

**Minutes of the Fifth Meeting of  
Building Management, Environmental Hygiene & Works Committee (2020-2021)  
Central and Western District Council**

Date : 17 September 2020  
Time : 2:30 pm  
Venue : Conference Room  
14/F, Harbour Building  
38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong

**Present:**

Chairlady

Ms NG Hoi-yan, Bonnie\*

Vice-chairman

Mr WONG Weng-chi\*

Members

Ms CHENG Lai-king	(2:38 pm – end of the meeting)
Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Victor	(Beginning of the meeting – 6:40 pm)
Mr KAM Nai-wai, MH*	
Mr HUI Chi-fung	(Beginning of the meeting – 6:15 pm)
Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin	(2:32 pm – end of the meeting)
Mr NG Siu-hong	(2:42 pm – end of the meeting)
Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry*	
Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam	(2:35 pm – end of the meeting)
Mr HO Chi-wang*	
Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus	(2:33 pm – 6:50 pm)
Mr PANG Ka-ho*	
Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille*	
Mr YOUNG Chit-on, Jeremy	(2:46 pm – 6:15 pm)

Remarks: \* Members who attended the whole meeting  
( ) Time of attendance of Members

## Guests

### Item 5(i)

Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Central/Western)
Mr FUNG Wai-nok	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	Chief Health Inspector 2

### Item 5(ii)

Mr KO Hin-lun, Ken	Buildings Department	Building Surveyor/ Slope Safety 2
--------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------

### Item 5(iii)

Ms CHAN Yuen-wing, Wing	Buildings Department	Structural Engineer/Site Monitoring (B)2
Mr TSE Yip-kei, Alvin	Environmental Protection Department	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional South)1

### Item 5(iv)

Mr KWOK Ho-yeung, Howard	Civil Engineering and Development Department	Engineer/5
--------------------------	--	------------

### Item 5(v)

Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Central/Western)
Mr FUNG Wai-nok	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	Chief Health Inspector 2
Mr. MA Wai-kei	Architectural Services Department	Property Services Officer

### Item 6

Mr LEE Pak-ho	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	Senior Health Inspector (Administration and Development)Special Duties
---------------	---	--

### Item 7

Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Central/Western)
-----------------------	---	---

Mr FUNG Wai-nok	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	Chief Health Inspector 2
-----------------	---	--------------------------

Item 8

Dr Jeffrey Hung	Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Ltd	Chief Executive Officer
-----------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------

Ms Windy Cheng	Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Ltd	Assistant Manager, Accounts and Administration
----------------	---------------------------------------	--

Ms Eunice Yam	Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Ltd	Project Officer
---------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------

Item 9

Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Central/Western)
-----------------------	---	---

Mr FUNG Wai-nok	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	Chief Health Inspector 2
-----------------	---	--------------------------

Dr LEUNG Wai-yiu, Anthony	Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department	Veterinary Officer (Avian Influenza Surveillance)
---------------------------	--	---

Item 10

Mr MAK Siu-ming, Bryan	Lands Department	Senior Estate Surveyor/Special Duties (District Lands Office, Hong Kong West and South)
------------------------	------------------	---

Ms CHAN Miu-ling	Leisure and Cultural Services Department	Deputy District Leisure Manager (Central and Western) 2
------------------	--	---

Ms YANG Ka-ye	Development Bureau	Assistant Secretary (Tree Management)2
---------------	--------------------	--

Item 11

Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Central/Western)
-----------------------	---	---

Mr FUNG Wai-nok	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	Chief Health Inspector 2
-----------------	---	--------------------------

Mr POON Yui-chau, William	Buildings Department	Senior Building Surveyor/A3
---------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------

Item 12

Mr LAU Wai-leung	Water Supplies Department	Senior Engineer/ Hong Kong &
------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------

		Islands Region 2
Mr LOK Yin-ming	Water Supplies Department	Engineer/ Hong Kong & Islands (Distribution 2)

Item 13

Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Central/Western)
Mr FUNG Wai-nok	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	Chief Health Inspector 2
Ms FUNG Hei-nam, Heidi	Drainage Services Department	Engineer/ Hong Kong West 2
Mr LAI Kin-hung, Johnny	Drainage Services Department	Engineer/ Hong Kong West 5

Item 14

Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Central/Western)
Mr FUNG Wai-nok	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	Chief Health Inspector 2
Mr TSE Yip-kei, Alvin	Environmental Protection Department	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional South)1

Item 15

Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Central/Western)
Mr FUNG Wai-nok	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	Chief Health Inspector 2
Mr TSE Yip-kei, Alvin	Environmental Protection Department	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional South)1

Item 17

Mr KO Po-lun	Hong Kong Young Women's Team Leader Christian Association (Central, Western & Islands District Youth Outreaching Social Work Team)	
--------------	--	--

Item 18

Ms Mak Lai-sum Cecily                      Support Kennedy                      Event Organizer

Item 19

Mr CHAN Kin-sun                      Caritas Mok Cheung Sui Kun Social Work Assistant  
Community Centre

In Attendance

Mr LEUNG Chee-kay, David, JP	Central and Western District Office	District Officer (Central and Western)
Miss WONG Sze-ki, Carol	Central and Western District Office	Assistant District Officer (Central and Western)
Mr WONG Yan-kwong	Central and Western District Office	Senior Executive Officer (District Council)
Mr WONG Lok-sang	Highways Department	District Engineer/Western
Mr WONG Chi-leung	Civil Engineering and Development Department	Senior Engineer / 7 (South)
Mr CHEUNG Chun-kee	Lands Department (District Lands Office, Hong Kong West and South)	Senior Estate Surveyor/West
Mr TSANG Kwok-on	Development Bureau	Tree Management Officer 4
Miss CHAN Po-lam	Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department	Wetland & Fauna Conservation Offr (Special Duties 1)

Secretary

Miss CHAN Yuen-ying, Crystal Central and Western District  
Office                      Executive Officer (District Council) 3

## **Opening remarks**

---

(from 2:30 pm to 2:32 pm)

The Chairlady welcomed Members and representatives of government departments to the 5th Meeting of the Building Management, Environmental Hygiene & Works Committee (BEHWC) (2020-2021). She also extended her welcome to Mr TSE Yip-kei, Alvin, Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional South)<sup>1</sup> of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), who stood in for Mr CHIU Chi-chung.

2. To enable more effective discussion, the Chairlady suggested to start with an open round of speech by Members on each discussion item. Each Member would be given not more than two minutes to speak each time. She also advised representatives present to be as concise as possible in their speech and response.

## **Item 1: Adoption of the agenda**

---

(2:32 pm to 2:41 pm)

3. The Chairlady agreed to accept the two Committee Papers submitted after the deadline. One of them, entitled “Market Disinfection and Rodent Control”, was submitted on 15 September by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD). Taking into consideration the existing rodent problem in Central and Western (C&W) district markets, the Chairlady saw the importance of discussions on rodent control and therefore included the Paper in the agenda. The other Paper, entitled “A large number of trees in Pok Fu Lam Road Playground are removed due to Brown Root Rot Disease”, was submitted on 2 September by Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille, Mr PANG Ka-ho and Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus. As Members submitting the Paper had stated the urgency of the matter and wished to relay their views to government departments concerned before compensatory planting was done to prevent the planting of inappropriate trees, the Chairlady agreed to include the Paper in the agenda, which would be discussed in conjunction with “Discussion on Consultation for the Proposed Lease Modification for Nos. 86A-86D Pok Fu Lam Road”.

4. Mr KAM Nai-wai said he had just noted that the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had only submitted a Paper on the “Standing item – Monitoring of the ground decontamination works at the site of ex-Kennedy Town incineration plant/abattoir and adjoining area” without sending a representative to the meeting. He said that he had criticised “such rubbish department for coming and not coming as he wishes” at the previous meeting, and he could hardly stand the CEDD for not sending any representatives to the meeting for discussions on the issue. He asked how the Secretariat had invited the CEDD to the meeting. If the CEDD had previously replied on not able to send a representative to the meeting, he would ask Mr LEUNG Chee-kay, District Officer (C&W) (DO(C&W)) to call the Director of CEDD (D of CEDD) at once asking him to send one to the meeting without delay. He suggested to skip this discussion item until a representative from the CEDD was there. If the CEDD representative could only come at 9 pm, he would wait until 9 pm; if the representative could only come at 10 pm, he would wait until 10 pm.

He added that the proposed decontamination works had already started since May 2020, but the CEDD still declined to send a representative to the meeting for discussion. He questioned whether, among the 200 000 civil servants, not even one representative could be sent to the meeting to explain the issue.

5. The Secretary responded that the minutes of meeting had been forwarded to the CEDD with letters sent to the Development Bureau (DEVB) and D of CEDD on 4 September 2020. The CEDD had provided a written reply to the Secretariat on 8 September 2020, saying that the department would submit the progress of decontamination works to Members before the BEHWC meeting as far as possible, and would consult the views of BEHWC upon the design of the preliminary decontamination works was completed to listen to the views of Members. The department therefore stated that it was not sending a representative to the meeting to discuss the item for the time being.

6. Mr LEUNG Chee-kay, DO(C&W) responded that before the meeting was held, the Secretariat had invited the CEDD to send a representative to the meeting. Regarding Mr KAM Nai-wai's suggestion on calling the CEDD at once, the Secretariat could make the call again or send an email repeating the call for a representative to be present. However, in case the CEDD still failed to send a representative after the call, the C&W District Office (C&W DO) could hardly force the department to do so.

7. On inviting the department to attend the meeting, Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Victor asked DO(C&W) whether he had tried his best to persuade the department to attend or whether it was only the Secretariat who had sent the email. He said that the previous DO(C&W) would try her best to help with coordination. If the department replied that there would not be a representative coming, the previous DO(C&W) would convince the department as much as possible to attend. He questioned whether DO(C&W) had helped to convince the department and if not, he considered DO(C&W) a dereliction of duty. Besides, he agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai's saying that if the department failed to send a representative, discussions on the Paper should be shelved, for relying solely on the Paper could hardly bring about an effective discussion and it would be a waste of time. He pointed out that the department was not respecting the District Council (DC).

8. Mr KAM Nai-wai urged the CEDD to send a representative to the meeting without delay, and asked DO(C&W) to give a personal call to D of CEDD at once asking for a representative to come and explain the details and rationale of related works to members of the public.

9. The Chairlady asked the Members present whether they agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai's proposal above and postponing the discussion of the "Standing item – Monitoring of the ground decontamination works at the site of ex-Kennedy Town incineration plant/abattoir and adjoining area" until a representative of the CEDD attended the meeting. With more than half of the Members present agreeing to the proposal, the Chairlady asked DO(C&W) to call D of CEDD, and the time for discussing the issue would be fixed when it was confirmed that the CEDD would attend the meeting

**Item 2: Confirmation of the minutes of the 4th BEHWC meeting held on 9 July 2020**

(2:41 pm to 2:44 pm)

10. The Chairlady said that the Secretariat had received the proposed amendments on the minutes of meeting put forward by Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry, Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Victor and herself before the meeting, which were tabled for Members' reference.

11. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that he had spent two hours on amending the minutes of meeting. He found that the minutes had been "cutting corners" with only "two lines of words", and the number of words after amendment were four times more than the original. He considered such way of writing the minutes improper, and one could hardly tell how many people in between had cut down the content. Given his lack of confidence in the Secretariat who often interpreted Members out of context, and very often not enough time was given to Members to work out the amendments of the minutes (notwithstanding that this minutes of meeting was better in that one week's time was given for amendment), he considered the Secretariat's draft of the minutes "ridiculous". He called upon the Secretariat to give ample time for Members to work on the amendments of all meetings so that the contents on criticising the government and "dirty cops" would not be deleted. He also asked the Secretariat to record clearly his speech above.

12. As Members did not have other views on the draft minutes of the 4th meeting, the Chairlady declared that the minutes were confirmed.

**Item 3: Action checklist on Matters Arising from the last meeting  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 79/2020)**

(2:44 pm to 2:44 pm)

13. The Chairlady invited Members to note the contents of the paper.

**Item 4: Chairlady's Report and Working Group Report**

(2:44 pm to 2:45 pm)

14. The Chairlady said that the Secretariat had already circulated the following information papers to Members for perusal earlier on:

No.	Title of Paper	Circulation Date
62/2020	FEHD – Anti-mosquito Campaign 2020 (Phase III) in Central & Western District	3 August 2020
82/2020	FEHD – Progress Report on Small Scale District Works in Central/Western District	11 September 2020

83/2020	FEHD – Facelifiting Works for Hospital Road Public Toilet	11 September 2020
84/2020	FEHD – Facelifiting Works for Kennedy Road Public Toilet	11 September 2020
85/2020	FEHD – Facelifiting Works for Queen’s Road Central Public Toilet	11 September 2020

**Item 5(i): Standing item – Handling of Refuse Dumped Beside Litter Containers On Pavements  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 77/2020)**

(2:45 pm to 3:06 pm)

15. Mr FUNG Wai-nok, Chief Health Inspector 2 of the FEHD, briefed Members on the Paper. He said that between June and July, the department had issued a total of 435 fixed penalty notices to offenders of illegal refuse dumping in the district. During the same period, a total of six default notices were issued to the contractor for matters of default or breach of contract requirements. Four complaints were received about refuse being dumped beside litter containers and recycling bins in the district. Targetting at blackspots where road obstructions were caused by shop front extensions, the department had taken follow-up actions at Des Voeux Road West and Queen’s Road West in Sai Yin Pun, Queen’s Road West in Shek Tong Tsui, Belcher’s Street in Sai Wan and Queen’s Road Central in Sheung Wan.

16. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr KAM Nai-wai said that the situation in Sheung Wan district had improved, it was hoped that the department would continue with the regular inspections and refuse collection to maintain environmental hygiene. With respect to inspections and enforcement actions at blackspots where road obstructions were caused by shop front extensions, he pointed out that the department had conducted 183 inspections at Des Voeux Road West and Queen’s Road West in Sai Ying Pun between June and July, which meant on average three times a day, but the number of prosecutions instigated were only 35. He had walked past Centre Street near Queen’s Road West some days before and found the situation improved, but the part of Centre Street near the tramway did not. He questioned the department on the small number of prosecution cases and asked whether enforcement and prosecution actions would only be taken during joint departmental actions. Furthermore, no prosecutions were instituted on Queen’s Road Central in Sheung Wan between June and July, yet the trader at Fook Sing Court at the junction of 378 Queen’s Road Central and Possession Street was often found placing such articles as fruit boxes and foam boxes on the pavement. He hoped the department could pay more attention to and deal with the problem

during inspections.

- (b) Mr PANG Ka-ho said that the number of inspections conducted outside Kennedy Town Centre in Belcher's Street was 78, and the verbal warnings issued to contractors were eight which was higher than the average number in other locations. However, when he walked past the location, he often found refuse accumulating. As the utilisation rate of rubbish bins there was high, he suggested the department to consider increasing the number of inspections and rubbish collections, as well as increasing the number of rubbish bins to tackle the problem at source.
- (c) Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam pointed out that among the locations of rubbish deposit blackspots listed on the department's paper, only the junction of Whitty Street and Des Voeux Road West was included in the Shek Tong Tsui district, but the hygiene condition of rubbish bins, recycling bins and glass bottles recycling bins at the junction of Queen's Road West and Hill Road was found unsatisfactory. The rubbish bin was often full in the afternoon, and the recycling bins were very worn out, it was hoped that the location could be added to the list of rubbish deposit blackspots with inspections and cleansing services stepped up. Regarding the inspections on blackspots of road obstructions caused by shop front extensions, Mr YIP questioned why only four prosecutions were instituted among the 183 inspections on Queen's Road West in Shek Tong Tsui between June and July, and that no joint actions were taken. He questioned whether the department considered there was no environmental hygiene problem. He added that there were traders placing wooden carts on the pavement which had taken up nearly half the space and hoped the department could strengthen inspections and enforcement actions to prevent other traders from following suit.
- (d) The Vice-chairman showed two photos taken at Centre Street, indicating how the shop "Fresh Everyday" (日新) often placed goods, cardboard and plastic boxes on the road that occupied one of the traffic lanes, with the drainage pipes nearby that were often blocked, it could be seen that "Fresh Everyday" was affecting the environmental hygiene. He hoped the department could follow up on the above situation and claim the related cleansing costs from the shop, taking joint actions with the Police, the Highways Department (HyD) and other related departments to tackle the problem of road occupation.
- (e) Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin pointed out that she had submitted a written question, namely, "Follow up on the problem of shop front extensions in Sai Ying Pun district" to the department, which consolidated the questions raised by Members in the previous meeting. She hoped the information papers to be provided by the department would take the form of replies to those written questions, indicating clearly the situation with the department's follow-up. Since the department was

able to provide statistical data up to 31 August with respect to those written questions, she hoped statistical data up to 31 October would be provided on the information paper to be submitted in the next meeting. Furthermore, regarding the hygiene problem at Centre Street and Des Voeux Road West, although she had communicated with the department on a number of times, there were still areas for improvement. Regarding the 27 joint actions taken at Des Voeux Road West and Queen's Road West in Sai Ying Pun, she asked the department the criteria for taking joint actions and the details of collaboration.

