

**Minutes of the Fourth Meeting of
District Works & Facilities Management Committee (2020-2021)
Central and Western District Council**

Date: 18 June 2020 (Thursday)
Time: 2:30 pm
Venue: Conference Room,
14/F, Harbour Building,
38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong

Present:

Chairlady

Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin*

Vice-chairman

Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus*

Members

Ms CHENG Lai-king*

Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Victor*

Mr KAM Nai-wai, MH*

Mr HUI Chi-fung

(From 3:07pm to 3:29 pm)

Ms NG Hoi-yan, Bonnie*

Mr NG Siu-hong*

Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry*

Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam*

Mr HO Chi-wang*

Mr PANG Ka-ho*

Mr WONG Weng-chi*

Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille*

(Beginning of the meeting to 7:24 pm)

Mr YOUNG Chit-on, Jeremy

(Beginning of the meeting to 6:54 pm)

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

Guest

Item 5:

Ms FUNG Miu-ling

Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West),
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms HO Alice District Leisure Manager (Central & Western),
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms YAU Yun-wah, Susanna Deputy District Leisure Manager (District
Support) Central & Western,
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Item 6:

Ms FUNG Miu-ling Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West),
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms HO Alice District Leisure Manager (Central & Western),
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms YAU Yun-wah, Susanna Deputy District Leisure Manager (District
Support) Central & Western,
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mr MOK Chi-kin, Jiv Senior Executive Officer (District Management),
Central and Western District Office

Mr MAN Chi-chiu, Eric Executive Officer (District Management) 1,
Central and Western District Office

Mr PANG Kam-ping Senior Inspector of Works (Hong Kong),
Home Affairs Department

Mr NGAN Suen-wa Inspector of Works (Hong Kong) 2,
Home Affairs Department

Item 7:

Miss CHEUNG Man-yee,
Rosalind Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour),
Harbour Office, Development Bureau

Mr Henry LAI Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 1,
Harbour Office, Development Bureau

Mr CHAN Wing-chuen, William Project Manager (Harbour),
Harbour Office, Development Bureau

Ms LI Kwok-chi, Daphne Architect (Harbour) 1,
Harbour Office, Development Bureau

Ms LEE Ka-lai, Jackie Senior Project Manager 330,
Architectural Services Department

Mr CHAN Tsin-ching, Jim	Senior Architect/22, Architectural Services Department
Mr LEUNG Man-chung	Project Manager 346, Architectural Services Department
Ms NG Ka-ki, Claudia	Architect/210, Architectural Services Department
Ms FUNG Miu-ling	Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms HO Alice	District Leisure Manager (Central & Western), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms YAU Yun-wah, Susanna	Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr KWAN Chung-kit	Senior Executive Officer (Planning)14, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms Sarah MUI	Design Director, One Bite Design Studio
Mr Lung MAK	Senior Architectural Designer, One Bite Design Studio
<u>Item 9:</u>	
Ms STEWART Mariah Beth	Country Parks Ranger Services Officer (Hong Kong), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Dr KWONG Kim-hung, Ric	Country Parks Officer (Hong Kong), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Miss YAU Ka-wai, Erika	Executive Officer (District Management) 2, Central and Western District Office
Ms FUNG Miu-ling	Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms HO Alice	District Leisure Manager (Central & Western), Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms YAU Yun-wah, Susanna
Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support)
Central & Western,
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

In Attendance:

Mrs WONG HO Wing-sze,
Susanne, JP
District Officer (Central and Western),
Central and Western District Office

Mr LEUNG Chee-kay, David,
JP
District Officer (Central & Western) (Designated),
Central and Western District Office

Miss WONG Sze-ki, Carol
Assistant District Officer (Central & Western),
Central and Western District Office

Mr MOK Chi-kin, Jiv
Senior Executive Officer (District Management),
Central and Western District Office

Mr MAN Chi-chiu, Eric
Executive Officer (District Management) 1,
Central and Western District Office

Miss YAU Ka-wai, Erika
Executive Officer (District Management) 2,
Central and Western District Office

Ms BOOK King-shun, Emma
Executive Officer I (District Council),
Central and Western District Office

Mr PANG Kam-ping
Senior Inspector of Works (Hong Kong),
Home Affairs Department

Mr NGAN Suen-wa
Inspector of Works (Hong Kong) 2,
Home Affairs Department

Ms FUNG Miu-ling
Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West),
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms HO Alice
District Leisure Manager (Central & Western),
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms YAU Yun-wah, Susanna
Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support)
Central & Western,
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms LEE Yuk-kit, Glendy
Senior Librarian (Central and Western),
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms Eva MAK

Librarian (Shek Tong Tsui Public Library),
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms YAM Lai-chun, Cindy

Chief Estate Officer (District Lands Office, Hong
Kong East, West and South), Lands Department

Secretary:

Mr HO Kai-yin

Executive Assistant (District Council) 7,
Central and Western District Office

Opening Remarks

The Chairlady welcomed Members and representatives of government departments to the Fourth Meeting of the District Works & Facilities Management Committee (DWFMC) (2020-21), Central and Western District Council (C&WDC). On behalf of the DWFMC, the Chairlady welcomed Mr LEUNG Chee-kay, David, District Officer (Central and Western) (DO(C&W)) (Designate) for his attendance at today's meeting; and greeted Ms YAU Yun-wah, Susanna, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), who succeeded Ms CHAN Suk-fan, Bianca. The Chairlady asked Mrs WONG HO Wing-sze, Susanne, DO(C&W) to introduce Mr LEUNG to Members.

2. Mrs Susanne WONG, DO(C&W) hoped to take this opportunity to share her personal feelings and express her gratitude to all Members at this meeting. At the last term of the Council, she had drawn an analogy between cycling and the work of the Council and the district. She wanted to share the same to this term of Council as well. She further elaborated that the purpose of the work of the Council and the district was same like that of riding a bicycle – the pursuit of moving forward, the effort of maintaining balance and “keeping one's feet on the ground” at all times. She sincerely thanked the C&WDC, saying that she had many happy memories in the past four and a half years and had experienced a fruitful journey with the DC. While Members of the C&WDC had been striving to fight for the well-being of local residents, she also shared this common goal with them. DO(C&W) expressed her gratitude to the DC for giving her the opportunity to go around every corner of the district together with other stakeholders in the past four and a half years and do her best to get the job done. She hoped to use the lyrics of the song “Bicycle” to express her well-wishing and gratefulness to the Council, which read “it is always hard to bid farewell, but isn't that part of human nature? Yet whenever I think of this bike, I feel blessed”. Lastly, DO(C&W) wished all District Councillors good health and success in their work. She stated that her term of office would end on 29 June and Mr David LEUNG would succeed her as DO(C&W) on 30 June. She then asked Mr LEUNG to introduce himself to Members.

