deadline for nomination was 31 August 2011.

225. SDC endorsed the aforesaid recommendation.

### **Study on Feeder Service for Public Transport in the Southern District after the Commissioning of the New Railway**

226. The Vice-Chairman said that on 24 June, the Secretariat had written to post-secondary institutions and market survey companies in Hong Kong to invite quotations and proposals for the aforesaid study. However, as of 5 July, there was no reply so far. It was proposed that the Secretariat should issue tender invitation again and extend the tender period to 1 month. If there was still no response, amendments to the study scope or timeline would be considered.

227. SDC endorsed the aforesaid arrangement.

### **Press Conference for the Southern District Literary Trail Landmarks**

228. The Chairlady said that the press conference for the landmark designs of the Southern District Literary Trail was scheduled at 2:00 p.m. on 25 August 2011 (Thursday) at The Repulse Bay Hong Kong, and asked Members to mark their diary accordingly.

### **Part II: Items for Information**

229. The Chairlady invited Members to note the following documents:

- Report from the Area Committees (SDC Paper No. 42/2011)
- Report of the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the District Facilities Management Committee (SDC Paper No. 43/2011)
- Report of the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Community Affairs and Publicity Committee (SDC Paper No. 44/2011)
- Report of the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the District Development and

Environment Committee (SDC Paper No. 45/2011)

- Report of the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Traffic and Transport Committee (SDC Paper No. 46/2011)
- Report of the 168<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Southern District Management Committee (SDC Paper No. 47/2011)
- Financial Statement in respect of SDC Funds (as at 4.7.2011) (SDC Paper No. 48/2011)

**Date of Next Meeting**

230. The Chairlady informed the meeting that with respect to the arrangements of the upcoming DC Election, SDC would cease operation from 15 September 2011 onwards. This meeting was the last one for the current term.

231. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Secretariat, Southern District Council  
September 2011