- (f) Ms CHENG Lai-king would like to include the location in front of Kin Yuen Mansion at 135 Caine Road near a big tree in the list of blackspots with refuse dumped beside litter containers and recycling bins, as the litter container there was often full at night.

17. Mr FUNG Wai-nok of the FEHD responded that for joint actions against road obstructions caused by shop front extensions, they were generally initiated by the department inviting the Police to take part. Given that staff were deployed to conduct regular inspections, the number of inspections would be higher than joint actions. In case irregularities were found during inspections, the department would follow up with the person(s) concerned, and enforcement actions were not only taken during joint actions. On submission of information papers, the department would provide statistical data from August to October at the next meeting as suggested by Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin. On refuse dumping blackspots and road obstructions caused by shop front extensions in Shek Tong Tsui, the department did target at shops causing road obstructions in the district and enhance enforcement. The first phase of actions would focus on more serious places including Centre Street, Queen's Road West and Des Voeux Road West, and enforcement actions would be stepped up gradually in other places. He said that the department had instituted a series of prosecutions in the month of August, with nine, three, two and one case(s) taken at Des Voeux Road West and Queen's Road West in Sai Ying Pun, Queen's Road West in Shek Tong Tsui, Belcher's Street in Sai Wan and Queen's Road Central in Sheung Wan respectively. Besides, the department would include the locations suggested by Ms CHENG Lai-king and Mr YIP Kam-lung, in the list of refuse dumping blackspots.

18. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Central/Western) of the FEHD added that recycling bins were not the properties of the department, but more cleaning services would be provided by their contractor.

19. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr YIP Kam-lung said that the outsourced cleansing contractors of the department were seen cleaning up the wastes in recycling bins. He asked whether the department was responsible for handling that part of the work.

- (b) Mr KAM Nai-wai pointed out that the operation of “Fresh Everyday” in many districts had posed the same problem as in Centre Street, including placing lots of paper boxes and foam boxes on pavements and traffic lanes. As long as the department paid a visit to “Fresh Everyday” at 5 pm of the day, he would find the situation that appeared on the photos shown by the Vice-chairman just then. He asked the department whether prosecutions would be instituted against the shop if the situation was seen during inspections. If so, prosecutions should have been instituted against the shop every day during inspection. Mr KAM added that if such irregularities were not subjected to prosecutions, “Fresh Everyday” would probably occupy more pavements and traffic lanes.

20. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD clarified that the department was not in a position to decide whether more recycling bins should be provided, but more cleaning services could be provided at the location. With respect to the problem of “Fresh Everyday”, the department would note the time suggested by Members in conducting inspections and take appropriate actions accordingly.

**Item 5(ii): Standing item – Leaking drains at Sands Street  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 64/2020)**

---

(3:06 pm to 3:10 pm)

21. Mr KO Hin-lun, Ken, Building Surveyor/Slope Safety 2 of the Buildings Department (BD) reported on the Paper. He said the first phase, i.e. the maintenance works on the upper part of the retaining wall at the rear lane of 3 to 5 Sands Street and Rock Hill Street had commenced in June 2019 and was basically completed in August. Phase 2A, i.e. the maintenance works on the rear lane of 7 to 17 Sands Street was also basically completed in November 2019. The remaining work on the investigation of underground drains was completed with the preliminary report received in late December 2019. Phase 2B, i.e. the maintenance works on part of the drain and manhole at the rear lane of 17 to 43 Sands Street had commenced in May last year and was basically completed in the middle of June this year. The remaining phase 3 project would involve underground drains replacement and drains diversion. As excavation work had to be done next to the slope and retaining wall, geotechnical studies and design were being carried out before the project commenced, and the remaining project would kick off as soon as the studies and design were completed.

22. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. Mr PANG Ka-ho asked about the approximate time of completion, and whether the leakage on the other part of the retaining wall near to the lift of Axeford Villa was due to the related work or stormwater discharge.

23. Mr KO Hin-lun, Ken of the BD responded that the department had been expediting the works progress. Work would start without waiting for completion of the entire geotechnical

studies and would proceed with the part where investigation and design had been completed. It was estimated that the drains replacement works closest to the retaining wall would commence in October. Besides, the point of leakage suggested by Mr PANG Ka-ho should not be related to the works concerned.

**Item 5(iii): Standing item –Monitoring of Redevelopment Sites in the Central and Western District**  
**(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 65/2020)**

---

(3:10 pm to 3:29 pm)

24. The Chairlady said that prior to the meeting, the Secretariat had invited departments concerned to attend, but the Police, Transport Department (TD) and Labour Department had given a negative reply. The Secretariat would record the views of Members and forward them to the departments absent.

25. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr KAM Nai-wai reprimanded the Police for not attending the meeting and not explaining the issue to the public. He said the BD had advised that for matters within a works site, it was under its supervision, and for matters outside a works site, it was under the supervision of the Police, but the Police was not attending the meeting. He suggested the DC to write again to the Police asking for a representative to come. Besides, the number of inspections conducted by the BD were too low. Some of the sites were not subject to inspections at all or were only inspected once during July and August. He continued with an example on 62 Robinson Road where the works site was normally not complying with the requirements, but the BD merely conducted one and the only one inspection on 26 August 2020, he therefore questioned whether the BD and the site representative(s) had any complicity. He was of the view that each works site should be inspected at least once a month and queried whether the BD was ignoring the C&WDO and its motions passed. He said such dereliction of duty on the part of the BD was hardly acceptable and site inspection work should be stepped up. Furthermore, seeing the frequent complaints lodged by the public, he suggested adding the works site at 331 Des Voeux Road Central/152 Connaught Road Central to the report.
- (b) Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin said that during the last meeting, she had already asked the TD to send a representative to the meeting, but the department still failed to do so this time. She said two days before the meeting, the TD representative and the site contractor had a site inspection with her at 15 Western Street. Since the department was able to arrange a site inspection, he should also attend this meeting to answer the questions of Members as the issue on works site might also involve other Members. She continued that during the site inspection, the TD representative had advised that

the location where site vehicles entered and parked would rely on the Police to take enforcement actions. Failure of the TD and the Police in sending their representatives to the meeting on various occasions was beyond understanding, as the mere attendance of the BD and the EPD could hardly answer all the questions raised by Members, such as the issue of Western Street where the road surface outside the site was crushed by the access of heavy vehicles. Therefore, she asked the DC to write again to the TD asking for a representative to attend the meeting.

- (c) Ms CHENG Lai-king quoted the written reply of the Police in respect of BEHWC Paper No. 52/2020 in the minutes of meeting, saying “It is much to our regret that .... there are Members using degrading expressions to name the Police”. She said that it was in fact Members’ wish to improve people’s livelihood, therefore, it was hoped that the Police would answer Members’ questions on the site issue, including temporary traffic arrangements. She pointed out that there were often emails asking her to reply whether she agreed with the temporary traffic arrangements on the works sites, but the TD and the Police who were responsible for approving the temporary traffic arrangements were not sending their representatives to the meeting. With the numerous reconstruction sites in the C&W district, she hoped that DO(C&W) could urge the TD and the Police to have their representatives at the meeting.
- (d) Mr KAM Nai-wai added that the Police had mentioned about the site at 117 to 119 Bonham Road East in his reply and said that “there was no site works at the location”. He asked whether the Police was out of his mind as there were site works going on, with non-compliant cases found every week. In addition, he asked the Police to list out clearly the inspection record on each site, just like the one provided by the BD, and DO(C&W) to forward the request to the Commander of that police district. He said the Police must have written on the logbook if they had patrolled the site above, and there must be a record on the logbook. He asked for such record to be provided to the DC and that the Police should stop wasting manpower doing unnecessary things.
- (e) With respect to the number of inspections provided by the Police, the Chairlady said that only inspections of reconstruction sites in the C&W district should be included but not emergency road works such as main bursts and gas leakages. Besides, she suggested the reconstruction site at 28 Bonham Road be included in the report as there had been cases of vehicles reversing which had forced residents to walk on the traffic lane.

26. Ms CHAN Yuen-wing, Wing, Structural Engineer/Site Monitoring (B)2 of the BD responded that the department, empowered by the Buildings Ordinance (BO) (Cap. 123), was responsible for controlling buildings and related works on private land, but streets and access roads maintained by the government were being exempted. Therefore, illegal occupation of pavements

or traffic lanes by contractors outside building sites were not subject to BO's control. If non-compliant cases were found during inspections, the department would instantly ask contractors to rectify the situation and remind them to comply with the requirements of other departments concerned so as to protect the safety of passersby and road users. Based on the principle of optimisation of resources, the department would continue to focus on controlling the safety and quality of construction work on private development project sites. At the request of Members, the department would include the sites at 311 Des Voeux Road Central/152 Connaught Road Central and 28 Bonham Road in the next report.

27. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr KAM Nai-wai said that BD's representative was repeating the same thing in each meeting. He was asking the BD to step up inspections on works sites but BD's representative was "either not giving any response or providing irrelevant answers", repeating "irrelevant" matters every time in their replies. He emphasised that he was asking the BD to step up inspections on works sites but not "walking on the street", and asked BD's representative whether he understood his question. He went on to ask why the BD did not conduct any inspections on some of the sites during July and August and that one inspection was only conducted in two months. Given that the BD was empowered by the BO (Cap. 123) to carry out inspection work, he questioned why the department was not doing so, and even with the DC's urge to carry out inspections, the department still failed to do so. He queried the representative for "dereliction of duty" and "being paid without work".
- (b) Mr NG Siu-hong suggested adding the sites at 1 to 4 Chancery Lane and 73 Caine Road to the report. He expressed his dissatisfaction towards the absence of departments in the meeting and BD's inadequate control of works sites. He asked whether the BD was not responsible for handling such work as wastes and wastewater produced from work sites, the illegal occupation of land, the damage to monument's granite, etc. He further asked whether the BD would monitor the noise, wastewater, mosquito and insect problems arisen from works sites and hoped the BD would solve those problems in a prudent manner.
- (c) The Chairlady pointed out that during an inspection at the site of 42 to 46 Eastern Street with BD's representative and the site contractor on 14 August, she had asked the BD on-the-spot to provide a report on the cracking of a tenement building in Tai Ping Shan Street due to site piling works at this meeting but the report had yet to be seen, she asked about the follow-up work of the BD.

28. Ms CHAN Yuen-wing, Wing of the BD responded that the department mainly focused on controlling the safety and quality of construction work in private development project sites, and in

general, a performance-based approach was adopted in determining the time and frequencies of inspections. She said the department would include the sites at 1 to 4 Chancery Lane and 73 Caine Road in the next report. On the other hand, the illegal occupation of pavements and traffic lanes by contractors outside the site, as well as the noise and breeding of mosquitoes and insects in works sites were not subject to BD's control under the BO. In case non-compliant cases were found during inspections, BD staff would instantly ask contractors to rectify the situation. The case would also be referred to departments concerned for follow up as necessary so as to protect the safety of passersby and road users. Regarding the site at 42 to 46 Eastern Street mentioned by the Chairlady, she said the BD had already provided a relevant written reply.

29. The Chairlady pointed out that the reply she received only mentioned briefly on the inspection carried out that day and that the BD would follow up on the case. As BD's representative had made it clear on the day of inspection that the crack on the tenement building appeared only after the site piling works commenced, she hoped the BD would report on their follow-up actions.

30. Ms CHAN Yuen-wing, Wing of the BD responded that she would forward the case to the colleagues concerned to follow up.

31. The Chairlady concluded that the Secretariat should write again to the departments absent asking them to attend the next meeting. In addition, the Police should provide clearly the dates of inspections, and that the sites at 311 Des Voeux Road Central/152 Connaught Road Central, 28 Bonham Road, 1 to 4 Chancery Lane and 73 Caine Road should be included in the next report.

32. Mr KAM Nai-wai asked the BD to target at the listed sites and carry out at least two inspections each month.

33. The Chairlady asked the Members present whether they agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai's proposal. Since the majority of Members agreed, the Chairlady asked the BD to provide a written report in the next meeting.

34. Since the CEDD had yet to send a representative to the meeting, the Chairlady said she would postpone the discussion of the "Standing item – Monitoring of the ground decontamination works at the site of ex-Kennedy Town incineration plant/abattoir and adjoining area" until a representative from the CEDD attend the meeting. The Chairlady reminded DO(C&W) of the need to call the D of CEDD, as she still did not see DO(C&W) taking actions accordingly.

**Item 5(v): Standing item – Improvement works for Lyttelton Road Refuse Collection Point  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 78/2020)**

---

(3:29 pm to 3:42 pm)

35. The Chairlady said that prior to the meeting, the Secretariat had invited the TD to attend but the department said they were unable to send a representative to the meeting. The Secretariat

would therefore note the views of Members and forward to the department.

36. With the aid of the revised plan, Mr MA Wai-kei, Property Services Officer of the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) said that the conservation area of trees had been expanded, and the area for litter containers and parking spaces had been reduced to 4 metres x 8.4 metres and 5 metres x 11.2 metres respectively. He went on to say that the additional greening area suggested by Members mainly concentrated on the location of the refuse bins facing the streets, and the new refuse collection station would have water and power supply.

37. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr KAM Nai-wai said that he had made an earlier request asking the Secretariat to provide a report on each site visit, but he wondered if the “big secretary” had followed up on his request, as he did not receive the inspection report on Lyttelton Road Refuse Collection Point. He hoped the “big secretary” would follow up with the secretaries of all the Committees so that they could learn about the result of the site visit. In addition, he asked about the commencement date of the project, the time required and the funding situation, and whether the works would involve alteration of the retaining wall. If so, whether greening work could be included during reinstatement.
- (b) Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille asked the FEHD how many refuse bins could be placed after the plan had been revised, whether the refuse bins and 3-colour recycling bins which added up to about 10 in number could all be placed there, and whether the bins placed could meet the actual demand of the area. Regarding the greening location, she would not recommend greening work beside refuse bins and asked whether there were better alternatives. She also asked what departments would be responsible for maintenance and protection of the plants after greening, as improper management of the plants in the future might affect the environment of the refuse collection point.
- (c) The Chairlady asked whether the revised plan would involve narrowing the pavement.

38. Mr MA Wai-kei of the ArchSD responded that the existing pavement was about 2.1 metres and was expected to reduce by 0.5 metre subject to discussions between the ArchSD and the TD. Regarding the retaining wall, based on preliminary assessment, there was no need to rebuild the entire retaining wall but it would be reinforced, and the department would consider the feasibility of greening. He said that the greening area currently proposed was only a preliminary idea, the actual area would be subject to detailed design after the funding was received. With respect to land use and funding arrangements, the issues had to be tackled and followed up with the Lands Department (LandsD) and FEHD. It was expected that the project would be completed within three years after funding was secured. Besides, the existing space reserved for refuse bins should

be large enough for accommodating the existing bins.

39. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that the exact number of refuse bins that could be installed was not available at the moment, but the DC Member of the district would be informed once the data was available.

**Item 6: Green Burial 2020**

**(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 63/2020)**

---

(3:42 pm to 4:27 pm)

40. Mr KAM Nai-wai asked DO(C&W) whether “green burial” was an issue confined to the C&W district. If it was considered a territory-wide issue, he asked DO(C&W) if he would walk out of the meeting with the Secretariat. If DO(C&W) considered it not a territory-wide issue and was not leaving, he would like DO(C&W) to make it clear in response so that he could take legal action in the future. He asked the Secretary to make a clear record. He questioned how that issue was different from the issues of “Council of teachers”, “Police enforcement in C&W district”, “Quarantine” and “Health Codes”. He would like DO(C&W) to answer one by one for a record to be made and asked the Secretary to make a verbatim record.