3. Mr David LEUNG, DO(C&W) (Designate) first expressed his pleasure to meet all Members and said that it was his third time to join the work of district administration. He had worked as ADO(North) and involved in DC affairs at the Home Affairs Department (HAD) before. He stated that he would formally serve as DO(C&W) from 30 June onwards and he looked forward to working with all Members and colleagues from government departments to serve the residents

of the C&W District.

4. The Chairlady thanked DO(C&W) and DO(C&W) (Designate) for their remarks. She noticed that Mr KAM Nai-wai had pressed the light button, so she invited him to speak.

5. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that DO(C&W) had not attended the meeting of the Cultural, Education, Healthcare, Leisure & Social Affairs Committee (CLSAC) held on 11 June, and questioned if her absence was intentional. At that meeting, he had pointed out that a statement was issued, not sure by the HAD or the entire Government, at 10:40 pm on 4 June. Its content not only smeared and “wronged” the DC, but also claimed that legal action may be taken against District Councillors. Therefore, he suggested at the meeting that DO(C&W) must clarify what actions or statements by the District Councillors would be held liable under the law. He said that the authority must make things clear, otherwise it would be difficult for the DC to convene its meetings in future. Last time, DO(C&W) said that she was absent from that meeting because she had official duties to attend to. Today, both DO(C&W) and DO(C&W) (Designate) were present at this meeting, so he hoped to take this opportunity to tell the Hong Kong Government or Lam Cheng Tyranny – since you locked up the door of the conference room and did not allow the DC to hold its meeting, so the publicly elected Members went to the District Office (DO) in person to try to reason with you in a peaceful, rational and non-violent manner. They had been waiting outside the office door for more than 20 to 30 minutes, but no one paid any attention to them. Later, Members were “wronged” as being unruly and unreasonable. Mr KAM said that everybody could go to Facebook Live to watch it. He hoped to clarify the facts and if the authority could not provide a clear explanation, he would definitely pursue all remedies at law and seek sanctions against you, including legal sanctions, sanctions imposed by law enforcement agencies and sanctions by the international community. He was also drafting a statement and intended to issue it at the next Full Council meeting. He warned all staff of the C&WDO that if they were not genuinely serving the people and elected Members, but merely acting as puppets and lackeys of Lam Cheng Tyranny, they would definitely not end well. He asked DO(C&W) to explain at the meeting what were the unruly and unreasonable acts of the District Councillors that would be liable to legal responsibility. He also demanded that the statement issued on 4 June be withdrawn.

6. The Chairlady stated that the issue had been discussed at the last CLSAC meeting. As DO(C&W) was absent from that meeting and representatives from other departments also failed to respond, she asked DO(C&W) what her response to Mr KAM Nai-wai's comments was.

7. Mrs Susanne WONG, DO(C&W) replied that at the CLSAC meeting held on 11 June, ADO(C&W) had explained to Members that the membership of the committee was DO(C&W) or ADO(C&W), so there was no need for DO(C&W) and ADO(C&W) to attend the meeting at the same time. She pointed out as DO(C&W), she had to attend to other district work on top of the affairs of the DC. She was engaged in other job arrangement on the day of the meeting. However, as ADO(C&W), being a member of the CLSAC, had attended the meeting all the way, the DO was deemed to have sent representative to attend the meeting and performed the duty of supporting the Council. DO(C&W) further said that the statement issued by the HAD had already clearly explained the Government's point of view. She understood that the two parties might have different interpretation of the content of the statement, but since the content of the statement was self-explanatory, she had nothing to add.

8. Mr Victor YEUNG said that the statement issued by the HAD had laid serious allegations. He was also disappointed that DO(C&W) was not going to give an explanation. He believed that everyone knew well what had happened at the second meeting of the Constitutional & Security Affairs Committee (CSAC) on 6 May. He also believed that DO(C&W) and the staff of the DO had all watched the Facebook Live broadcast. He added that what happened that day was that the door to the DC conference room was locked. Then a group of District Councillors requested to meet with DO(C&W), but the reception staff claimed that DO(C&W) was in the middle of something and could only communicate by phone. Later, the District Councillors requested to meet with ADO(C&W), but ADO(C&W) refused to meet them. Afterwards, the District Councillors requested to meet with the Secretary of the C&WDC and the Secretary of the CSAC, but to no avail. Mr YEUNG pointed out that the District Councillors were just there kept demanding to meet with officers from the DO to understand why the CSAC was not allowed to hold its meeting. On the same day, he had also told the relevant officers that they were suspected of misfeasance in public office and he would file a complaint against them. Yet, he did not see that their action had involved any elements of intimidation, harassment or alarm. He regretted that DO(C&W) had not met with the District Councillors but only contacted the HAD, who then issued a statement condemning District Councillors. Mr YEUNG opined that the content of the statement was misrepresented, and he did believe that the relevant information was provided by DO(C&W).

9. Ms CHENG Lai-king inquired whether the press release issued at 10:40 pm on 4 June, 2020 was issued by the HAD or by DO(C&W). She quoted one of the sentences in the statement, “the staff at the C&WDO were deeply disturbed”. However, she believed that it was the 14 or 15 District Councillors present who were deeply disturbed by the issued statement, causing them to worry that their speeches in the Council would end up giving the authority the right to take legal action against them any time. She pointed out that DO(C&W) was unable to attend the meeting held on 11 June due to other engagements and ADO(C&W) was unable to answer questions from Members on that day. For this reason, she requested DO(C&W) to explain clearly at this meeting what the District Councillors had done wrong then. She added that the responsibility of elected District Councillors was to seek the well-being of the residents, to comply with the District Councils Ordinance and to hold meetings in accordance with the Standing Orders of the DC. She expressed sincere hope to collaborate with the DO and meet with DO(C&W) to find a solution to the problem.

10. The Chairlady invited DO(C&W) to respond.

11. Mrs Susanne WONG, DO(C&W) pointed out that all colleagues in the DO regarded the DC as their partner to promote district affairs together, and expressed her willingness to meet with various District Councillors. She added that the statement was issued by the HAD. She also clarified that she had written to various Members many times before the CSAC meeting to clearly explain the status of the CSAC, including whether the terms of reference of the CSAC were in compliance with the functions of the DC, and hoped that the DC could handle the relevant issues. The Government’s stance was that it would be difficult to provide Secretariat support and meeting venue before the issue over the CSAC’s terms of reference was not yet resolved. She emphasised that the case of locking up the door of the conference room to stop Members from holding the meeting without giving prior notice to Members did not exist. She acknowledged that the DO and

Members might have interpreted the incident in a different manner, and expressed understanding and respect for the views of Members. As a Member had mentioned just now, because there was Facebook Live broadcast about the incident on that day, the public had a chance to understand how it happened. Therefore, she found it unnecessary to repeat the whole story again. DO(C&W) added that Mr Victor YEUNG did request a meeting with staff of the DO, and Miss KWOK Nim-wai, Mercy, District Secretary of the C&WDO had already explained the position of the DO. Since no meeting was expected to be held on that day, DO(C&W) was attending to other official duties then and staff of the DO were also busy with their other duties. Therefore, it was not possible to arrange a meeting with Members immediately. For this reason, she hoped that Members would understand under the principle of mutual respect.

12. The Chairlady said that she would invite another round of speeches from Members. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr Victor YEUNG said it was not until 9:15 pm on the day before the second meeting of the CSAC that he had received multiple e-mails from the DO indicating that meeting venue would not be provided. Therefore, he disagreed with DO(C&W)'s claim that the DO did not object to the meeting all of a sudden. He stressed that the CSAC was set up in January this year and DO(C&W) was also present at the meeting to discuss and approve the Committee's terms of reference and provided advice. He wondered why DO(C&W) only pointed out that the terms of reference of the CSAC may be an issue a few months later, and took the initiative to ban the CSAC based on her subjective judgement. Mr YEUNG said that he himself had been serving as a District Councillor for eight years and had maintained good working relationship and communication with the former DO(C&W) and ADO(C&W). However, he was very disappointed with the situation of the current term of DC born six months ago. He pointed out that DO(C&W) was an official equivalent to a parental figure and a D2 directorate grade officer. He expected that DO(C&W) would plead for justice on behalf of the people and cooperate with the DC. But what DO(C&W) had been doing in the past six months was to suppress the elected Members of the DC and the CSAC, and stopped Members from criticising the Government and discussing issues related to police violence. That was complete disruption to the DC composed of elected Members. He also pointed out that past DCs had also discussed issues related to police violence and constitutional development, and questioned why the current term of DC could not discuss them. DO(C&W) had never provided an explanation. He conceived the approach a suppression to the DC and the person a sinner condemnable in history and a lackey of the tyranny. Mr YEUNG said that he would continue to pursue the matter and complain to the Office of The Ombudsman, Hong Kong (The Ombudsman) and the Independent Commission Against Corruption, Hong Kong (ICAC) about misfeasance in public office by DO(C&W). He added that he learned from newspaper report that Mr Joshua WONG had already proposed to add the names of the 18 DOs to the international sanctions list, and stated that those who suppressed the democratic society and undermined human rights situation in Hong Kong would not end well.
- (b) Ms CHENG Lai-king asked Mrs Susanne WONG, DO(C&W) to request the HAD to withdraw the press release titled "Government expresses regret over Central and Western District Council members' unruly and unreasonable acts" issued at 10:40 pm on 4 June

2020 before leaving office. She said that she was astonished when she heard the statement broadcasted on radio and had notified the other 14 District Councillors right away. She said that she did not mind DO(C&W) pointing out what was wrong with the Members, but as an elected Member, it was necessary for her to listen to the views of the public.

- (c) Mr Victor YEUNG reiterated that he would not back down and would stick to his position, and added that he would consider filing a judicial review and instituting private prosecution against the 18 DOs separately. Mr YEUNG believed that DOs of various districts should reflect to their superiors that the Government's current approach was not feasible. If they, being officials equivalent to a parental figure, chose to become lackeys of tyrannical rule and help the tyrant to suppress the voice of elected DC Members and citizens, their names would be nailed on the column of shame throughout history.
- (d) Mr Jeremy YOUNG said just now he heard his colleague mentioned about 15 Members, so he wanted to clarify that he was not among those involved. Hence, he would not make any comments. He also hoped to take the opportunity of this meeting to thank Mrs Susanne WONG, DO(C&W) for her collaboration with Members over the years. He wished her continued success in her future endeavours and contribution to Hong Kong.

13. The Chairlady asked DO(C&W) for a final response.
14. Mrs Susanne WONG, DO(C&W) stated that she had nothing else to add.
15. Mr Victor YEUNG requested a response from Mr David LEUNG, DO(C&W) (Designate).
16. Mr David LEUNG, DO(C&W) (Designate) said that Mrs Susanne WONG had already responded, and he himself had nothing more to add.
17. The Chairlady stated that the follow-up work may be to lodge a complaint with The Ombudsman and the ICAC and seek judicial review. The Chairlady announced the completion of the discussion of the issue and asked all Members to pay attention to making due declaration of interest whenever necessary.

Item 1 – Adoption of the agenda

(3:01 pm)

18. The Chairlady announced that the agenda of the meeting was adopted.

Item 2 – Confirmation of the minutes of the 2nd and 3rd DWFMC meetings held on 7 May 2020

(3:01 pm – 3:03 pm)

19. The Chairlady stated that the Secretariat had just received a proposal from Mr KAM Nai-wai to revise part of paragraph 119(e) in the draft minutes of meeting.
20. Mr KAM Nai-wai suggested that the content in the draft minutes of meeting “the

authorities had not dealt with incidents of assaults and arsons” should be revised to read “the authorities had not dealt with people assaulting those tendering the ‘Lennon Walls’ and setting fire to the ‘Lennon Walls’”.

21. The Chairlady requested the Secretary to revise the draft minutes of the meeting based on the proposal, and stated that since no other Members had proposed any amendments, the minutes of meetings were adopted.