41. DO(C&W) thanked Members for reminding him of his legal duty on the related subject. He opined that there was no problem in discussing the issue.

42. As DO(C&W) stated that there was no problem with the discussion item, Mr HUI Chi-fung asked whether “green burial” was a territory-wide issue.

43. Ms CHENG Lai-king pointed out that “green burial” was not only a C&W district issue, a territory-wide issue, it was even a world-wide issue as everybody had to go through birth, death, illness and old age. She very much supported the discussion of such an important issue as “green burial” in the DC. She pointed out that in the past, if the Chairperson included a territory-wide issue in the discussion which DO(C&W) disagreed, saying that it was not a matter of C&W, he would leave the meeting. If DO(C&W) decided that there was no need to leave the meeting, that would mean the issue could be a subject for discussion. She called upon the chairpersons of various committees to bear that in mind, when discussing about “bus lanes” or “ferries”, etc. in the future, say in determining whether the ferry service from Tsim Sha Tsui to Central was a C&W district issue, considering the mobility of people in society, they should quote the example of “green burial”. She would like that to be put on record to facilitate the Chairpersons in determining whether a subject could be put to discussion.

44. Seeing that there was no crematorium in the district, Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam said if DO(C&W) considered “green burial” an issue in the C&W district, he would like DO(C&W) to explain how green burial was possible in the district without a crematorium. He asked whether there were sites in the district that could be used for green burial, his understanding was that there were no such facilities for green burial but only a public mortuary in the district. He expressed his

dissatisfaction with DO(C&W) for he often handled papers which was outside his purview.

45. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that he would “scold till DO leaves the meeting”. He deliberately insulted DO(C&W), saying he was “unscrupulous, shameless, incapable and despicable” in stating “the health code” was a territory-wide issue, the “Council of teachers” was a territory-wide issue, the “DC election” was a territory-wide issue, but not “Green burial”. He asked DO(C&W) if he considered himself despicable. He continued that “I would say the same thing even to a stupid fool. What the hell are you doing? How can you move the goalposts in such a way heedlessly?” He said as a person, as a civil servant, how he could possibly act in such a way in front of a democratically elected council. He pointed out that if under any directives, DO(C&W) could leave the meeting if he was being insulted, he would ask DO(C&W) to leave because “I am now insulting you, I am absolutely insulting you because you are insulting all the people of Hong Kong”. He said DO(C&W) had responded that there was no problem in dealing with the issue because of his legal duty. He queried what kind of legal duty it was, who he was representing and “who paid for his job”. He further said that “he had never seen such a despicable person” who said “green burial” was not much of a territory-wide issue. “You are lying through your teeth. How can you act in such a manner? How can you be considered a civil servant? How can you be considered an AO?”, he said to DO(C&W). He pointed out that DO(C&W) should be accountable for his own act in the DC. He said that he would definitely take part in the discussion of such an issue in the meeting. He would take part in the discussion of all issues including territory-wide issues, for being an elected member, he had the obligation to take part in the discussion. He would take part in the discussions of all matters relating to the well-being of the C&W residents under the District Councils Ordinance. There was even a greater need to discuss the issue in the face of such a “shameless, despicable, contemptible and depraved person, a government official who deliberately confounded right and wrong, in particular, the DO of C&W”. He would like to know if DO(C&W) had the right to define if a subject was a territory-wide issue and asked DO(C&W) “are you dumb? Where is your brain? What a despicable person you are.” He asked the Secretary to record his speech clearly. As a district councillor for twenty odd years, he said that he would hold himself liable for what he said. “If you want to chain me up, please do.”

46. DO(C&W) reiterated that there was no problem in discussing the item, and he had nothing to add. On the other hand, he would like the Secretary to put on record that he disagreed with the remark of Mr KAM Nai-wai made just now.

47. Mr KAM Nai-wai pointed out that DO(C&W) would no doubt disagree with his remark, as he would hardly admit that he was a “despicable” and “shameless” person. He asked DO(C&W) why he was still at the meeting, wondered why there was such kind of “contemptible” and “despicable” person. As this was a territory-wide issue, he wondered why DO(C&W) was still at the meeting, he should have “walked out of the meeting with his team”. He said that he had asked DO(C&W) to call the D of CEDD and questioned whether DO(C&W) “knew how to do it”. Regarding whether green burial was a territory-wide issue, he did not think that DO(C&W) should be the person to decide, he called upon citizens who were watching live on Facebook to find out what a topic it was. Seeing that DO(C&W) had ruled out the discussions on the topics of “Health

Code”, “Council of teachers” and “DC election”, he asked whether DO(C&W) was “a human being”.

(Post-meeting note: With respect to the letter dated 30 September 2020 from the Director of Home Affairs to the Chairlady of the C&W DC entitled “Calling again for mutual respect and rational communications in the C&W DC”, Mr KAM Nai-wai had replied to the Director on 8 October 2020 saying that he would withdraw the unparliamentary languages used in the meeting.)

48. Mr HUI Chi-fung asked whether “green burial” was a territory-wide issue, he demanded DO(C&W) not to evade the question.

49. DO(C&W) pointed out that he had twice given the government’s stance in his response, and there was no need to repeat.

50. Mr. LEE Pak-ho, Senior Health Inspector (Administration and Development) Special Duties of the FEHD gave a briefing on the Paper. He said that green burial was an effort made by the government to promote a more environmentally friendly and sustainable means of handling cremains, including scattering cremains in gardens of remembrance (GoRs) or at sea. The FEHD currently managed 12 GoRs where a variety of trees and flowers were planted. Memorial walls or electronic kiosks were installed for members of the public to mount commemorative plaques or make use of the electronic memorial service to pay tribute to the deceased. Apart from arranging their own vessel trips, members of the public might also apply for FEHD’s free ferry services for scattering cremains at designated waters. The FEHD would assist bereaved families to create personalised memorial pages in the Internet Memorial Service (IMS) website to enable them to pay tribute to the deceased via the internet anytime and anywhere in future. The FEHD also arranged four memorial sails each year. He went on to say that for the past eight years, the number of green burial cases had been on the rise, and briefed Members on the Green Burial Central Register. He also introduced FEHD’s policy on optimisation of niches. If a deceased person was a close relative or in a close relationship with the person whose ashes were the first placed in a niche, members of the public could apply for co-location of their cremains in the same niche. As such, the loved ones could stay together, and it would also be easier for descendants to visit them. He further introduced the temporary storage of cremains, the Garden of Forever Love, Tsang Tsui Columbarium and Wo Hop Shek Columbarium Phase VI.

51. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Ms CHENG Lai-king asked whether a commemorative plaque for scattering of cremains in the GoR was for one deceased member, and whether the plaque was of the size of a name card. She further asked whether bereaved families using the scattering of cremains at sea service could only pay tribute to the deceased through the internet or taking part in FEHD’s memorial sail each year.

- (b) Mr KAM Nai-wai moved an impromptu motion to reprimand DO(C&W), pointing out that “green burial” should be a territory-wide issue instead of a C&W issue. On the other hand, he said he had taken part in his relative’s scattering of cremains at sea ceremony and was on board a vessel converted from a vehicular ferry, which was an old vessel manufactured many years before. The FEHD vessel was shaking a lot, he therefore asked whether the department would consider upgrading the vessels to a newer model, as the design of these old vessels, being vehicular ferries, was not meant for scattering of cremains ceremonies, and would make people feel a lack of respect to the deceased. He hoped the setting and process of the scattering of cremains at sea service would be made more solemn to show respect to the deceased and help promote the service. He went on to say that more than \$800 million had been spent on producing “masks that looked like underpants”, and the Universal Community Testing Programme which succeeded in identifying some 30 confirmed cases had been spending an average of \$40 odd million in detecting one confirmed patient. Given that the government was willing to spend such a large sum of money, he wondered if the scattering of cremains service could be enhanced as a means to encourage green burial to deal with the number of deaths every day. In addition, he asked how many free memorial sails family members of the deceased could take part, as bereaved families might wish to pay tribute to the deceased through the memorial sail each year. If the memorial sails could not be made free of charge, he asked whether the government could arrange regular memorial services for bereaved families to pay tribute at sea.
- (c) Mr HUI Chi-fung would like to know whether the GoRs, scattering of cremains at sea and IMS were only services for residents of C&W district or were opened to residents of other districts, as many of the areas mentioned were not within the C&W district. He hoped the department would clarify and asked whether the department would discuss the issue in other DCs. Given that paying respect to the deceased might last for 30 or 50 years, he would like to know how long the IMS would operate, and whether the department could commit on managing the website.
- (d) Mr YOUNG Chit-on, Jeremy said that the vessels used on scattering of cremains at sea service needed improvement, which should be made more solemn with a better outlook to encourage more people to use the service. There could be different charges for people to choose. As the current percentage of adopting green burial in handling the dead body of the deceased to the number of total deaths was around 15%, he asked whether the department had a target set. If there was a gap between the current percentage and the set target, the department should step up promotion to encourage more residents to choose the service which was a more sustainable approach, particularly in face of the serious problem of an ageing population. He suggested the department to provide more incentives to arouse residents’ interests in adopting green burial, and to increase the locations of scattering cremains at sea.

52. Mr LEE Pak-ho of the FEHD responded that bereaved families adopting scattering of cremains in GoRs could mount a commemorative plaque for the deceased. A plaque measured 150 cm x 55 cm and could add in other deceased members later. Scattering of cremains at sea, however, would not have commemorative plaques installed. The department would call bereaved families who had taken free memorial sails within three years via SMS and notices on newspapers to take part in memorial sails. Bereaved families could also pay tribute to the deceased through the IMS website without any due date. The department had been employing bigger vessels since 2012 which provided more stable sea voyages. In the new terms and conditions of service, contractors were required to provide adequate memorial facilities and settings to ensure the whole ceremony would be held in a solemn atmosphere. The three locations for scattering cremains at sea had been selected after consulting the EPD and stakeholders. Since it took a progressive approach for residents to accept green burial, the department would continue to improve the facilities concerned so as to attract more family members to consider using green burial in handling cremains. There was no concrete target percentage for the time being. The department would present the subject of green burial to various DCs so that the public would have a better understanding of the service.

53. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Victor asked the FEHD whether only family members who had used the department's funeral services could use the IMS website, and whether the website could be opened to all family members of the deceased.
- (b) Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry asked about the charges of green burial services, as well as the utilisation rate. She also asked whether there were private companies providing green burial services.

54. Mr LEE Pak-ho of the FEHD responded that the IMS was for application of bereaved families who had used the department's funeral service or the cremains of the deceased had been kept in a private columbarium. Scattering of cremains in GoRs was free of charge, while mounting of commemorative plaques would charge an administrative fee of \$90 plus the related production costs. The department's ferry service for scattering of cremains at sea was also free of charge.

55. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr HUI Chi-fung asked whether the green burial service was confined to residents of the C&W district or open to other districts.
- (b) Ms CHENG Lai-king asked whether the department had provided information on keeping abortuses service for residents in need.

- (c) Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry further prompted on the utilisation rate of green burial service.

56. Mr LEE Pak-ho of the FEHD responded that in 2019, the percentage of adopting green burial in handling the dead body of the deceased to the number of total deaths was 14.7%. As at June 2020, 126 keeping spaces had been used in the Garden of Forever Love. The green burial service was open for application of all residents in Hong Kong.

57. Noting that the department's green burial service was open to all residents in Hong Kong, Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Victor asked DO(C&W) why the territory-wide issue was put up for discussion in the meeting. He hoped DO(C&W) would not give "useless" answer such as "I have nothing to add" or "I have nothing to respond", unless he admitted that he was a "useless" person.

58. DO(C&W) replied that he had nothing to add.

59. Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Victor would like to put on record DO(C&W)'s decline to respond and to explain. He asked for a verbatim record.

60. The Chairlady said that an impromptu motion proposed by Mr KAM Nai-wai and seconded by Ms CHENG Lai-king was received. Agreed by one-third of the Members present, the motion could be put up for discussion at the meeting. There was no amendment by Members on the motion.

61. After discussion and voting, the following impromptu motion was adopted:

"On 17 September 2020, the Building Management, Environmental Hygiene & Works Committee (BEHWC) of the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) holds a discussion on 'Green Burial' which is a territory-wide issue. In view of this, the BEHWC of C&WDC strongly condemns Mr LEUNG Chee-kay, District Officer (Central and Western), and the autocratic and tyrannical rule of the Carrie LAM Administration for indiscriminately prohibiting and obstructing the C&WDC and its Committees to discuss other territory-wide issues."

(14 affirmative votes by: Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Victor, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr NG Siu-hong, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry, Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille)

(1 dissenting vote by: Mr YOUNG Chit-on)

(0 abstention vote)

**Item 7: Market Disinfection and Rodent Control**  
**(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 76/2020)**

---

(4:27 pm to 5:00 pm)

62. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD apologised for not able to submit the Paper before the deadline and hoped Members would understand.

63. Mr FUNG Wai-nok of the FEHD briefed Members on the Paper. He said that to tackle the COVID-19 pandemic, the FEHD had arranged local markets to close an hour earlier for additional deep cleaning and disinfection in addition to regular cleaning and cleansing work. Deep cleaning work had also been done on the periphery of markets and nearby streets. The FEHD had stepped up cleaning and disinfection of communal areas and facilities in the markets, arranged for checking the body temperature of market patrons, provided disinfectant hand sanitisers and stepped up cleaning of market air conditioning and ventilation systems. On rodent control, the FEHD had arranged contractors to place rodenticides and rodent traps on places where rats were found, mend walls and floor cracks, fill up gaps of door foot, etc. The FEHD had also arranged contractors to thoroughly clear refuse and clean passageways and drains in the markets every night after the markets were closed. The FEHD encouraged proactively the cooperation of stall tenants to carry out rodent control work and had discussed with market vendor representatives on launching the Special Cleansing Day. Furthermore, the FEHD had arranged contractors to set up a number of temporary refuse collection points to facilitate stall tenants to dispose of their refuse, and contractors were required to carry out deep cleansing and disinfection afterwards.

64. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr KAM Nai-wai said that each market had their respective consultative committees and rodent issues would be discussed during their meetings. In Sheung Wan Market for example, the number of rats caught would be reported in each meeting. However, the statistical data of rat catch in the recent six months did not see any significant growth, market vendors and stall tenants had reflected on a rising trend in rat infestations instead. He enquired whether the department had used very old-fashioned methods such as untempting food baits which had affected rat catch. He suggested the use of barbecued pork or more delicious baits to lure rats into traps so as to increase the probability of rat catch. He pointed out that rodent infestations had been persistent in the district and their activity range was not confined to markets. Rodents were also found on the cracked road surfaces of Queen's Road West and Fook Sing Court in Queen's Road Central, for example. He asked the department to follow up on these two locations afterwards.
- (b) Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin said the rodent problem in Sai Ying Pun Market that she

reflected to the department had been featured earlier by reporters. The rats there were fierce, not only did they bite the food, but they also chew through the foam boxes that held the food. She would like to know the effect of placing rodent traps. In addition, some market vendors had reflected that by placing glue traps themselves, they were able to catch one to two rats each day which was even more effective than the department's placing of rodent traps. She understood that glue traps would probably be avoided based on residents' perception and humanitarian grounds. She therefore suggested the department to have more exchanges with traders and consider placing rodent traps inside their shops.

- (c) Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam said it was his understanding that the department would not place "fragrant" baits in general. Quoting his rat-catch experience in the Hong Kong Coliseum, he said the then contractor suggested placing fresh roasted squid in places where rats were often found and glue traps laid by the side, which would increase the probability of rat catch. He said similar methods were seldom used in markets, but China-made plastic boxes that easily broke were often used instead. The probability of rat catch by broken boxes was indeed low, he therefore hoped that the department would consider using plastic boxes with better quality instead of the China-made boxes acquired by the lowest bid. Furthermore, he enquired whether the Department would consider offering free rental or rental deduction to market traders by three months during the pandemic.
- (d) Mr HO Chi-wang said that complaints from residents reflected that rats were found in the rear lane between the refuse depot near Shek Tong Tsui Market and Wing Hing House, he hoped more attention would be paid. In addition, bodies of burnt rats were found in the heaps of burnt joss papers. With more residents burning incense sticks and joss papers recently, he hoped the department would increase site inspections to deal with the health and rodent problems that might be caused. As residents were often found feeding rats, which could be seen from Queen's Road West to Belcher's Street, he opined that more attention should be paid.
- (e) Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus pointed out that the staff responsible for checking the temperature of market patrons at the entrance of Smithfield Market was not performing well, not paying full attention to the temperature readings of people entering the market and were using their mobile phone during work, adding that not all the markets were equipped with temperature checking systems at the entrance. He enquired about the criteria for selection of thermometers as well as the brands and models currently used in markets of C&W district.
- (f) Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille said that the report currently submitted by the department was too brief, she hoped that the rodent prevention work on each market would be provided and consideration be given to using updated methods in rat catching. She

also hoped that the department would exercise more supervision on the work of contractors, as the staff responsible for temperature check were not found at the place of work sometimes.