**Item 3 – Action checklist on matters arising from the 2nd and 3rd DWFMC meeting
(C&W DWFMC Paper No. 37/2020)**

(3:03 pm – 3:04 pm; 3:05 pm – 3:16 pm)

22. The Chairlady asked Members to note the Paper.

23. Miss Camille YAM said that she had received a written reply from the HAD on Item 11 “Arrangements for use of DC notice boards on pavements by DC Members” and stated that the DWFMC had adopted an Impromptu Motion at the last meeting to request for posting the motions adopted by the DC on DC notice boards. She quoted the department’s response as saying that due to the limited space of the notice boards, it was not possible to display information such as discussion papers, motions and minutes of meeting of DC meetings. She questioned why the motions adopted by the DC could not be posted on the notice boards, and pointed out that Members had not requested to post the minutes of meeting on the notice boards. Therefore, she suspected that the department had misunderstood the meaning of Members.

24. Mr KAM Nai-wai stated that the department’s response was sent to Members the night before the meeting. He also quoted the content of the written response as saying that “The notice boards of the C&WDC are mainly used by the DO to display information related to DC meetings to the public”. He was frustrated at the reply and pointed out that the notice boards had always been the properties of the DC, not the DO. According to his understanding, the DO was just assisting the DC in disseminating the information of the DC. He questioned why the DC could not decide what to post on the notice boards and demanded the DO to clearly explain whether the notice boards belonged to the DO or the DC.

25. Ms CHENG Lai-king suspected that the DO, by sending the written response to Members at night, might have wished that Members would not have noticed its content in time. She said that the DC notice boards were set up with funds from the DC. For many years, it was the DC who decided on the contents of the notice boards and then informed the Secretariat to follow up. Even the cleaning work of the notice boards was paid with DC funds. She believed that the right to use the notice boards should belong to the DC rather than the DO. The DO was only assisting the DC to engage a contractor to undertake the cleaning work of the notice boards. Moreover, Ms CHENG expressed her support for posting the motions adopted by the DC on the notice boards, and pointed out that the content displayed on the notice boards should be reviewed to facilitate the public to understand the business of the DC.

26. The Chairlady asked the representative of the DO to respond.

27. Ms Emma BOOK, EO I (District Council) replied that the notice boards of the DC were used by the DO to disseminate the information of the DC to the public. The content currently posted included notices of meetings and agendas of meetings. Due to space limitations, no other information could be posted. The public could obtain relevant information by browsing the DC website.

28. The Chairlady invited second-round questions from Members. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr KAM Nai-wai stated that he would submit a paper at the next meeting for detailed discussion on this. He pointed out that if the notice boards belonged to the DO, he would request the deletion of the words “C&WDC” on the notice boards. Besides, he opined that the DC should no longer allocate funds for the cleaning work of the notice boards, and all content posted on the notice boards should have nothing to do with the DC.
- (b) Ms CHENG Lai-king stated that if the authority did not allow the posting of motions adopted by the DC on the notice boards, it was a kind of suppression on the DC. For this purpose, she proposed to change the words “C&WDC” on the notice boards to “C&WDO” and requested the removal of the notice boards in her constituency.
- (c) Miss Camille YAM believed that motion related to the content to be posted on the DC notice boards was not adopted before, and considered that the importance of the content of the resolution of the motion was higher than information such as minutes of meetings, dates of meeting and agendas of meetings. She also requested the DO to clarify whether the notice boards were used by the DO to disseminate information of the DC or by the DC to disseminate its information. If the decision power belonged to the DO, the content posted on the notice boards should no longer have anything to do with the DC and the DC should not approve funds for the management of the notice boards.

29. The Chairlady asked the representative of the DO to respond in one go.

30. Ms Emma BOOK, EO I (District Council) responded that the cleaning fee of the notice boards was not paid by DC funds, but by the annual recurrent expenditure of the DO. She reiterated that the purpose of setting up notice boards was to disseminate information about the DC. Therefore, the logo of the C&WDC was attached to the notice boards so that the public knew that the content posted on the notice boards was information about the DC.

31. The Chairlady asked if the DO could provide information on whether the DC had adopted any motion on what should be posted on the notice boards in the past.

32. Ms Emma BOOK, EO I (District Council) replied that at best no such motion was adopted by the last term of DC. Since the notice boards were for use by the DO, so she believed no such motion should have been adopted in the DC.

33. The Chairlady said Mr KAM Nai-wai had mentioned that he would submit a paper on the

DC notice boards for further discussion. Members were requested to note that expenses on the cleaning and management of the notice boards were not paid by the DC.

Item 4 – Chairlady’s report

(3:04 pm – 3:05 pm)

34. The Chairlady said that the Secretariat had emailed a letter to Members on 11 June, inviting them to comment on the existing arrangements for greening and potted plants in the Central & Western (C&W) District. Members were reminded to complete the attached reply slip and send it back to the Secretariat by email or fax on or before 30 June. The Chairlady asked Mr Sam YIP whether the matter would be discussed at the meeting of the Working Group on Environmental Improvement, Greening and Beautification Works in C&W District.

35. Mr Sam YIP replied that it could be discussed at the meeting of the Working Group if necessary.

Item 5 – New proposals on district minor works projects 2020-2021 and related funding applications (C&W DWFMC Paper No. 26/2020) (Revised)

(3:16 pm – 4:24 pm)

36. The Chairlady stated that the Secretariat had received three new proposals on district minor works (DMW) projects.

(a) Construct a pedestrian pathway across the flower bed at the junction of Magazine Gap Road and Brewin Path (C&W DWFMC Paper No. 26/2020 Annex 01)

37. The Chairlady welcomed representatives of the LCSD to the meeting and stated that this paper was submitted by Mr Jeremy YOUNG. She then asked Mr YOUNG to brief on the paper.

38. Mr Jeremy YOUNG stated that road-crossing pedestrians who wanted to use the traffic lights and zebra crossings located at the junction of Magazine Gap Road and Brewin Path had to walk past the periphery of the flower bed. So those who wanted to save time and energy would skip the road crossing facilities, which could be dangerous. For this reason, he proposed that a pedestrian pathway be constructed across the centre of the flower bed to facilitate pedestrians to use the road crossing facilities.

39. The Chairlady invited Members to consider whether the proposal should be implemented as a priority works project or it should be put on hold.

40. Miss Camille YAM asked if there was any budget estimate for this proposed works project.

41. The Chairlady asked if the representative of the LCSD had anything to add.

42. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD replied that the pedestrian pathway at the location was relatively narrow. The department had already discussed with the Works Group and initially accepted that the project was technically feasible. However, further study on the project details was needed and the budget estimate for the works project was not available for the time being.

43. Ms CHENG Lai-king inquired whether the relevant works could be fully in charge by the LCSD and whether the pavement at Magazine Gap Road could be widened.

44. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD replied that the venue was managed by the LCSD and the pedestrian pathway to be constructed was about 1.5m wide. She added that after preliminary studies, the department concluded that the relevant works probably would not affect the trees there. Although the department had to study the works details, the project was supposedly feasible.

45. The Chairlady stated that since no Members had requested to speak further, Members were invited to consider whether the proposal should be implemented as a priority works project or it should be put on hold.

46. Miss Camille YAM asked what it meant to list a project as a priority works project, and reiterated that she hoped to know the budget of the project in order to decide whether to list the project as a priority works project.

47. The Chairlady replied that listing the project as a priority works project would mean that Members had approved the project proposal, and the relevant government departments would then estimate the project budget required. If Members listed the project proposal as a project on hold, it would mean that Members had rejected the project proposal and the relevant departments would not take any follow up action. She asked if any Members objected to the project proposal. Since no Members raised any objections, she announced that listing the project as a priority works project was approved.

**(b) Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Central Region
(C&W DWFMC Paper No. 26/2020 Annex 02 & Paper No. 28/2020)**

**(c) Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Western Region
(C&W DWFMC Paper No. 26/2020 Annex 03 & Paper No. 29/2020)**

48. The Chairlady welcomed representatives of the LCSD to the meeting. The Chairlady stated that the proposed projects were submitted by the LCSD and invited representatives of the LCSD to brief on them.

49. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD stated that the LCSD had submitted a total of two “DMW” projects at the meeting, of which the funding for the Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Central Region project was \$288,000. The content of the project was to plant shrubs and flowers in ten locations in the Central District, such as planting Christmas flowers during Christmas and

planting peonies and marigolds during the New Year. The department hoped to enhance the aesthetics and greening effect in the community during the festive seasons through district beautification projects and bring joy to the public and the tourists. She urged Members to support this project proposal and approve the related funding application so that the department could start the project.

50. The Chairlady asked if Members had any questions or comments. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr PANG Ka-ho used the Belcher Bay Park as an example. He pointed out that the budget for the Mid-Autumn Festival project was \$18,000, while the budget for Christmas and Lunar New Year project was \$39,000. He asked the department to provide information on the landscaping design and inquired about what shrubs and flowers the department was going to plant, and whether different types of flowers would be planted in the two different periods.
- (b) Mr NG Siu-hong questioned why the proposed location of the “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Central Region” had not covered the Caine Road Garden, and whether the project budget of the Kwong Hon Terrace Garden would be increased. As the project was funded by the C&WDC, he asked whether the department would display the DC logo at the project site.
- (c) Miss Camille YAM stated that the budget for the Pok Fu Lam Road Playground project under the “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Western Region” was \$8,000. She opined that the layout of the potted plants shown on the pictures in the paper was no good.

51. The Chairlady asked representatives of the LCSD to respond to Members’ questions and comments.

52. In response, Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD said that with regard to the “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Central Region” project, the department would arrange to launch the works at the ten locations mentioned in the paper during Christmas and the Chinese New Year. The department would determine the project budget for this year based on the size of individual location and the project expenditure of last year. She added that the budget of the works project was mainly used to purchase various types of shrubs and potted flowers. After the potted plants were procured, the departmental staff would arrange the potted plants in different shapes and designs. If Members considered that previous preparation and design of the department were not satisfactory, the department could consider adding decorative accessories such as fences to improve the design.

53. The Chairlady pointed out that Mr PANG Ka-ho had also raised a question about the “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Western Region”, she would like the representative of the LCSD to respond.

54. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD responded that the department had set aside a budget for “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Western Region” to carry out works during the Mid-Autumn Festival, pitching in the lantern event that would be held at the venue during the Mid-Autumn Festival. She added that the department would usually display flower species such as Feather Celosia, Crape Myrtle, Safflower and Chinese Ixora during the Mid-Autumn Festival. After the potted plants were procured, the department would place the potted plants there and remove them when the flowering period ended. During the Christmas season, potted plants such as Christmas flowers would be placed instead. Ms YAU added that the project budget currently applied for only covered the cost of procuring potted plants, exclusive of the budget for the design work and the installation of the C&WDC logo.

55. The Chairlady started a second-round questioning session for Members. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr PANG Ka-ho pointed out that since the department’s budget for Belcher Bay Park during Christmas and Lunar New Year was as high as \$39,000, he hoped that the outcome of the project could be more distinctive. For example, placing a small Christmas tree and putting some decorative lights could be considered. The effect would be fantastic and attractive to residents.
- (b) Mr Sam YIP stated that the total budget of the “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Central Region” project was over \$200,000. Since the project was funded by the DC, he hoped that the DC logo could be displayed. That would be fairer to the DC and opined that the department could consider applying DC funding for making a batch of DC logos. Mr YIP pointed out that the department’s budget for the “Central and Western District Promenade – Western Wholesale Food Market Section” was \$10,000, while the budget for the “Central and Western District Promenade – Sheung Wan Section” was \$23,000. He considered that the department should evenly distribute the budget and also hoped that the department could submit an illustration of the conceptual design of the potted plants.
- (c) Mr KAM Nai-wai asked why the costs of the “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Central Region” project was funded by the DC instead of the department itself. He did not find it necessary to beautify the area outside the Police Headquarters and suggested that the location be deleted from the funding application. He believed that most of the spots proposed by the department for beautification in the Central District were serving citizens of the entire territory, not specifically for residents of the district. Therefore, the DC should not be responsible for the project costs. He suggested to keep only the “Brewin Path Temporary Playground” and “Kwong Hon Terrace Garden”, while other spots should be all cancelled. Moreover, he agreed with other Member’s initiative to place Christmas trees and opined that the department should not just get the job done by placing a few potted plants arbitrarily. He also specifically suggested that the department place a Christmas tree in the Hollywood Road Park.
- (d) Miss Camille YAM agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai’s remarks and said that the financial

resources of the DC itself were already very tight. She did not understand why the LCSD should apply for funding from the DC to carry out beautification works at the department's own venues. Although she supported the beautification project during the holiday season, she pointed out that the quotation on potted plants obtained by the department was more expensive than the market price, so she could not support the project proposal.