- (g) The Vice-chairman asked how frequent the Special Cleansing Day was held, and whether the DC Member of the constituency would be informed in advance as he/she might be interested in learning more about the Special Cleansing Day. With respect to the rodent baits mentioned by Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam, he suggested switching to new rodent baits on a regular basis so that the rats would not be tired of a certain kind of bait.
- (h) Ms CHENG Lai-king said that she had asked the department earlier to place rat poison in the vacant green hawker area, but the poison was ultimately taken by sparrows who were killed instead of the rats. She learnt that the hawker area was infested by rats and hoped the department would pay more attention to the case.

65. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that the department did not relax its efforts even though the rodent infestation rate in the C&W district was not high. Regarding the locations mentioned by Mr KAM Nai-wai, the department would put them on record and follow up. Regarding the market vendors issue, the department did negotiate with them on the Special Cleansing Day and call on stall tenants to clear their refuse to help with the cleaning and disinfectant work. As the Special Cleansing Day was arranged in a rather hurried manner and was held shortly after discussion with the Chairlady, the department was only able to inform the DC Member of the constituency one to two days before the event was held. She added that the department had put up notices after the event to tell residents about the department's efforts and the effect. Regarding rodent baits, the department had used different baits to lure rats to traps, including barbecued pork and freshly roasted squid, but glue traps were not used based on humanitarian considerations. She added that staff of the Pest Control Teams would further communicate with individual tenants and follow up with the views relayed. Regarding the plastic boxes mentioned by Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam, she pointed out that plastic boxes were generally used to hold rat baits to prevent residents from getting into contact with them, rat traps were used in markets in general. Regarding the hawker area mentioned by Ms CHENG Lai-king, she had arranged staff to put more rat traps there. Regarding body temperature check, she had asked contractors of respective markets to replace the under-performers and would follow up on the situation raised by Members. Regarding the lack of temperature check at some of the entrances as mentioned by Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus, she explained that the entrances concerned were not in use, but were probably afforded access by market vendors or residents who had individually removed the stands put to stop entry. She would follow up again on the situation and arrange staff to help with temperature check at all entrances as far as possible. Given that the existing temperature checking system was provided by the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD), she had to ask the EMSD for the relevant information before providing the brands and models of thermometers Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus asked for. In tackling the situation where more residents burnt joss papers in the seventh month of the lunar

year, the department had arranged for more frequent cleaning services and more attention would be paid to environmental cleanliness. Regarding the rental reduction mentioned by Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam, she said on the day before the meeting, the government had announced a 6-month rental concession by 75% for all market stalls under the FEHD, which would take effect from 1 October this year.

66. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry learnt that the FEHD had tried to use infrared device for rat catch in some districts, she asked Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD about the effect of work, and whether consideration would be given to introduce it in the C&W district.
- (b) Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin asked the FEHD about the effect of placing rodent traps in designated target areas in the Sai Ying Pun Market, and the differences from the regular practice of trap placement. She also asked whether consideration would be given to placing rodent traps or other devices inside stall areas.
- (c) Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam pointed out that the rental concessions offered to stall tenants were different from the motion asking for free rentals by the DC earlier, he hoped Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD would relay their views to the department. He went on to say that businesses near to Community Testing Centres had been affected by the testing service and the number of customers and business turnover had reduced, he hoped relief measures could be introduced. Regarding rodent control, he asked whether there were new technologies to help with rat catch.

67. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that the trial run on infrared device was mainly for monitoring rat infestation instead of rat catching. However, further discussions could be held with Members after the specific information and statistical data were available. Besides, the Pest Control Advisory Section of the department had been studying ways to capture rats. She would follow up on any new guidelines put in place. Regarding the suggestion of Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin in providing traps to market vendors, the department would study its feasibility and make necessary arrangements as far as practicable if it was found feasible.

68. Mr FUNG Wai-nok of the FEHD added that the trial run in Sai Ying Pun Market involved placing more rodent traps in individual locations, which meant to concentrate the resources in designated areas. After a trial run of two weeks, the effect on rats catching was seen improved. The trial project would therefore be continued in other areas. With respect to the rodent problems inside and outside the markets, he pointed out that a series of anti-rodent operations had been carried out in designated target areas in the past month with cleaning and rodent control work done inside and outside of markets.

**Item 8: Used clothes collection points in the Central and Western District**

**(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 67/2020)**

**Request for providing more used clothes collection bins in the Central and Western District to facilitate residents in the district to practise green living**

**(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 70/2020)**

---

(5:00 pm to 5:31 pm)

69. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr HO Chi-wang said that there were no used clothes collection points in the Water Street constituency, he suggested adding new collection bins in the Third Street Playground. Based on his experience in used clothes recycling work over the past two years, the response from residents was very encouraging. He therefore hoped that regular services would be introduced in the district.
- (b) Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille asked whether the C&WDO had any comments on the locations of used clothes collection bins raised by Members and if they had studied the feasibility of these locations. She said that the nearest collection bin in the University constituency was located on the ground floor of Sai Ying Pun Community Complex, but the collection bin was always full and the location was not convenient. She suggested providing an additional collection bin at Exit C of the Sai Ying Pun Station and would like to know the comments of the C&WDO on Member's suggestions.
- (c) Mr YOUNG Chit-on, Jeremy said that as a district councillor of the Peak constituency, he hoped that a used clothes collection bin would be provided at MacDonnell Road, which was more populated and near to the constituency of Mr HUI Chi-fung. He therefore hoped that a collection bin would be added. He would also like to hear the views of the government, such as the area occupied, the space needed, the frequency of collection, and whether bigger bins could be chosen, etc. so that Members could suggest more specific locations.
- (d) Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam said that there were two collection bins in his constituency. One was placed inside Kwan Yick Building Phase 1 Shopping Arcade and the other in FEHD's Sai On Lane Children's Playground. The FEHD's Sai On Lane Children's Playground continued to provide used clothes recycling services while the Owners' Corporation (OC) of Kwan Yick Building Phase 1 had notified residents that "recycling service was suspended due to the COVID-19 pandemic". Adhesive tapes were used to seal the opening of the bin. He asked whether the department allowed the sealing of the bin. He also enquired whether the collection bins were

waterproof, whether recycling work had continued during the pandemic, and the frequencies of collecting used clothes from the collection bins. In addition, he suggested adding a collection bin under the Hill Road flyover, as there were already installed refuse bins, 3-coloured recycling bins and glass bottles collection bins. Additional provision of a used clothes collection bin would make the location a recycling hotspot. If a used clothes collection bin was to be installed, he asked whether cleaning work could be enhanced or a special design adopted to maintain environmental hygienic.

- (e) Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry said that according to the list, there was no used clothes collection bins in her constituency, but there was one in Sai Wan Estate. She asked whether or not the collection bin belonged to the HAD, and wondered which department managed the collection bin. Besides, she asked what streets and circumstances warranted the provision of used clothes collection bins. As there was no covered space in her constituency for example, she worried that rainwater might dampen the clothes inside the collection bin which would subsequently be thrown away. She then asked how the department would ensure collection bins were kept cleaned, as she would not wish the used clothes collection bins were as dirty as the 3-coloured recycling bins, and dirty recycling bins were not suitable for clothes recycling. She suggested the provision of an additional collection bin in the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden, which was a covered site. Given that parks and gardens were under the purview of the FEHD, she asked whether the HAD could place collection bins in gardens, if so, which department would be responsible for management, and whether the HAD would deploy manpower for regular cleaning and collection.
- (f) Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin expressed her concern over the quality of used clothes collection bins. She had received numerous complaints alleging residents dumping miscellaneous items into the used clothes collection bin at the Western District Community Centre on Third Street, Sai Ying Pun, and there were allegations on stealing clothes from the collection bin. She asked how the department would monitor the situation so that residents would regain the confidence in using the collection bin. She added that quite a lot of residents had asked her whether used clothes recycling activities would be held, as they did not believe in the proper management of collection bins by the government. She was also concerned about the way the winter clothes currently collected would be handled, as in general circumstances, the used clothes collected would be distributed to poorer countries which might not need winter clothes. She also asked whether there were clothes not suitable for collection.
- (g) Mr KAM Nai-wai opined that the issue of collection bins management should be settled before suggesting the locations of collection bins. Take the 3-coloured

recycling bins as an example, residents had asked Members to take away the bins as they opined that recycling bins not properly managed would create new hygienic blackspots. He enquired how the department would do a good job in maintaining environmental cleanliness and hygiene. He said that many Members had taken part in used clothes recycling work, they saw that residents were very concerned about the outlet of used clothes collected, say, where the clothes would be distributed, who would be benefitted, how the clothes would be distributed, etc., he asked whether these were clearly indicated on the collection bins. Besides, many residents had brought their used clothes to Members' offices for recycling based on their confidence on Members, he queried the department for not giving proper explanations on these questions which should be explained in detail. In addition, the department should set out clearly the frequency and time of collection at the recycling point, just like the postal services which would list out the time for mail collection. Furthermore, he asked why municipal services buildings and markets, which were covered and suitable places for placing used clothes collection bins, were not used as collection points. Seeing that a used clothes collection bin was placed next to the public toilet in the Hollywood Road Park, he queried how the department would determine the locations of collection bins, and why conspicuous locations and covered places such as Sheung Wan Market, Shek Tong Tsui Market, Smithfield Market or Smithfield Municipal Services Building were not chosen, as these places should facilitate collection and monitoring of the situation.

- (h) Ms CHENG Lai-king asked whether the guest speakers attending for discussion of the item represented the organisations that assisted the HAD in managing used clothes collection bins, and how long the contract would be renewed. According to the Paper, the volume of used clothes recycling in the C&W district amounted to 40 tonnes, which took up 32% of the clothes collected in Hong Kong Island and the Islands under the recycling programme. As it was considered a significant amount, she had attached much importance to used clothes recycling and hoped the programme would be made more open and transparent, say, how the used clothes collected would be handled and sold. She had seen used clothes falling out from the full collection bin in Caine Road Garden, and in a number of years before, she had personally seen people taking used clothes from the collection bin in Kwong Hong Terrace Garden at night, she therefore hoped that the department could properly monitor the situation. She added that residents preferred to have collection services provided by Members as they were more transparent in making proper records on how the clothes were handled after collection. She hoped the department would explain to Members the details about used clothes recycling programme and provide a clear schedule of clothes collection.

70. Dr Jeffrey Hung, Chief Executive Officer of the Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Ltd. (FoE(HK)) responded that the "Used Clothes Recycling Programme" was assigned to four Scheme

Managers for management and the FoE(HK) was responsible for Hong Kong Island and the Islands. There were currently 15 collection bins in the C&W district, 10 managed by the FoE(HK), the other five by other non-governmental organisations (NGOs). Allocation to applicant organisations would be done by ballots every quarter, and the current Scheme Managers were Tuen Mun Youths Association, 關愛行動 (organisation name not available in English) and 活水之泉有限公司 (organisation name not available in English). The FoE(HK) would provide a report to the HAD every quarter, listing out the volume of clothes collected during the period, the number of complaints received, whether there were other incidents, etc.. Regarding the suggestion of providing additional collection bins, he pointed out that practical limitations had to be taken into account. For example, the two collection bins currently placed in the Cheung Chau Market were very dirty as many residents had misused the collection bins as refuse bins. There were also complaints from residents alleging that the collection bins placed on prominent locations were causing obstructions, therefore, he was of the view that additional collection points had to be determined with the experiences gained in different districts and various factors for consideration. Based on past experiences, it was considered unfeasible to put used clothes collection bins alongside 3-coloured recycling bins. One used clothes collection bin had been placed alongside a 3-coloured recycling bin in Lockhart Road and a number of complaints were received during the period, alleging that the collection bin was very dirty, being misused by many residents as refuse bins. Regarding the design of the collection bins, he said that the collection bins currently in use were waterproof with a pull opening. Compared to the old design, the new ones had an anti-theft board to prevent people from taking clothes from the bin. Residents could simply put their used clothes into the collection bin and to make sure that it was completely closed. According to the terms of the contract, they would handle used clothes dumped by the side of collection bins within 24 hours after a complaint was received. However in the past, there were cases where residents just dumped used clothes directly by the side of the collection bin when it was only about 20% full, therefore, the FoE(HK) would enhance education to the public so that they would put used clothes inside the bins themselves. He said that the collection bins currently managed by the FoE(HK) were still under operation, while those managed by some of the NGOs had their services temporarily suspended due to the pandemic. He said that the Scheme Managers would be having a meeting with the HAD next week to study the arrangements during the pandemic. Regarding the theft of used clothes, he said that Scheme Managers would call the police to handle the situation and it was hoped that the Police would step up patrols on road sections near to collection bins and negotiate with the HAD the ways to handle individual cases. Regarding the outlet of used clothes, he pointed out that the clothes collected were mainly clean clothes, trousers, socks and shoes, and beddings and underwear were not accepted based on hygiene concern. He added that the FoE(HK) would hold donations of clothes in winter and had started contacting receiving parties. Winter clothes would also be exported to places in need for reuse. The FoE(HK) worked in collaboration with the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, used clothes of inferior qualities were used in seawater desalination experiments for academic studies. Regarding frequencies and timetable of collection, he said that Belcher Bay Park in Kennedy Town Praya and Western District Community Centre in Western Street, Sai Ying Pun had the most frequent collection schedule in C&W district. The volume collected was near to 1 000 tonnes in both July and August. The Western District Community

Centre in Western Street of Sai Ying Pun, on the other hand, had in total 18 and 16 times of collections in July and August respectively. The FoE(HK) did set down schedules for collection, but that was for reference only. The FoE(HK) had set up a telephone hotline to handle unexpected cases and staff would be there to clear the collection bins within 24 hours after a report was received.

71. DO(C&W) responded that he would relay the views of Members on used clothes collection bins expressed during the meeting to the HAD.

72. After discussion and voting, the following motion proposed by Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille and seconded by Mr PANG Ka-ho was adopted:

“This Committee recommends providing more used clothes collection bins in the Central and Western District as soon as possible to meet the demands of the residents.”

(14 affirmative votes by: Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr NG Siu-hong, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry, Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille, Mr YOUNG Chit-on)

(0 dissenting vote)

(0 abstention vote)

**Item 9: Request for taking measures to control congregation of feral pigeons in the Central and Western District  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 68/2020)**

---

(5:31 pm to 6:14 pm)

73. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr HUI Chi-fung pointed out that feral pigeons in the C&W district had been a subject for discussion in several terms of the DC, but effective measures to solve the problem in the long term were yet to be seen, he hoped specific measures would be put forward with long-term commitment in this meeting. He said that the congregation of feral pigeons was causing more hygiene problem, from leaving bird droppings in congregation blackspots at the beginning to the current hygiene problem of flying into homes of residents. Replies from departments in the past had said that resources would concentrate on enforcement and education, but from the current reply of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD), the number of inspections and samples of bird droppings collected were on a downward trend. And even with the number of inspections by the FEHD increased, it was still

not enough to deter residents from feeding feral pigeons, he hoped the two departments could step up inspection work. Given that current complaints on feral pigeons mainly came from buildings and OCs, he hoped that departments would contact them proactively to provide assistance. He asked whether bird repellent liquid could keep pigeons away without hurting them, if so, whether it could be widely used and whether the department would consider distributing repellent liquid to residents in collaboration with the DC. He also asked whether the AFCD had other effective bird repellent products that could be of use.