- (e) Mr WONG Weng-chi enquired about the proposed spot "roadside planters at the junction of Queensway/Cotton Tree Drive" under the "Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Central Region". He said that the department's project budget of \$16,000 for the relevant spot was too high, and hoped the departmental representatives could explain it.
- (f) Ms CHENG Lai-king thanked the newly elected Members for their creative suggestions, and said that the display of the logo of the C&WDC could let the public know that DC's funds were spent there. She also found that the cost of potted plants procurement by the LCSD was too high. She stated that since the DC logo was not displayed in the past, the public would think that the costs of the landscape beautification works were borne by the LCSD. Therefore, she supported the proposal that the DC logo must be displayed.

56. The Chairlady asked the representatives of the LCSD to respond to Members' questions in one go.

57. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD responded to the Members' suggestion that Christmas trees be placed at the venues during Christmas. She agreed that the proposal could attract the public and the department could study the proposal further. She stressed that the purpose of the paper submitted by the department was to apply for DC funding, and the department could discuss with Members on how to implement the specific content later. She added that Members' comments were noted, including their request for the department to revamp past practices and bring changes in the design. She was also aware of the views of Members requesting the inclusion of the DC logo in the design, and undertook to study it further after the meeting. With regard to the enquiry about the "roadside planters at the junction of Queensway/Cotton Tree Drive", Ms YAU said that although the land right of the roadside planters did not belong to the LCSD, the department was responsible for the landscape maintenance work there.

58. Mr WONG Weng-chi said that the size of the "roadside planters at the junction of Queensway/Cotton Tree Drive" was not big and the number of potted plants placed was not high, and asked why the works would cost up to \$16,000.

59. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD replied that the department was not placing potted plants at the roadside planters, but planting directly in the soil. According to records, more than 300 Christmas flowers were planted there during the last Christmas.

60. The Chairlady asked the departmental representatives to answer the question about why

the costs were not borne by the LCSD and why it was necessary to apply for DC funding.

61. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD responded that the department needed the support of the DC to take part in district management and succeed in the beautification works.

62. The Chairlady said that further discussion on the project costs, design and other aspects might be necessary. She also said that Mr KAM Nai-wai had pointed out that it was not suitable to use DC funds to carry out the relevant projects at certain spots. She believed that was an issue worthy of discussion by Members.

63. Miss Camille YAM stated that the project budgets of some of the venues proposed by the department were reasonable, but some others were not. She asked whether the department would lack the resources to carry out the related landscaping projects if the DC did not approve the funding.

64. Mr Sam YIP asked whether the details of the projects would be discussed at the meeting of the Building Management, Environmental Hygiene & Works Committee (BEHWC) or the Working Group on Environmental Improvement, Greening and Beautification Works in C&W District after the DWFMC approved the funding. He also said that it was necessary for the department to provide detailed breakdown of the funding, such as the costs of potted plants procurement and the manpower required to place them. He further asked the departmental representatives to respond whether the DC logo would be displaced and whether there were records of plants intoxicated by tear gas and died.

65. Mr KAM Nai-wai stated that he would move an Impromptu Motion, which mainly sought to cancel most of the proposed venues of the “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Central Region” project and keep only the “Brewin Path Temporary Playground” and “Kwong Hon Terrace Garden”. He considered that the landscaping beautification works in Central District was not mainly meant to serve the residents of the district. He also worried that the potted plants could be removed any time without prior notice being given. Therefore, he did not think there was a need for landscape beautification works at those spots. Mr KAM hoped that all Members would support his Impromptu Motion and stated that he would demand the LCSD to use its own funds for the relevant landscaping beautification works in the Impromptu Motion. Besides, he suggested that there was no need to carry out landscape beautification works at the “Li Sing Street Playground”, and questioned why the department did not carry out the works at the Sheung Wan Cultural Square which was frequented by more residents.

66. The Vice Chairman stated that he had greater concern with the roadside planters, including the “roadside planter at the Pedder Street Roundabout”, the “roadside planter at the Justice Drive Roundabout” and the “roadside planter at the junction of Queensway and Cotton Tree Drive”. He believed no one would pay attention to roadside planters, even photo-shooting by the public was not possible at these locations. He also found that the layout design of the potted plant of the “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Western Region” project was relatively awkward and failed to fit in with the surrounding environment. He hoped that the department could make improvements in this regard.

67. The Chairlady asked the departmental representatives to respond to Members' questions in one go.

68. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD replied that the department had noted Members' comments and their desire to place Christmas trees in some key places. The department would study the opinions of Members and she had nothing to add for the time being.

69. The Chairlady stated that representatives of the department had not answered the questions raised by Members just now, including whether the department would consider discussing the content of the projects at meetings of the BEHWC or the Working Group on Environmental Improvement, Greening and Beautification Works in C&W District, and whether detailed breakdown of the funding would be provided. She also enquired about how the department would handle the landscape beautification works at locations other than "Brewin Path Temporary Playground" and "Kwong Hon Terrace Garden" if the Impromptu Motion proposed by Mr KAM Nai-wai was adopted, and whether the department would consider carrying out landscape beautification works at the Sheung Wan Cultural Square.

70. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD replied that the department had detailed breakdown of the funding budget. She also said that the department had never required suppliers of potted plants to provide after-sales service before, but they would review the situation based on current needs. The department would also consider Members' requests and then re-examine the venues to carry out the works. With regard to the suggestion to launch the landscape beautification works at the Sheung Wan Cultural Square, Ms YAU said that it was necessary to conduct further study on the landscape maintenance work there.

71. Ms Alice HO, District Leisure Manager (Central & Western), LCSD added that the DC had been taking part in the management of the department's venues and providing related advice since 2008. The department would also consult the DC on matters related to venue management. Therefore, the department would generally apply for funding under "DMW" projects to carry out beautification works at the venues.