- (b) Mr HO Chi-wang pointed out that the congregation of feral pigeons in Water Street constituency had improved, but not at the rooftop of Sai Ying Pun Community Complex near the entrance of Eastern Street Carpark, as the crib wall and pipeline design had attracted many feral pigeons to seek habitation there at night. It was hoped that the responsible department could alter the design of the rooftop to deter feral pigeons from gathering at High Street and Eastern Street.
- (c) Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus said that he and Mr PANG Ka-ho had tried using the bird repellent liquid trial pack of the AFCD at the Kennedy Town Praya but it was far from effective, a resident was even seen feeding feral pigeons with rice after that. Seeing that the application of repellent liquid by the AFCD or other professionals should produce more effective results, he hoped the department could spray repellent liquid in public places. As residents feeding feral pigeons at present were prosecuted by anti-littering regulations whose penalties were not effective enough to stop residents, he asked whether the department would consider using other regulations, or even amending the existing regulations as in the case of feeding wild pigs and monkeys in country parks where the penalties were much higher than littering. It was hoped that imposing heavier penalties would deter residents from feeding feral pigeons.
- (d) Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin suggested that consideration be given to alter the structures of some government buildings, such as part of the Sai Ying Pun Community Complex and Sai Ying Pun Market to prevent congregation of feral pigeons at the top of the building. Targetting at these places of congregation, she hoped the AFCD could work with the C&WDO to provide assistance to residents of nearby buildings.
- (e) Ms WONG Kin-ching quoted the reply from the AFCD saying that the use of contraceptive drugs on feral pigeon control might affect the conservation of the protected species of spotted doves. She pointed out that the nuisance of spotted doves to residents was no less serious than feral pigeons. She asked whether both contraceptive drugs and repellent liquid would affect spotted doves. She also asked how the department would handle the problems caused by feral pigeons and spotted doves, and whether the handling methods would be different just because spotted

doves were protected species.

- (f) Mr PANG Ka-ho said that after trying the repellent liquid with Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus, they found that feral pigeons were curious about the repellent agent. They would stop at the sprayed area, sniff and perch there. He asked whether spraying of repellent liquid would produce an immediate effect, or it would take longer time to wait for its effect. He pointed out that Exit A of the Kennedy Town Station near to the minibus stop was also a congregation blackspot, he hoped more attention would be paid. He said that the Kennedy Town New Praya should also be included in FEHD's list of blackspots.
- (g) Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille said that the congregation of feral pigeons brought many problems to nearby residents, for example, for residents of buildings in Bonham Road near Exit C, their air-conditioners were dirtied by bird droppings. She hoped that the AFCD would provide assistance to residents proactively.
- (h) Ms CHENG Lai-king said that the area around Hollywood Terrace also suffered from the congregation of feral pigeons and the air-conditioners were dirtied by bird droppings. She enquired whether there were ways to attract feral pigeons to woodlands or larger parks to prevent them from congregating in the urban area and appearing and finding food in residential areas.
- (i) Mr KAM Nai-wai said that it was the first time that he learnt about bird repellent liquid and hoped he could also try using it. He said that there should be many scientific ways to keep pigeons away. From Central to Western and from the seaside to the hillside, the feral pigeons were affecting residents, yet the AFCD was unable to provide solutions that could protect animal rights and at the same time produce effect. He hoped the AFCD could provide professional views on repellent products and if found feasible, he suggested that the DC provide funding for bulk purchase of repellent liquid, repellent gel and repellent agents for distribution to residents for use.
- (j) Mr NG Siu-hong asked whether the department would provide assistance to help buildings keep pigeons away, and what measures were in place to support affected buildings.
- (k) The Vice-chairman hoped the department would pay attention and follow up on the Western Wholesale Food Market where there were always people feeding feral pigeons as well as Sai Ying Pun Station Exit B3 where feral pigeons congregated.
- (l) Mr YOUNG Chit-on pointed out that many residents fed wild animals, including feral pigeons. He hoped the department would impose heavy penalty on these residents

so as to alleviate the hygiene problem caused by feeding of wild animals and reduce the risks of wild animals spreading disease.

74. Dr LEUNG Wai-yiu, Anthony, Veterinary Officer (Avian Influenza Surveillance) of the AFCD responded that the department would strengthen district education in future, including the idea of launching publicity and education at blackspots, and Members would be invited to join and take part when arrangements on the activities were confirmed. Regarding bird repellent liquid, the department would distribute trial pack for use when complaints were received or upon request from Members, management offices, etc. The department also planned to spray repellent liquid on some of the blackspots on a trial basis to test the effect on public places, and detailed arrangements on the test could be subject to discussion with Members. In general, it took longer time, say, a few weeks to effectively assess whether the repellent liquid produced effect. On the other hand, when complaints on feral pigeons were received, the department would give suggestions to management companies and residents on ways to keep birds away, including setting up bird spikes, ramps and repellent gel. The department had no plan to use contraceptive drugs for the time being as it might affect the protected wild birds of spotted doves, but would pay attention to the result of using contraceptive drugs in nearby regions and take reference of different study reports to decide whether contraceptive drugs should be used in future. He said that the location of Kennedy Town Station Exit A already included the “To Li Terrace, Ching Lin Terrace, Hee Wong Terrace and Academic Terrace area”.

75. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that the department provided not only regular cleaning services, but also disinfectant cleaning with 1:99 diluted bleach solution used in places where feral pigeons gathered. The locations mentioned by Members just now would be noted and cleaning work would step up. Regarding prosecution, there was no legislation to regulate bird feeding at present, but citizens who dirtied public places by bird feeding would be summonsed under the Public Cleansing and Prevention of Nuisances Regulation. She would reflect the views of Members on the lack of deterrent effect of the penalty fine to the FEHD headquarters. Regarding the reduction of perching places for congregation of feral pigeons in the Sai Ying Pun Market, the issue had been referred to the ArchSD for follow up.

76. Miss WONG Sze Ki, Carol, Assistant District Officer (C&W) (ADO(C&W)), responded that the government would spray repellent liquid at congregation places of feral pigeons which Members expressed concern under the next round of District-led Actions Scheme. The DC would report the effect upon completion of the Scheme for the reference of Members as well as other departments.

77. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr KAM Nai-wai proposed the collaboration of BEHWC and the AFCD on a trial scheme, engaging tens of thousands of dollars on some buildings on publishing publicity leaflets and distributing repellent liquid and repellent gel etc. If the

scheme proved effective, it could be extended for implementation in all buildings in the district.

- (b) Mr HUI Chi-fung would like the AFCD to clarify whether feral pigeons were poultry or pests. He hoped that the AFCD could take large-scale measures to solve the congregation problem of feral pigeons, and explained to Members the findings of its studies, such as whether bird repellent liquid would do harm to feral pigeons, the effect of repellent liquid, and the department's plan on the use of repellent liquid. As DO(C&W) was not present at the moment, he hoped ADO(C&W) would listen to the views above and help communicate with local buildings, disseminating the information on how to keep birds away to residents. As feral pigeons flew across different regions, he was not sure whether DO(C&W) would take this as a territory-wide issue and refuse to follow up.
- (c) Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry commented that driving feral pigeons away might not be a good solution, the use of repellent liquid in buildings would only make feral pigeons fly from one building to another, and reducing the number of feral pigeons should be considered instead. She asked whether the department would refer to the methods adopted by foreign countries on handling wild animals. She said that with human beings and feral pigeons living in the same city, too many feral pigeons would cause a great nuisance to residents. Seeing that spotted doves were common in the C&W district, she would like to know why spotted doves were protected animals.
- (d) Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam said that the department's measures were not seen effective in the Shek Tong Tsui constituency as there were already two congregation blackspots outside the Western Wholesale Food Market. He asked whether the department could arrange security guard to standby in the Market to prevent residents from feeding feral pigeons. Besides, there were numerous feral pigeons gathering at the safety island near the Whitty Street Depot, he hoped the department would step up inspections and cleaning work.
- (e) Mr HO Chi-wang described his personal experience to illustrate that the feral pigeon problem had been existing in the district for years. He hoped the C&WDO could arrange a site visit to the Sai Ying Pun Community Complex at night.

78. Dr LEUNG Wai-yiu, Anthony of the AFCD responded that feral pigeons were poultry and not pests. On controlling the number of feral pigeons, the department currently focused on public education, guiding residents not to feed feral pigeons. On bird repelling, the department would contact management offices and OCs proactively to provide them with information related to bird repelling. He said that law enforcement actions would be taken up by the AFHD. On the Western Wholesale Food Market, he would discuss further with the relevant departments and follow up.

79. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that she would pay attention to the place mentioned by Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam.

80. The Chairlady concluded that the trial programme on the use of bird repellent agents in buildings as suggested by Mr KAM Nai-wai would be followed up after the meeting.

81. The Chairlady said that DO(C&W) had contacted and invited the CEDD to attend the meeting before he left, and representative of the CEDD was expected to arrive at 7 pm. The Chairlady decided to advance the discussion on the Pok Fu Lam Road issue, and would decide whether to proceed to discussions on “Concern over the problem of water dripping air-conditioners or damaged and leaking pipes on external walls of buildings” or back to the outstanding item of “Standing item – Monitoring of the ground decontamination works at the site of ex-Kennedy Town incineration plant/abattoir and adjoining area” as appropriate.

**Item 10: Discussion on Consultation for the Proposed Lease Modification for Nos. 86A-86D Pok Fu Lam Road  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 69/2020)  
A large number of trees in Pok Fu Lam Road Playground are removed due to Brown Root Rot Disease  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 81/2020)**

---

(9:10 pm to 9:44 pm)

82. The Vice-chairman invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille said that Papers No. 69/2020 and No. 81/2020 was proposed for joint discussion because both papers involved the environmental management problems of trees in Pok Fu Lam Road. Discussion Paper No. 69/2020 aimed to clarify the problems of trees in nearby slopes while Discussion Paper No. 81/2020 involved FEHD’s removal of six trees from the Pok Fu Lam Road Playground without proper explanation to residents which had aroused their reactions. She hoped the FEHD would consult the DC first before any large-scale removal of trees and compensatory planting in future. She added that in the past, the department merely replanted the King Palm after felling banyan trees that provided shades and shelters for residents, and the situation was considered undesirable. On the other hand, she pointed out that there was an incident involving the sudden collapse of a tree at 84 Pok Fu Lam Road before the meeting. Having studied the case, she learnt that the FEHD did not even know that the collapsed tree was under its management, therefore, she would ask the departments concerned to study the reasons leading to the incident, and whether the incident involved human negligence or errors. She requested the department to provide the inspection reports on the tree in the past and clarify the responsibilities of the HyD and the FEHD on

the incident. She also requested the department to conduct a detailed investigation on the nearby area of the tree and carry out instant maintenance of the slope so as to prevent the recurrence of the accident.

- (b) Referring to BD's reply saying "The structures...requesting for exemption in site coverage calculation...by the BD under the Buildings Ordinance... accounts for approximately 60% of the site area", Ms CHENG Lai-king asked if reconstruction work was to be carried out in a private lot which involved a large piece of slope area at the back, would the reconstruction site be granted an additional 60% of area, that is, would there be a total of 160% of site area which would not require additional charges. She also asked whether the redevelopment of a building meant it could take over the adjacent slope, and could construct carparks and its ancillary areas such as car park entrance lobbies, lifts, staircases, plant rooms, water tanks; covered driveways; elevated terraces, gardens, lawns and planters; external staircases and fence walls, retaining walls and any other floor area or structure being exempted from site coverage calculation by the BD, with payment of land premium not required.
- (c) In view of the tree collapse incident happened just then at 84 Pok Fu Lam Road, Mr HO Chi-weng said that he would like to focus discussion on the tree issue. Regarding the management of trees, he opined that government departments were not doing the job properly. Departments should clarify their respective areas of responsibilities and inform DC Members as well as members of the public. He requested the department to provide the number and frequencies of inspections on the slopes and trees involved in the tree collapse incident and hoped the department would try its utmost to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents.
- (d) Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam said that according to his understanding of the current reporting mechanism, some of the trees were removed by the FEHD without reporting because the diameter at breast height did not reach the reporting standard. He hoped that the department would provide a specific answer on such. On handling brown root rot disease, he asked whether the department had followed the procedures of work. If so, he would ask for a report on the handling procedures, and the department's reply on whether there were adequate protection facilities for fear that the fungi might spread to other trees. For the red-stem fig (青果榕) collapsed before the meeting, it was learnt that the buttress roots had been seriously rotten which might be due to a lack of long term maintenance. He enquired how the DEVB and departments concerned had coordinated in the inspections of some trees which were "left unattended". Referring also to the slopes and trees "left unattended" in the constituency of Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus, he opined that the situation was undesirable in terms of tree protection which would pose a hazard to pedestrian safety.

83. Regarding the trees in the Pok Fu Lam Road Playground, Ms CHAN Miu-ling, Deputy District Leisure Manager (Central and Western) 2 of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) replied that the department had found five of the trees in the playground contracted the brown root rot disease in May and June, and a total of six trees were subsequently found infected with the help of the Tree Management Office. The department then informed all Members through an email in accordance with the tree reporting mechanism of the need to remove one of the trees with a diameter of more than 0.5 metre at breast height. The department appreciated Members' concern about tree conservation and would contact and explain the details to the DC Members of the constituency as far as possible in future. When arranging the removal of the diseased tree, the department did provide the contractor with clear guidelines and rules. For the case of Pok Fu Lam Road Playground, the department did require the contractor to employ professionally qualified workers and provide adequate protective measures. Suitable enclosures were set up around the place of removal and special protection given to the Old and Valuable Trees (OVTs) within the area. After the removal, disinfection was done on the shrubs within the dripline area, and the infected tree stump and roots were packed in enclosed plastic bags before transported to the landfill. As the brown root rot disease was highly infectious, compensatory planting would not be done in general on-site. The department appreciated the concern of residents and Members, therefore, thorough disinfection would be done on the flower bed before covering with new soil. Soil examination would also be arranged before replanting suitable trees. It was expected that trees less vulnerable to infection and without cases of infection, such as the Queen Crape Myrtle, would be planted after discussions with DC Members concerned. Regarding the tree collapse incident happened before the meeting, she said that tree gang colleagues had been following up and should be able to provide relevant information to Members soon.

84. Regarding the lease modification of 86A to 86D Pok Fu Lam Road mentioned by Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr MAK Siu-ming, Bryan, Senior Estate Surveyor/Special Duties (District Lands Office, Hong Kong West and South) of the LandsD said that lease modification did not involve additions to site area, the lot area therefore remained 2 649 square metres, and relaxation in the site coverage area actually involved "the proportion of area of structures built over the lot" and a percentage was therefore used. He continued to say that the landowner did apply to the LandsD for the reconstruction project, and the department had exempted part of the structures on area calculation in accordance with the BO. Insofar as the payment of land premium was concerned, he said that payment was required for the case. Even though there were no additions to the site area, but if the lease modification would increase the land value of the property, the landowner would still be required to pay the amount of land premium according to the general process.

85. Ms YANG Ka-yee, Assistant Secretary (Tree Management)2 of the DEVB responded on the brown root rot disease. The DEVB played a steering and supervision role and would provide assistance to departments in case of need, including the deployment of staff for site inspection and to take specimen for examination as appropriate so as to ascertain whether a tree was infected with brown root rot disease. The DEVB would also provide guidance for the reference of departments, including the issue of the Manual on the Management of Brown Root Rot Disease on April 2019. The Manual provided a pictorial guide showing clearly the steps to follow for reference of other

departments. She continued to say that from the speech given by LCSD colleague just then, it could be seen that she was well acquainted with the whole process and believed the LCSD had followed the guidelines in handling the infected tree. Regarding the site of tree collapse on Pok Fu Lam Road, the slanting surface in the front was a slope under the HyD, at the back was a piece of private land, and the government land in the middle was under the management of the LCSD. The LCSD, HyD as well as the DEVB had been to the site to understand the situation, and the case was being followed up by the LCSD who should be able to provide a detailed report on tree collapse and the background information on the whole case in due course.

86. The Chairlady invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille understood that the trees inside Pok Fu Lam Road Playground was removed due to the infection of the brown root rot disease, but in case there were large-scale removal of trees in future, she hoped that the department could explain more to nearby residents and reduce the enclosed area as far as possible. She hoped that the department would also provide more information on compensatory planting so that she could help explain to residents and collect their views. For the tree collapse incident, she said that the status of the slope at 82 Pok Fu Lam Road was similar to that at 84 Pok Fu Lam Road, she therefore hoped that the department could clarify the responsibilities on tree management. She continued that before the incident, the LCSD was not aware that the collapsed tree was under its management, which was a very serious problem. If the bus driver was not able to put the bus to an immediate stop, it would bring about major injuries and loss of human life. The collapse of a tree which was 10 metres tall might affect the stability of the slope, but no temporary stabilisation works was seen even several hours after the incident. She hoped the department could coordinate on the matter and take immediate actions to follow up on the slope concerned.
- (b) Ms CHENG Lai-king said that it was a very serious question that the LCSD was not aware of its responsibility on the management of the 10-metre collapsed tree. She pointed out that it should be DO(C&W) who was responsible for leading various government departments, including the HyD, LCSD, CEDD, etc. on the work, but DO(C&W) had left the conference room. She hoped the departments could provide name plates and identification for trees so that the trees would no longer be left unattended in future. Giving an example, a lot of fungi were found growing by the side of a tree at 100 Caine Road, however, due to the lack of identification, she could hardly refer the case to the responsible department for follow up. She would not wish to see recurrence of these incidents, as the several cases of tree collapse tragedy in the district were saddening.
- (c) Mr KAM Nai-wai said that DO(C&W) left the meeting at 5 pm to 6 pm every time

and such a scrounging District Officer was hardly acceptable. He considered DO(C&W) “shameless, incapable and unscrupulous”, which had to be put on record. He said it was unacceptable for the government department to conduct large-scale removal of trees without informing DC Members. He questioned why the department had not informed Members and asked for a formal written explanation, a written apology and explanations on subsequent ways of handling the matter. He pointed out that the tree collapse incident at Pok Fu Lam Road was shocking, as no one would know which tree on the road section would suddenly fall down. He said Pok Fu Lam Road was a high-risk area with tens of thousands of people coming from the southern district to the C&W district every day. He suggested arranging a site visit after the meeting to the place of incident on the next day, with departments present to give explanations on-site, including the idea of high-risk management, the reason for tree collapse, and whether there were other trees of risk on the whole Pok Fu Lam Road. Although there was not much rain recently and it was not raining for the whole week, he was concerned that tree collapse incidents might recur with the approach of typhoon. He reiterated his request for a site visit to the place of incident the next day.

87. Ms CHAN Miu-ling of the LCSD replied on the arrangements of Pok Fu Lam Road Playground, saying she recognised residents’ concern over the possible removal of one of the OVTs. Although the department had put up a notice on one of the OVTs indicating its protection area, earlier notice should be given to Members and be present at the scene to explain the situation to residents. The department would improve with the experiences gained. Regarding compensatory planting, the department would provide more information on the species of trees, the blooming and flowering season, etc. after the meeting. Regarding the tree collapse incident at Pok Fu Lam Road, the department would arrange examination and follow-up actions by tree gang colleagues.

88. The Vice-chairman followed up on whether the LCSD could arrange a site visit.

89. Ms CHAN Miu-ling of the LCSD replied that she would liaise with the colleague in charge and make possible arrangements.

90. The Vice-chairman followed up on whether the LCSD could arrange a site visit next morning.

91. Ms CHAN Miu-ling of the LCSD replied that she had to liaise with the tree gang colleagues first.

92. Ms YANG Ka-yee of the DEVB added that the collapsed tree was situated on the ground and not a slope. She recognised the concern of Members on slopes and would learn more about the issue of slope safety from the HyD.

93. After discussion and voting, the following motion proposed by Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille

and seconded by Mr PANG Ka-ho was adopted:

“This Committee requests that the LCSD and other government departments must inform Member of the constituency concerned before removing any trees and explain with detailed reasons and pictures.”

“This Committee requests that the LCSD and other government departments must cater to local conditions when carrying out compensatory planting, replant the most suitable trees in respect of the site concerned and consult Member of the constituency concerned.”

(12 affirmative votes by: Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr NG Siu-hong, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry, Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille)

(0 dissenting vote)

(0 abstention vote)

**Item 11: Concern over the problem of water dripping air-conditioners or damaged and leaking pipes on external walls of buildings  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 71/2020)**

---

(6:47 pm to 7:12 pm)

94. The Vice-chairman invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam said that there were numerous places with water dripping air-conditioners in the district, some of them had been referred to the FEHD earlier and required follow up, he then asked the FEHD about the current progress. He hoped that Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD could urge her colleagues to handle the problem as soon as possible and the water dripping problem at such locations as bus stop, minibus stop and pedestrian crossing should be put on the top of the list.
- (b) Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin said that she had earlier contacted the FEHD regarding water dripping of a building in Bonham Road. As the FEHD said that part of the dripping problem was caused by pipe leakage, the case was subsequently referred to the BD. When following up with the two departments later, the FEHD said that a Nuisance Notice had been issued to a household while the BD replied that views of the consultant had to be sought. She asked what the distribution of work was between the two departments, and what follow up work would be done after a Nuisance Notice

was issued.

- (c) Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry said that the dripping problem of May Sun Building at Smithfield was very serious. A number of households had their air-conditioners dripping non-stop leaving water to stand on the street all the time. She had tried to discuss the problem with the FEHD but like to know whether investigations were being carried out through the OCs or with individual households. She also asked the department how they would handle such dripping problem and how much time would be needed.
- (d) Mr HO Chi-wang said that he had informed the FEHD of the dripping problem of Tung Ming Court at 39 Pok Fu Lam Road on 9 July and received the department's reply on 27 July that a Nuisance Notice would be issued to the household. As the dripping problem remained unsolved, he approached the department again asking about the work progress. It was in the afternoon of 25 August that the department finally issued a Nuisance Notice to the household concerned. He would like to know about the process for the FEHD to handle the water dripping problem and hoped Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD could help follow up on the case with the colleagues concerned.

95. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that the time required for handling water dripping air-conditioners varied according to the complexity of the complaint case. In general, the household who had been issued a Nuisance Notice would follow up and repair the dripping part. With respect to the case mentioned by Mr HO Chi-wang, she had to learn more from the colleagues concerned. Regarding cases where the complainant was not able to locate clearly the unit with water dripping air-conditioners, FEHD staff would contact the building management office, issue advice letters to households on the suspected floor, and observe outside the building with a view to identifying the unit in question, but the process would take time. Regarding the dripping problem at Bonham Road mentioned by Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, the case involved pipe leakage from the premises and required follow up actions by the Joint Office formed by the FEHD and the BD. She pointed out that when a complaint was received, the department would contact the complainant and take measurements on the humidity of the location having water seepage in the unit. If the level of humidity was over 35%, it would mean the unit was suffering from potential seepage problem. The department would then contact the household of the floor above to undergo a colour water test. If the result indicated that the seepage was caused by the floor above, a notice would be issued to that household; if the source of seepage could not be identified, the case would be referred to the BD for follow up. She added that if the BD found the source of water seepage, it would issue a notice to the household concerned and follow up on the repair work.

96. The Vice-chairman pointed out that it was the wish of Members that the department would expedite the follow up work and solve each case as soon as possible. For instance, the department might consider carrying out site inspections at 6 or 7 in the morning.

97. The Vice-chairman invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam said that when a complaint on water dripping was received, he would pay a visit to the place in question and highlight the unit concerned for the FEHD to follow up. He added that the part of Yip Cheong Building near Maxim's Cake as well as Hong Kong Plaza near the bus stop were the locations having serious water dripping problems in Shek Tong Tsui, he hoped the department would follow up on the dripping problem there. Besides, there were households connecting air-conditioner drain pipe to the external wall that had caused water from air-conditioners to flow onto the street along the wall. He asked the FEHD whether such practice was legal.

98. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that the department would conduct inspections and follow up on the water dripping air-conditioners at the most serious hours according to the information provided by complainants. She stated that the department would further follow up the locations of dripping mentioned by Members. Regarding the connection of air-conditioner drain pipe to the external wall, she said it would depend on whether the situation posed a nuisance to others, but in general the department would advise the household to install pipes and drain pans under the air-conditioner concerned.

99. Regarding the distribution of work, Mr POON Yui-chau, William, Senior Building Surveyor/A3 of the BD said that the BD would follow up on dilapidated drain pipes, while general cases of water dripping from air-conditioners would be followed up by the FEHD.

100. Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam pointed out that many buildings failed to provide wall-mounted pipes for households to connect their air-conditioner drain pipe. He asked what advice would be given to these households. Besides, there were air-conditioner drain pipe of buildings not connected to the drainage system but stormwater drains. In case the stormwater drains broke, seepage would occur from the paving blocks of pavements. He asked whether there were advice or guidelines for reference and compliance of building owners in this aspect.

101. Mr POON Yui-chau, William of the BD responded that buildings could install air-conditioner drain pipe in accordance with the simplified requirements of the Minor Works Control System during the building's external maintenance work. If the drain pipe posed a nuisance or was in breach of the BO, the BD would follow up and ask the building owner to rectify the irregularities.

102. The Vice-chairman requested the department to expedite follow-up actions to prevent the recurrence of similar problems next summer.

103. After discussion and voting, the following motion proposed by Mr WONG Weng-chi and seconded by Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam and Mr HO Chi-wang was adopted:

“This Committee requests the departments to expedite the handling of the problems concerning water dripping air-conditioners and leaking pipes of buildings.”

(12 affirmative votes by: Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr NG Siu-hong, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry, Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille)

(0 dissenting vote)

(0 abstention vote)

**Item 5(iv): Standing item – Monitoring of the ground decontamination works at the site of ex-Kennedy Town incineration plant/abattoir and adjoining area  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 66/2020)**

---

(7:12 pm to 7:45 pm)

104. With CEDD's representative attended the meeting, the Vice-chairman said that the next discussion item would be "Item 5(iv): Standing item – Monitoring of the ground decontamination works at the site of ex-Kennedy Town incineration plant/abattoir and adjoining area".

105. The Vice-chairman requested Mr KWOK Ho-yeung, Howard, representative of the CEDD to brief on the Paper and gave the reason for not attending the meeting just then.

106. Mr KWOK Ho-yeung, Howard, Engineer/5 of the CEDD explained that, as mentioned in the written reply, the department was awaiting the consultant to complete the design of the preliminary scheme on decontamination works before consulting the views of Members. The department, therefore, provided an information paper for circulation to members for the time being to report on the latest progress regarding the studies and design pertaining to the decontamination works. He said that the consultant was currently consulting relevant government departments on the depth of decontamination works and its remediation standards in order to work out an appropriate works plan.

107. The Vice-chairman invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr KAM Nai-wai pointed out that the department's representative, being just an engineer, had been "contemptuous" in refusing to attend the DC meeting. He asked the representative whether he knew that the project would affect tens of thousands of residents in Kennedy Town and the C&W district, and why the DC had set the project as a standing item for discussion. It was because the DC was very concerned about the subject that had made it a standing item. He hoped the department "would sit still at the meeting" from now on. If the department refused to attend future meetings, he would ask DO(C&W) to call again the department or even moved the

discussion item to the last. He asked the department once again the reason for not attending the meeting and whether they were civil servants. He hoped the department would learn from this lesson and attend the next meeting on time. Given that a consultant had already been commissioned, he questioned why the department was not attending with the consultant to listen to the views of Members. He said although the DC did not agree to the commencement of decontamination works, if the department decided to proceed, it should listen to residents' views anyhow so as to reduce the effect of the works on nearby residents. He also asked the department the information of the consultant and the contract, including contract fees, name of the consultant, completion date of the works, and when the consultant would attend the meeting. He pointed out that if the department was not attending the meeting, it could hardly answer the questions above. He asked whether the department was having "work from home" or "work from hill". He asked that his speech be clearly recorded. "Such rubbish department is really ridiculous, attending the meeting only after repeated reminders", he said. As the representative was only an engineer, he pointed out that "he is not much of a senior".

- (b) Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry said that the decontaminated works had already started for a few months, she would like to know if the department had any decision on the plan to take soil samples for examination. She hoped that details of the report would be submitted to the meeting so that a record could be made. She pointed out that the department had taken soil samples for examination at Cadogan Street Temporary Garden and the location near to the Sai Ning Street bus depot outside the Garden in 1990 and 2003 respectively. As the contamination level of the two samples was similar, the department opined that no more soil samples had to be taken. The examination report was then passed on to Professor Chiu, and a meeting was held with the professor and the consultant. The professor in fact disagreed with the viewpoint of the department saying that the level of contamination in 1990 and 2003 was different, and contaminants had their half-life. As many plants were planted in the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden and plants had their pollutant-removal properties, the level of soil contamination should have reduced during that period. Notwithstanding, no soil samples had been taken for examination in the past 20 years. She enquired if the department would take more samples for testing and opined that samples should be taken from the shallow layer instead of the deep layer. She would like to know when the consultant would complete the report so that members of the public would know the method used for decontamination.
- (c) Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam said that CEDD's representative had the duty to explain to Members the technicality of the issue so that Members could have a better understanding of the decontamination works and decide if support should be given to the project, it was therefore hoped that the representative would be present every meeting. He continued that the current term of office took a serious attitude towards

discussions, it was hoped that the department would provide detailed information on the report instead of giving a concise written reply. Members could then listen to the views of the department and seek other professional advice as necessary.

- (d) Ms CHENG Lai-king asked how the decontamination works and the project along the harbourfront which HAD had applied for \$8 million funding would work together, as the harbourfront works should not be commenced only after the decontamination works were completed. She would also like to know whether the hoardings near the Cadogan Street crossing would be removed by the department.

108. Mr KWOK Ho-yeung, Howard of the CEDD responded that the consultancy contract on decontamination works took time to study the information and consult relevant departments, therefore at the present stage, the department could not provide the detailed works plan. He added that three ground investigations had been conducted on the entire lot in 2000, 2003 and 2013 and the data of contaminants in soil samples collected from about 190 locations indicated that the soil contained heavy metals and hydrocarbons, the concentration level of some of the samples even exceeded the corresponding land remediation standards set by the EPD. He continued that after the environmental assessment report was approved in 2015, no large-scale excavation work had been done on the site. As decomposition of contaminants was generally uncommon and not easy, the department believed that the current level of contamination was similar to the previous level. However, the department would study with the consultant again to see if there was a need to undergo further examination. Regarding Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam's request for details of the report, he said it would rely on the consultant to complete the report before relevant information could be provided to Members, and arrangements would be made for the consultant to attend DC meetings as appropriate. Besides, the commencement date of the harbourfront works should be earlier than the decontamination works. The department would liaise with the HAD on the hoardings at Cadogan Street and work out the removal arrangements.

109. Mr MOK Chi-kin, Jiv, Senior Executive Officer (District Management) of the C&WDO responded that the harbourfront works was expected to enter the tender process in early 2021 and the whole project completed within the year. He said that the department had close liaison with the CEDD and gained its full support and coordination on relevant work. He understood that Members did not want to make use of the funding from the District Works & Facilities Management Committee for removal of the hoardings, the department would discuss the matter again with the CEDD.

110. Mr KAM Nai-wai pointed out that the department did not respond to the four questions he raised just then.

111. Mr KWOK Ho-yeung, Howard of the CEDD responded that the department was awaiting the consultant's completion of the preliminary design of the works plan, and would attend the DC meeting with the consultant after completion to give a briefing to Members. He added that he did

not have the detailed information of the consultancy contract in hand but would provide supplementary information after the meeting as required.

112. The Vice-chairman invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Responding to what Mr KWOK Ho-yeung, Howard had said, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry said that as a government technical officer, Mr KWOK should be responsible to what he said. She pointed out that the samples taken after 2003 came from the area near Sai Ning Street bus depot outside the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden but not from the Garden itself. There were always buses entering and leaving the depot and it was understandable that the soil was relatively polluted in that location, but the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden was full of trees which by nature possessed pollutant-removal properties. The department should, therefore, distinguish the differences in the location and properties of soil instead of making a general conclusion. Referring to the decontamination method mentioned during the meeting of Mr MOK Chi-kin, Jiv with the department, she asked if pollutants hazardous to public safety were found, what the CEDD would do to segregate the decontamination works to make sure it would not affect its vicinity.
- (b) The Chairlady pointed out that the project would affect the development of Kennedy Town and the undergoing works would also affect nearby residents. She hoped that the departmental representative would understand the importance of the issue and attend the upcoming meetings to brief the whole Committee and listen to the views of Members and residents. She also hoped that the departmental representative would learn from the standing representative of the CEDD, that is, Senior Engineer Mr WONG Chi-leung who had been there at the meeting since it started. She asked the department to provide a written explanation giving the reason for not attending the meeting earlier and was willing to come only after DO(C&W) called the D of CEDD.
- (c) Mr KAM Nai-wai said there was no need for Mr KWOK Ho-yeung, Howard, the departmental representative to attend the next meeting as he “did not answer what was asked”. He asked for a more senior officer to attend the meeting, saying that “these junior officers were useless”, and as a representative of the department, he totally did not understand the questions raised in the meeting. He continued that if the departmental representative attended the meeting last time, the consultant would also be attending the meeting this time. As the consultant had to “study the effect of the decontamination works on the environment and recommend appropriate environmental remedial and monitoring measures”, he asked why the consultant did not come to understand the views and concern of residents. For the questions he raised on the consultancy and contract just now, including the contract fees, name of the consultant, the time of the works and its completion date, and when the consultant

would attend the meeting, the departmental representative did not provide any positive answer. He asked the departmental representative to note the above questions and “answer what he knew”. He said he should be the person to decide whether a subject was worthy of discussion but not the departmental representative, the subject matter was put on the agenda for discussion because the DC considered it worthy of discussion. If the departmental representative thought that it was not worthy of discussion, he should “quit his job”. He requested the department to send a more senior officer to the meeting next time and the consultant to attend the next meeting to explain the details of the project. Mr KAM said that he was not a professional but was speaking from a resident’s point of view, showing his concern about the effect of the decontamination works on residents.