72. The Chairlady asked what the department would do if certain venues were not funded.

73. Ms FUNG Miu-ling, Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West) of the LCSD replied that the DC had been assisting in the management of the district facilities and services of the LCSD since 2008. Two types of funding were involved, including funding for DMW Projects and funding for Community Involvement projects. She expressed her willingness to listen to Members' comments on the project venues and could discuss design details with Members. Responding to the comments on the inclusion of the DC logo, she said that since the funding was approved by the DC, the department was happy to acknowledge the DC's contribution. Inclusion of the DC logo in the landscape works of LCSD venues would not be a problem, yet the department had to explore how to fit in the DC logo into the landscape design of the roadside planters. Regarding whether the project should be discussed at the BEHWC meeting, she

suggested that it may be more appropriate to discuss with the local District Councillor after conducting on-site visits.

74. The Chairlady stated that the meeting would proceed to voting of the Impromptu Motion for this paper and the content of the Impromptu Motion was read out as follows:

Impromptu motion: “The District Works & Facilities Management Committee of the Central and Western District Council objects to all the sites proposed in the Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Central Region, with the exception of Brewin Path Temporary Playground and Kwong Hon Terrace Garden which can be retained, and suggests that the LCSD should allocate funds itself to deal with the landscape beautification works.”

(Proposed by Mr KAM Nai-wai and seconded by Ms NG Hoi-yan, Bonnie)

75. The Chairlady stated that the Impromptu Motion must be approved by one third of the Members present before it could be discussed at the meeting. The Chairlady asked Members to indicate their stance and announced that the Impromptu Motion was accepted by one third of the Members and could be discussed at the meeting.

76. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that if the Impromptu Motion was adopted, he suggested that the department could increase the amount of funding applied for the “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Western Region” and submit the project details at the next meeting.

77. The Chairlady invited any Member who wanted to amend the Impromptu Motion to indicate his intention and raise it up within two minutes. She then said that no amended motion to the Impromptu Motion was received after the lapse of two minutes. The Chairlady asked Members to consider whether to adopt the Impromptu Motion. After voting, the Impromptu Motion was adopted:

(11 affirmative votes by: Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin, Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus, Ms CHENG Lai-king, Mr YEUNG Sui-yin, Victor, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Ms WONG Kin-ching, Cherry, Ms NG Hoi-yan, Bonnie, Mr NG Siu-hong, Mr YIP Kam-lung, Sam, Mr PANG Ka-ho, Mr Wong Weng-chi)

(0 dissenting vote)

(1 abstention vote by: Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille)

78. The Chairlady stated that after the Impromptu Motion was adopted, Brewin Path Temporary Playground and Kwong Hon Terrace Garden were the only sites retained among the proposed sites in the “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Central Region”, which involved a funding of \$25,000 in total. After resolution, the relevant funding was approved.

79. Ms FUNG Miu-ling, Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West) of the LCSD clarified that the funding of \$25,000 did not covered expenses related to Members’ proposal to include

the logo of the C&WDC.

80. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that if Members agreed to increase the funding for the “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Western Region” and inclusion of the logo of the C&WDC, he suggested the LCSD to submit another revised funding application at the next meeting.

81. The Chairlady said that if funding approval was deferred until the next meeting, it may not be able to carry out the landscape beautification project for the Mid-Autumn Festival in time.

82. Ms Alice HO, District Leisure Manager (Central & Western), LCSD said that given the limited funding, if Members accepted that the logo of the C&WDC be displayed on stickers, such expenses could be covered under the funding application.

83. Mr KAM Nai-wai suggested to examine and approve the funding application of \$48,000 for the landscape beautification works at the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park, Belcher Bay Park and Hollywood Road Park during the Mid-Autumn Festival first, and proposed the department to try to include the logo of the C&WDC in the design of the works. If the design effect was found to be satisfactory, it could continue to be used during Christmas and Chinese New Year.

84. Mr Sam YIP shared Mr KAM Nai-wai's view and agreed to first complete the examination and approval of the funding for the Mid-Autumn Festival. He also suggested the department to design and produce a reusable form of C&WDC logos.

85. The Chairlady invited Members to consider the funding application of \$48,000 for the landscape beautification works at the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park, Belcher Bay Park and Hollywood Road Park during the Mid-Autumn Festival under the “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Western Region”. After resolution, the relevant funding application was approved. The Chairlady advised the LCSD to consider revising the funding amount when submitting papers at the next meeting, and suggested that the design details of the C&WDC logo could be discussed at meetings of the Working Group on Environmental Improvement, Greening and Beautification Works in C&W District.

86. Mr Sam YIP stated that discussions could be held at meetings of the Working Group on Environmental Improvement, Greening and Beautification Works in C&W District. After the discussions were done, the issue could be submitted to the BEHWC for approval.

87. Miss Camille YAM said that she had abstained from voting for the funding application just now. It was not an objection to the relevant landscape beautification projects, but she believed that public funds should be used properly. In the funding application submitted by the LCSD, spending several thousand dollars for the procurement of dozens of potted plants was not good value for money.

88. Mr NG Siu-hong suggested the department to study the option of applying additional funding for the “Landscape Beautification Works at Parks & Playgrounds of Central Region” project at the next meeting in order to better the landscape design of the two retained sites.

Item 6 – Report on district minor works projects

(4:24 pm – 5:54 pm)

(From this item on, the Vice Chairman would preside over the meeting)

89. The Vice Chairman welcomed representatives from the LCSD, the C&WDO and the HAD to the meeting.

(a) Progress report on LCSD-led district minor works projects in the Central and Western District (C&W DWFMC Paper No. 30/2020)

90. The Vice Chairman asked the representatives of the LCSD to brief on the paper.

91. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD stated that this paper covered eight approved DMW projects, of which Item 1 “Installation of glass rain shelter atop the arbour of Forbes Street Temporary Playground” had been completed. Item 2 “Energy-saving works of the lighting systems in the recreational venues in Central & Western District under the LCSD” was also expected to be completed in June. She added that the department was closely monitoring the progress of the remaining DMW projects item 3 to item 7 and would report to Members in due course.