- (d) Ms CHENG Lai-king pointed out that the DC had a funding of \$8 million for the harbourfront project. As the land concerned was also an extremely valuable resource at the harbourfront, Members had the responsibility to monitor the land properly and make it clear whether the decontamination works was necessary. She continued that the department that erected the hoardings should be responsible for removal and the costs should not be passed on to the DC. She hoped that the HAD could expedite the harbourfront works to provide a public open space for residents in the waterfront. She said that if the department took samples at the wrong place and submitted the report to the DC just as Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry had said, it was a dereliction of duty. She hoped the department would be cautious in sample-taking.

113. Mr KWOK Ho-yeung, Howard of the CEDD responded that the department had undertaken three ground investigations in 2000, 2003 and 2013. The consultant would examine the data of the previous investigations to see if they served as useful references. He understood that the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden was important to district residents, therefore, in designing the decontamination works plan, the department would minimise its effect on the Garden as well as the community. Regarding the removal arrangements of hoardings, the department would discuss again with the HAD.

114. The Vice-chairman invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Ms CHENG Lai-king said that if it was the CEDD who erected the hoardings previously, it should be responsible for the removal and the full costs, and the passageway should be opened up again as soon as possible for the access of residents. She said the payments should not be charged to the HAD and DC, for DC funding should only be used on the works undertaken within the open space site. She asked the Secretary to make a clear record and advise the HAD not to agree with the CEDD on any payments for removal of hoardings.

- (b) Mr KAM Nai-wai proposed to write to D of CEDD copied to the Secretary for Development, informing them that Mr KWOK Ho-yeung, Howard, the departmental representative, “did not answer what was asked”, not showing respect to the DC, and attended the meeting only after repeated reminders. Mr KWOK did not understand the concern of residents and was therefore not a competent person for the meeting, he therefore asked for a senior engineer as well as the consultant to attend the next meeting. He added that the letter should specify that the DC did not want to make any more ad hoc invitations for attendance and request D of CEDD to answer all the outstanding questions raised in the meeting.

115. In conclusion, the Vice-chairman asked the Secretary to help draft a letter to D of CEDD and Secretary for Development, requesting the CEDD to arrange for the consultant to attend the next meeting as well.

**Item 12: Concern over salt water main burst incident at Hollywood Road outside S.K.H. St. Matthew’s Church Kindergarten  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 72/2020)**

---

(7:45 pm to 8:00 pm)

116. The Vice-chairman invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:
- (a) Referring to the site visit to the Hollywood Road with staff of the Water Services Department (WSD), the Chairlady asked the WSD about the progress of follow-up actions on the Hollywood Road Chuk Lin Lane water mains.
- (b) Mr KAM Nai-wai extended his appreciation to the representative of the WSD, saying that he might not agree with the reply from the department and there were frequent cases of main bursts, but the WSD representative had shown his respect to the DC and stayed in the Conference Room to listen to the views of Members. He hoped that the ADO(C&W) would help relay his views to other departments, and said if they wanted to “act against” Members, they were “always welcome” and he would “fight till the end”. Seeing that it was so difficult to require a government department such as CEDD to send a representative to the meeting even with the efforts of the ADO(C&W) and the Executive Officer, and that there were so many community issues awaiting for discussions, he took each and every meeting as a fight against the government. He opined that it was indeed the duty of the DO(C&W), even though he was “slow and apathetic”, and was “unscrupulous” as he left the meeting early. Besides, he had reflected his views to the department earlier during a site visit, pointing out that the Hollywood Road was always subject to excavation work over the past 10 years. Some contractors had even failed to complete the work during major renovation that rendered the area around Possession Street and S.K.H.

St. Matthew's Church Kindergarten suffered from frequent main bursts lately. He asked about the maintenance work of the department in the past and whether the water mains of some of the streets were not replaced.

117. Mr LAU Wai-leung, Senior Engineer/ Hong Kong & Islands Region 2 of the WSD responded that arrangements were being made to conduct leakage tests at Hollywood Road, and the result was expected to be available within one week and would be reported to Members. He continued that the department had received a case from Mr KAM Nai-wai on the day before the meeting about water leakage at Ladder Street. As the department considered it a more serious case, leakage detection work had been done first followed by repairs. Regarding the contractor's uncompleted works raised by Mr KAM Nai-wai, he said that the works involved mainly new salt water trunk installation work but not water mains replacement work, and would express his apology for the effect of the uncompleted works on residents. For the unplasticised polyvinyl chloride (UPVC) pipe near the S.K.H. St. Matthew's Church Kindergarten which had burst due to ageing, the department was examining that type of pipes and had included that section of the water mains into the risk-based improvement works to be implemented next year. Moreover, most of the fresh water leakage mains at Chuk Lin Lane had been replaced, while the uncompleted parts would be replaced together with the improvement works next year. The department was reexamining and studying the water mains at Hollywood Road and follow-up actions would be taken as necessary.

118. Mr KAM Nai-wai quoted the reply from the WSD, saying "there was a total of six fresh water mains and 13 salt water mains leakage cases at Hollywood Road, Chuk Lin Lane and the vicinity of Queen's Road West". He asked the department what would be done under the risk-based improvement works. He added that the part from Possession Street to Eastern Street always suffered from main bursts, he asked whether the department could arrange leakage tests on a larger scale and be reported at the next meeting.

119. Mr LAU Wai-leung of the WSD responded that the department could provide a written reply on the progress of Hollywood Road.

120. The Vice-chairman pointed out that Mr KAM Nai-wai was asking about the guideline on the whole risk-based improvement works, as well as the follow-up arrangements in the area along Queen's Road West such as whether repair works were not possible due to the traffic condition at the road junction.

121. Mr LAU Wai-leung of the WSD added that the "risk-based approach" would consider the probability of main bursts as well as the effect of main bursts to the neighbouring area. For instance, the probability of main bursts of UPVC pipes was higher and the effect more serious due to their properties, but for galvanised iron pipes, as the mouth of leakage caused by rusting and corrosion was relatively small, the effect of main bursts to the neighbourhood would be less serious. Besides, if the water pipes were for supply to hospitals and clinics or places near the main streets, the effect of main bursts would be greater. Under the risk-based strategy, the department would first replace water mains that had greater impact and higher risk or those with rapid deterioration.

122. Mr KAM Nai-wai suggested that the department should report on the status from Hollywood Road to Aberdeen Street, and the section of Queen's Road West between Possession Street and Eastern Street at the next meeting.

123. Mr LAU Wai-leung of the WSD asked whether the whole section of Hollywood Road and Queen's Road West was referred.

124. Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam pointed out that there were already four to five times of main bursts in August in Shek Tong Tsui and would appreciate the inclusion of the last section of Queen's Road West into the study.

125. The Vice-chairman concluded that the department should complete the study of the entire section of Queen's Road West, especially the locations with frequent main bursts.

126. Mr LAU Wai-leung of the WSD said that the department would complete the report as far as possible before the next meeting. If it could not be completed, the department would still report the progress to Members.

**Item 13: Concern over sewer blockage incidents at Caine Road and Tai Ping Shan Street  
Request for regular inspection of sewers and clearance of drains  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 73/2020)**

---

(8:00 pm to 8:21 pm)

127. The Vice-chairman invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) With respect to the sewer blockage incident at Caine Road, the Chairlady extended her appreciation to the working attitude of staff of the Drainage Services Department (DSD), including Mr LAI Kin-hung, Johnny, Engineer/ Hong Kong West 5, and Mr CHEUNG Keng-kwong, Inspector of Works/ Hong Kong West 5 and others. The subject staff were working from home during the pandemic but had attended the scene personally at night to handle the problem. She then pointed out that in the department's reply, it was mentioned that construction materials were found in the sewer, she asked whether the department had contacted the officer in charge of the construction site and examined the way they handled debris and construction wastes. She added that the incident had lasted for nine hours which was appalling, and hoped that the department would evaluate the situation and follow up to prevent the recurrence of sewer blockage which had forced water to overflow onto the road surface.
- (b) Mr NG Siu-hong asked what precautionary measures would be in place to prevent such incidents, the date of the last inspection on Caine Road sewer, the state of the

sewer and the name of the contractor on sewer installation. He also asked whether electronic monitoring equipment could be installed on sewers just like fresh water mains.

- (c) Mr KAM Nai-wai said that Caine Road was a major road and the whole mid-level would be affected if anything happened, he asked the department what precautionary measures were in place. He said that there were two work sites on Caine Road, namely, No. 73 and No. 66 of Caine Road, he would like to know if the department would increase its site inspections and check the way contractors handled debris. He also asked whether the use of high pressure water jetrig to clear the sewer would cause damages, whether there was the need to close Caine Road for drainage repair work and whether it would affect nearby residents. He continued to ask how the department would take preventive measures and urged the department to take early actions.
- (d) With respect to the sewer blockage at Caine Road outside Mayland Court, Ms CHENG Lai-king asked whether there were misconnection of pipes in the area around the place of incident, for there should only be domestic and foul sewage in sewers but not construction materials. As it was relatively difficult to arrange closure of Caine Road due to its traffic condition, she asked whether there were better ways to prevent sewer blockage.

128. In response to what the Chairlady said, Mr. LAI Kin-hung, Johnny of the DSD pointed out that in the morning of the day when the complaint was received, staff of the DSD had promptly attended the scene to clear the drainage. As the manhole and underground drainage was abnormally blocked by large quantities of debris and hard objects, the regular method of clearing had failed to complete the process which rendered the use of high pressure water jetting unit to clear the debris and hard objects. Regarding the follow up and inspection of nearby work sites on handling debris and construction wastes, as it was under the purview of the BD, the DSD had transferred the case to the BD for further follow up. He continued to explain that the DSD had been conducting regular inspections on the drainage, the latest inspection was completed in April this year and the result indicated that the drainage was normal without blockage. According to DSD's record, it was the first time to see that blockage of the sewer had forced water to overflow onto the road surface while the sewer was in normal operation. He added that the department would consider installing an electronic self-monitoring device in the public sewer at the place of incident so as to monitor the operation of the drainage more efficiently and to allow prompt follow-up actions. He supplemented that the use of a high pressure water jetrig would not damage the drainage. During inspection work, the department would check and examine the structure of drainages. According to record, the structure of the sewer was in satisfactory condition. For the rehabilitation of sewers, the department would carry out trenchless pipe rehabilitation works as far as possible with the cured-in-place-pipe (CIPP) lining technology employed. The CIPP technology involved the use of a soft polyester liner or fibre glass plastic liner which would be

pushed into the host pipe through a “launch shaft”. The liner was then cured by hot water, steam or ultraviolet ray until it hardened and formed a new pipe. In general, only the section near the upper and lower reach of the shaft would need to be enclosed during the rehabilitation work, and the traffic impact would be minimal.

129. The Chairlady asked the FEHD what the arrangements would be made for emergency street cleaning services during small hours of the day.

130. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that street cleaning services after 11 pm would be rather difficult to arrange, but she knew that the HyD should have the related service.

131. The Vice-chairman invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr NG Siu-hong opined that the department had the responsibility to arrange for cleaning and disinfectant services irrespective of the time. He then asked about the progress of site inspections, the date for installing the drainage monitoring device and the name of the contractor who built the section of the sewer concerned.
- (b) Ms CHENG Lai-king thanked the FEHD colleagues who had cleaned the streets properly that night.

131. The Vice-chairman invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

132. Mr LAI Kin-hung, Johnny of the DSD said that the work site concerned was a private site, inspections on whether there were irregularities were within the purview of the BD. Regarding the installation of drainage monitoring device, the department would take it into detailed consideration and inform Members when the timetable was finalised. Lastly on the name of the contractor who built the sewer concerned, the department would provide the information to Mr NG Siu-hong after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The DSD had provided the name of the contractor to Members and the Secretariat through an email on 28 September 2020.)

133. After discussion and voting, the following motion proposed by Ms NG Hoi-yan and seconded by Ms CHENG Lai-king and Mr KAM Nai-wai was adopted.

“Request regular inspection of sewers and clearance of drains to prevent sewage overflow and affect residents and environmental hygiene.”

(12 affirmative votes by: Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Ms CHENG Lai-king,

Mr KAM Nai-wai, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr NG Siu-hong, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry, Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille)

(0 dissenting vote)

(0 abstention vote)

**Item 14: Concern over prolonged illegal occupation of roads by recycling shops in the district and other problems relating to their operation  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 74/2020)**

---

(8:21 pm to 8:36 pm)

134. The Vice-chairman said that prior to the meeting, the Secretariat had invited the Police to attend the meeting but the Police had replied in the negative. The Secretariat would therefore note the views of Members and forward to the department.

135. The Vice-chairman invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry pointed out that the occupation of roads by “Keung Lik Recycling” (強力回收店) was becoming more serious, extending from the pavement outside the shop to the pavement on the opposite street and several car parking spaces at Cadogan Street. She understood that a lot of space was needed for operations of the recycling trade, she therefore asked the EPD what would be done to support the urban recycling trade, including land provision. The EPD only briefly replied that financial assistance was provided as a support. She asked the EPD what had been done to support the recycling trade in the urban area. She said that she was surprised at the prosecution figures of the Police and the FEHD, as Keung Lik Recycling occupied large area of the road surface nearly every day, while the Police had only initiated one prosecution case with 10 complaint cases received. Notwithstanding that FEHD staff often had site inspections at Forbes Street and the Police had been handling illegal parking there, the two departments did not initiate any prosecutions against the recycling shop for occupying the road surface, she said she could hardly understand the case and asked the departments why.
- (b) Mr KAM Nai-wai pointed out that the “black cops” were always absent from the meeting and “being paid without work”. Very often, enforcement actions had to be taken by the Police but no actions were seen to be done. He said that the problem raised by Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry was common in the whole C&W district as the recycling trade was necessary under the environmentally friendly initiative, however, spaces were not provided by the government and the trade was left to “survive on their own”. As land, rentals and staff costs were high in Hong

Kong, the environmental recycling industry had found it hard to survive. Recycling trade should be operating close to the urban area, but with the higher rental costs, traders would definitely not rent additional space for waste papers and waste metals recycling but would rather occupy the road surface which would pose a nuisance to residents. He suggested that the government should establish a licensing system and identify suitable spaces such as refuse stations and under flyovers for use of the industry. Otherwise, even with prosecutions initiated against recycling operations every day, the problem would remain unsolved.

- (c) Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus expressed his dissatisfaction with the absence of the Police. Keung Lik Recycling had been placing metal carts on the pavement, if these carts slid onto the carriageway, it might cause an accident, the Police's absence from the meeting was therefore beyond understanding. He hoped the EPD would study proactively the ways to support the industry as a means to promote an environmental way of living. He pointed out that there had never been a Community Green Station provided in the C&W district.

136. Mr TSE Yip Kei, Alvin of the EPD responded that the government's recycling fund did provide funding for the recycling trade to purchase related equipment. The funding also supported the Relocation Rental Support Project (RRSP) by subsidising half the rental so that recyclers could identify more appropriate operational sites, such as industrial buildings to help them reduce the operational nuisance to residents. He added that the department had inspected the Keung Lik Recycling and "Man Kee Recycling" (文記回收店). As their major operations involved metal and paper recycling with no significant odour produced during operation, no irregularity had been found so far. Nevertheless, recyclers were advised to place their materials back to the shop to avoid occupation of public space.

137. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that as recyclers' occupation of public space involved street management, much would depend on whether they affected environmental hygiene, impeded street cleaning work and operated illegal trading. If their operation impeded street cleaning, recyclers would be issued a notice advising them to clear the materials concerned before the deadline, if not, they would be summonsed. She added that the HAD had been coordinating interdepartmental actions, and between 2016 and 2019, the FEHD had taken part in 21 joint actions to keep the environment clean.

138. In conclusion, the Vice-chairman said that departments should consider whether a licensing system should be established for the recycling industry, and see if there was a need to finance or arrange better places such as under flyovers and inside refuse stations for their operation.

139. Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry asked again if the Keung Lik Recycling and Man Kee Recycling could be included as a Standing Item on blackspots for shop inspections.

140. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that blackspots for shop inspections mainly involved shops on merchandise trading whose nature was a bit different.

141. Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry then asked whether the difference in the nature of the shop would preclude its inclusion in the inspection list, and whether it had to have a “trading” element.

142. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that Standing Items mainly handled street obstruction caused by trading, and the department did conduct regular cleaning at the location of the two recycling shops.

143. The Vice-chairman proposed to observe the situation for a period of time. If the problem persisted, the two recycling shops would be listed as a Standing Item for follow up.

144. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that the Vice-chairman’s proposal was acceptable. She reiterated that the occupation of public places was a street management issue, therefore the department would focus on keeping the environment clean, which was different from handling the shops of trading in the Standing Item list.

**Item 15: Concern over emission of oily fume and odour from restaurants in the district  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 75/2020)**

---

(8:36 pm to 9:00 pm)

145. The Vice-chairman invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus said that a lot of complaints were received from residents alleging the serious emissions of oily fume and odour from restaurants in the district, but the EPD had found that the emissions were within the permitted level in their follow-up. He would like to know the EPD’s criteria used in odour measurement. According to its reply, the department would base on “the factors of emission time, duration and frequency, the unpleasant level of odour and whether the emission causes uneasiness to eye, nose, skin or other senses” to determine if the emission posed a nuisance. He considered the above criteria rather subjective and asked whether the EPD had more objective standards to measure the odour level in determining whether it posed a nuisance. Regarding the oily fume emissions from restaurants mentioned in FEHD’s reply, the requirement was “to discharge into the open air at a height of not less than 2.5m above ground level and in such a manner as not to be a nuisance.”, he asked how the department would define and determine if the emission would “not...be a nuisance”.
- (b) Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin said that she had received complaints from residents saying the ventilation system of the fast food shop on the ground floor of Federate Building in Centre Street was malfunctioning. Gas emissions from the shop made the opposite shop hot and stuffy as if “having a sauna”. She had also referred another case to the department where the odour emission of the restaurant was releasing direct

to the pavement which caused an odour problem. She asked the department to report on the follow-up actions taken on the two cases and asked about its work distribution and criteria adopted to qualify cases of irregularity.

- (c) Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry asked in case a complaint was received, in what location of the scene would EPD's professional take measurements of the oily fume, and whether the EPD had any objective standards of measurement. She pointed out that complaints were received from residents of the Sincere Western House saying the exhaust vent was facing inward and upward instead of the street which allowed large quantities of fume to be discharged into household units. If the department could not gain access to the unit for measurement, it would not be able to locate the emission problem of the said restaurant.
  
- (d) Mr PANG Ka-ho asked whether the department had regular inspections on the listed locations and the frequencies. He said that the emissions of Twelve Flavors in Sands Street had been affecting residents, therefore, apart from lunch hours, he suggested that inspections be carried out during dinner time as well. Although the emission problem had lessened from July to September due to the pandemic, he hoped that the department would frequent its inspections even when the pandemic eased off. Regarding the area between the rear lane of Tung Hing Mansion at Belcher's Street and Sands Street, he disagreed with the EPD in saying "no visible cooking fumes nor objectionable odour were found emitted from the restaurants concerned". He said that the fume emission at the rear lane was very serious and no households on the upper floors would open their windows, he therefore suggested the department to conduct one more test. He also hoped the department would provide the number of inspections for each location instead of giving a total number next time.

146. Mr TSE Yip Kei, Alvin of the EPD responded that the department did conduct inspections on each location after receiving the discussion paper. Over the past year, the department had received a total of 75 complaints on oily fume and odour emissions from restaurants in the C&W district. Four Air Pollution Abatement Notices had been issued with three cases of successful prosecution. On assessment criteria, the methods and standards adopted by the department were similar to international standards, mainly based on the assessment of two enforcement officers carried out at the scene in determining whether there was a need to issue the Air Pollution Abatement Notice. He said the department would contact the complainant. If the complainant was a household living upstairs, staff of the EPD would enter the house to conduct assessment. Regarding the issue of exhaust vents facing residential buildings, the department would make assessment on the affected location and advise the restaurant to improve the situation, say, to check whether the emission control equipment was functioning properly. Regarding the number of inspections, the department would conduct inspections in general according to the complaint, follow up with individual restaurants and contact the complainant, and assessments would be made at the

time causing the most serious nuisance. He said that the department had been following up the case of Twelve Flavors, which had been issued a statutory notice and prosecuted. The fume emissions had improved with the installation of electrostatic precipitator and ultraviolet lamp. The department would follow up on the fume and odour emissions concerned.

147. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that it was a licencing requirement for restaurant emissions “to discharge into the open air at a height of not less than 2.5m above ground level and in such a manner as not to be a nuisance”. The phrase “in such a manner as not to be a nuisance” meant the oily fumes of a restaurant had to be discharged into the open air. She asked Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin if she could provide the specific location mentioned just then for the department to follow up.

148. Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin said the location could be provided to the FEHD after the meeting.

149. The Vice-chairman invited Members to express their views and raise questions on the issue. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam pointed out that the nose was not an objective tool for measurement, as every person had a different sense towards odour. He said there should be different instruments used to measure oily fumes and suspended particulates in the international world that adopted a more objective and statistical approach. He asked whether the department would consider changing its method of testing. In addition, there was another Twelve Flavors in Shek Tong Tsui whose exhaust hood was seriously dilapidated with oil dripping onto the entrance of the building, and the exhaust hood was changed only with the coordination of the FEHD earlier. He said it was the lack of a scientific standard for the compliance of restaurants that had created the above problem. Apart from Twelve Flavors, he said the Fire Well Hot Pot and Seafood Restaurant also had fume emission problem, which he hoped would be given more attention.
- (b) Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus agreed with Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam on the use of more scientific and accurate methods to replace the staff smelling method in odour measurement. He pointed out that residents had reflected on the oily smell that were left on the body every time they walked past the bars and restaurants along Forbes Street, however, EPD staff had said there was no problem after inspection, indicating the lack of an objective approach in measurement. He hoped the department would consider setting down the measurement standard. Besides, he asked the FEHD if the exhaust vent of a restaurant was facing the pavement which was rather narrow, would it meet the standard of “not... a nuisance”.
- (c) Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry supplemented on the situation of the Sincere Western House. She said that there were complaints on the exhaust vent of the restaurant

facing the light well that had affected nearby residents. She asked whether exhaust vent facing the light well would meet the standard of the FEHD. Furthermore, since the exhaust vent was not facing the street, the measurement taken by EPD staff smelling at the scene would not be accurate, she asked whether the EPD had conducted tests in the light well of the Sincere Western House.

150. Mr TSE Yip Kei, Alvin of the EPD responded that the department would conduct assessments case-by-case on various locations including pavements and residential buildings. He said if complaints were received from residents of the Sincere Western House, arrangements could be made for assessments in the unit of the complainant to determine whether the odour from the restaurant constituted a nuisance of air pollution. Besides, the department would follow up with Twelve Flavors and Fire Well as mentioned by Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam. He reiterated that the department would contact the complainant and arrange for inspection at the most serious time of nuisance, and enforcement actions would be taken against non-compliant restaurants.

151. Ms LI Yat-fung, Kathy of the FEHD responded that whether the exhaust vent was facing the light well or the pavement, it should be dealt with case-by-case, but it was a requirement for the exhaust vent to be installed at a height of not less than 2.5m above ground level for emissions to be discharged into the open air without causing a nuisance. Furthermore, if the exhaust hood of the restaurant was found covered with oily fume or unclean, the license holder or person in charge of the restaurant would be given an instant warning for him to rectify the situation, otherwise he would be summoned.

152. After discussion and voting, the following motion proposed by Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus and seconded by Mr PANG Ka-ho was adopted.

“This Committee requests the department to step up inspection of the emission blackspots of oily fumes from restaurants in the Central and Western District, and conduct timely review on the emission standards of oily fumes from restaurants so as to improve local environment.”

(12 affirmative votes by: Ms NG Hoi-yan, Mr WONG Weng-chi, Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr NG Siu-hong, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Mr YIP Kam-lung, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Miss YAM Ka-yi)

(0 dissenting vote)

(0 abstention vote)

---

**Item 16: Funding application – Year-end Cleaning Operation in Central & Western District**

2021

(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 80/2020)

---

(9:00 pm to 9:04 pm)

153. The Chairlady said that the Paper was submitted by the BEHWC to apply for DC's funding of \$110,000 for organising district events tentatively scheduled for February next year. Cleaning packs with bleach, detergents and scourer pads, etc. would be distributed to residents at five locations in the district.

154. Mr KAM Nai-wai asked whether government-nominated area committees with unsuccessful candidates of elections would be invited to distribute these cleaning packs to district residents.

155. The Chairlady said that the events were expected to call upon the assistance of DC Members only for distribution, and the detailed arrangements would depend on the pandemic then.

156. Ms CHENG Lai-king referred to the sentence "the budget earmarked for the 'Mosquito prevention and year-end cleaning operation' currently leaves a balance of only \$70,000 which is not enough for the suggested scale of the event. If Members agree to the proposed event, the deficit of \$40,000 has to be allocated to the event" mentioned on the Paper and asked whether the event was currently under budget.

157. The Chairlady said that the budget for the "Mosquito prevention and year-end cleaning operation" this year amounted to a total of \$100,000 only, \$30,000 had been used on "Anti-mosquito Campaign 2020", the balance of \$70,000 was insufficient for organising an event on cleaning pack distribution of a scale similar to the past, therefore an additional allocation of \$40,000 had to be made for the event.

158. Having considered the financial situation this year, Ms CHENG Lai-king opined that the additional allocation of \$40,000 could be made through the Finance Committee (FC) for the event.

159. The Chairlady added that if Members endorsed the allocation in this meeting, the event would be put to vote for endorsement in the FC by circulation.

160. As Members present had no objection, the Chairlady announced that the application for funding allocation was endorsed.

**Item 17: Funding application – "Green stalls" in Hong Kong Flower Show 2021**  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 86/2020)

---

(9:04 pm to 9:06 pm)

161. Mr KO Po-lun, Team Leader of the Hong Kong Young Women's Christian Association (Central, Western & Islands District Youth Outreaching Social Work Team) briefed Members on

the Paper. He said that the event aimed at promoting the awareness of greening and environmental protection. Young people with low work motivation would be employed as temporary staff to provide them with work experience and practical work placement.

162. As Members present had no objection, the Chairlady announced that the application for funding allocation was endorsed.

**Item 18: Funding application – Support Western District – Green Pioneer Recruitment Day  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 87/2020)**

---

(9:06 pm to 9:08 pm)

163. Ms Mak Lai-sum Cecily, Event Organizer of Support Kennedy briefed Members on the Paper. The event would be held in Fung Mat Road Harbourfront Area in the form of a carnival with environmental workshops and game booths set up. The plan was to recruit “Community Green Pioneers” (社區綠先鋒) and collect the views of participants on a greener lifestyle during the event.

164. As Members present had no objection, the Chairlady announced that the application for funding allocation was endorsed.

**Item 19: Funding application – Greening and Beautification of Railings Along Footpaths 2020  
(C&W BEHWC Paper No. 88/2020)**

---

(9:08 pm to 9:11 pm)

165. Mr CHAN Kin-sun, Social Work Assistant of the Caritas Mok Cheung Sui Kun Community Centre briefed Members on the Paper. He said that the plan was to beautify and green the environment by hanging small plants on some of the pedestrian railings in the district. The project had already had a trial run last year.

166. Mr KAM Nai-wai asked about the result of the trial run last year. He said he did not see any of the plants and worried that there might be residents littering the plants. He asked how the Centre would ensure the cleanliness of places provided with the plants.

167. Mr CHAN Kin-sun responded that the effect was satisfactory last year. Volunteers of the Centre would be arranged for visiting and watering the plants every day. He believed that with attractive plants, it was unlikely that residents would throw litters and cigarette butts onto the plants.

168. As Members present had no objection, the Chairlady announced that the application for funding allocation was endorsed.

**Item 20: Follow up on the problem of shop front extensions in Sai Ying Pun district  
(C&W BEHWC Written Question No. 3/2020)**

---

---

(9:11 pm)

169. The Chairlady said that the written reply from the governmental department was attached to the Paper and forwarded to Members for perusal.

**Item 21: Follow up on the cleaning arrangements and staffing situation in the Central and Western District**  
**(C&W BEHWC Written Question No. 4/2020)**

---

(9:11 pm)

170. The Chairlady said that the written reply from the governmental department was attached to the Paper and forwarded to Members for perusal.

**Item 22: Any Other Business**

---

(9:11 pm to 9:17 pm)

171. With respect to the arrangements on a site visit to the scene of tree collapse at Pok Fu Lam Road, the Chairlady requested LCSD's representative to report on the updated position.

172. Ms CHAN Miu-ling of the LCSD reported that the earliest arrangement could be made at 3 pm the next day for Members to site visit the Pok Fu Lam Road.

173. The Chairlady suggested a show of hands by Members interested and asked whether there were any views on the time of visit. As Ms CHENG Lai-king was only able to join after 4 pm, she asked whether other Members agreed to schedule the visit at 4 pm.

174. With a show of hands, the Chairlady said Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille, Mr HO Chi-wang, Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam, Ms CHENG Lai-king and herself were interested in the site visit next day. She asked Members to go by themselves and meet at 84 Pok Fu Lam Road.

175. Ms CHAN Miu-ling of the LCSD confirmed that tree gang colleagues would meet Members at 4 pm next day.

176. Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam requested the department to explain to Members the tree collapse incident during the site visit and whether the tree involved fungal infection.

177. Ms CHAN Miu-ling of the LCSD said she would reflect the concern of Members to colleagues.

178. Ms CHENG Lai-king pointed out that residents had different views on the tree collapse and there were things they did not understand, she hoped that with the site visit, the department would be able to provide the relevant information so that they could explain clearly to residents.

179. The Chairlady invited interested Members to attend the site visit next day.

180. The Chairlady said that she had written to the Office of the Ombudsman (The Ombudsman) about the discussion on the subjects of “Standing Item - Monitoring of redevelopment sites in the Central and Western District” and “Concern over nuisance to residents caused by liquor-licensed premises around Sai Ying Pun” after the last meeting. The Ombudsman had given its reply, however, as it was a private letter, content of the whole letter would not be released.

181. Mr KAM Nai-wai suggested that the content of the whole letter should not be released, but a copy could be forwarded to Members through email. If Members considered that further discussion was warranted, it could be dealt with after the meeting.

182. The Chairlady said that the Ombudsman would like the BEHWC to address the related issues by itself. As the letter was received only before the meeting, she would seek the help of the Secretariat to forward a copy of the letter to Members. She reminded Members that the letter should not be released.

183. Mr KAM Nai-wai reflected that the agenda of the meeting was too long. Since there were already five standing items, non-urgent papers such as water dripping of air-conditioners should be left for discussion at the next meeting. He opined that the number of papers Members could add in for discussion should be reduced so that the meeting would not end up after 9 pm.

184. Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille pointed out that the time for discussion of each funding application was very short but invited guests had to wait late. She suggested that discussions on funding applications could be moved forward in future meetings.

185. The Chairlady agreed that discussions on funding applications could be moved forward in future meetings.

### **Item 23 : Date of the Next Meeting**

(9:18 pm)

186. The sixth BEHWC meeting would be held on 12 November 2020. The paper submission deadline would be 21 October 2020 for government departments and 28 October 2020 for Members.

187. The meeting on 17 September 2020 was adjourned at 9:18 pm.

The minutes were confirmed on 12 November 2020

Chairlady: Ms NG Hoi-yan, Bonnie

Secretary: Miss CHAN Yuen-ying, Crystal

Central and Western District Council Secretariat  
November 2020