92. The Vice Chairman started a questioning section for the Paper. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr Sam YIP responded to the item “Energy-saving works of the lighting systems in the recreational venues in Central & Western District under the LCSD”. He said that Members had already reflected in the last meeting that the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park was not well illuminated, and asked if the department would take the opportunity of this project to improve the illumination of Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park. He reflected that although many people visited the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park every night from 8 pm to 9 pm, the area was very dark and the atmosphere was creepy and scary. Besides, Mr YIP stated that apart from the project of “Installation of fitness equipment at and improvement works to Mount Davis Sitting-out Area No. 3”, he considered that the fitness facilities in other parks and sitting-out areas were under-provided, especially chin-up bars. For this purpose, he asked whether the department would improve and replace related facilities. He was also dissatisfied with the existing children’s amusement facilities in Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park and Belcher Bay Park, and hoped that the department could make improvements.
- (b) Mr KAM Nai-wai referred to the project of “Energy-saving works of the lighting systems in the recreational venues in Central & Western District under the LCSD” and asked whether the department would replace the lights in all venues. He said that at the last meeting, it was discussed that the faulty lights in the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park were not replaced since long. For this reason, he inquired whether the faulty lights in the Sun

Yat Sen Memorial Park had already been replaced or fully repaired. Mr KAM also referred to the “Facility Improvement Works for Li Sing Street Playground” project and asked whether the department knew that the playground would be developed together with the Urban Renewal Authority’s redevelopment project, and inquired about the completion date of the related improvement works. He was worried that the venue would be revamped shortly after the completion of the project. If the venue was demolished within three years after the completion of the improvement project, the public may complain.

- (c) The Chairlady supplemented that the DWFMC was organising a visit to the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park. The Secretariat was busy preparing two other visits earlier on and the weather was bad lately. The visit to Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park would be arranged as soon as possible.
- (d) Ms CHENG Lai-king stated that the last term of DC had approved a considerable amount of funding for the department to carry out the “Energy-saving works of the lighting systems in the recreational venues in Central & Western District under the LCSD” project. She asked the department whether there had been a bridging gap between removal of the original lights and fixing of new lights during the works period, resulting in black out at the site that necessitated public notification to park users.
- (e) Regarding the “Enhancement works for the children’s play equipment at Belcher Bay Park (Phase I)”, Mr PANG Ka-ho said that he had inspected the site with LCSD staff earlier and noticed that the place was carpeted with new safety matting. He said he understood that the budget of the entire project reached \$700,000, and asked the department to provide the costs breakdown of individual items. Besides, he proposed the department to annex photos to this paper to facilitate Members to understand the content of each item.

93. The Vice Chairman ask the representatives of the LCSD to respond to Members’ questions in one go.

94. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD responded to Members’ questions on the “Energy-saving works of the lighting systems in the recreational venues in Central & Western District under the LCSD” project, saying that there were still more than a dozen lights at the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park pending replacement. The department was also aware of the problem of poor illumination in the park and would continue to follow up. She added that the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) had been carrying out works in Blake Garden, Caine Lane Garden and Hollywood Road Park in phases since October last year, and the works were completed now. At present, there are 16 lights in Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park and King George V Memorial Park, Hong Kong separately, and 50 lights in Belcher Bay Park pending replacement. Energy-saving long-life LED lights would be used by the EMSD. In response to Mr Sam YIP’s question about children’s play facilities, Ms YAU stated that the funding originally applied for did not cover the installation of chin-up bars. The department could study at a later time what venues were suitable for adding the facility. In response to Mr PANG Ka-ho’s question, she said that no costs data for individual

items of the “Enhancement works for the children’s play equipment at Belcher Bay Park (Phase I)” were available on hand and the relevant information would be provided later. In response to Mr KAM Nai-wai’s question about the “Facility Improvement Works for Li Sing Street Playground” project, she learned that the Urban Renewal Authority project located adjacent to the above venue would not start until several years later, so the public could still use the newly installed facilities for a few years.

95. The Vice Chairman reminded the departmental representatives to respond to questions on lights in the park from Ms CHENG Lai-king and Mr KAM Nai-wai.

96. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD stated that the department would mostly choose to carry out light replacement works during the day, so it would not affect much the public. Besides, she said that the newly replaced lights in Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park would be easier to manage and maintain.

**(b) Progress report on C&WDO-led district minor works projects in the Central and Western District
(C&W DWFMC Paper No. 31/2020)**

97. The Vice Chairman asked the representatives of the DO to brief on the paper.

98. Mr Eric MAN, Executive Officer (District Management)¹, C&WDO stated that at the last meeting, he had received Members’ comments on the third item “Construction of a sitting-out area at the open space at the junction of Ladder Street and Circular Pathway in Central”. The Secretariat had arranged for Members to conduct a site visit at the end of May. First of all, Members believed that the extent of the venue could be reduced, so the area near Yu Hing Lane was no longer necessary. This would help to reduce the project costs. Some facilities at the venue also need to be replaced, including the dilapidated fence, and the project also covered the construction of an entrance/exit for the venue. Besides, due to the poor condition of the ground and drainage facilities of the site, it was necessary to carry out ground leveling and channel connection works. He said that useless stairs at the site would be removed to help increase the area of the venue. He added that in addition to the basic repair and optimisation works, there would also be a need to connect power to the venue and install distribution board. Moreover, it was necessary to reserve space for stowage of tents, set up lockers for storage of event facilities, and provide two benches at the venue. As the venue would not cover the area near Yu Hing Lane, it was not necessary for the project to deal with the daily management of the large tree there. Referring to the existing huge overhead cover at the venue which stretched across most of the area of the venue, Mr MAN said that the department currently had proposed three options. The first option was to remove the existing overhead cover and all the pillars; the second option was to remove two-thirds of the existing overhead cover and keep only one third of it; the third option was to completely remove the existing overhead cover and then rebuild a new one covering one third of the area of the venue. Since other works costs, including the costs of consultants and site supervision, would be borne by the HAD, so no DC funding was required for this part. The DC only had to shoulder the contract costs, i.e., the construction costs involved. Before the availability of the three options, the estimated costs of the project were about \$2.1 million. At present, the estimate for option one was about \$1.55 million, the estimate for option two was

about \$1.77 million, and the estimate for option three was the most expensive. Mr MAN invited all Members to express their opinions on the three works options and make their choice so that the Works Section could proceed with refined design work and prepare the tender documents.

99. The Vice Chairman asked Members to raise questions and give comments on the “Construction of a sitting-out area at the open space at the junction of Ladder Street and Circular Pathway in Central” project first. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr KAM Nai-wai stated that he had joined the site visit organised by the DWFMC. He considered that a part of the overhead cover should be kept, so the first option was not desirable. He asked the department to study option two to find out how long the existing cover could last. If the existing cover could be used for a long time, he would choose option two to reduce the project costs. However, if a lot of resources were needed later to keep the existing overhead cover, he would switch to option three. Besides, Mr KAM suggested setting up signs with the DC logos in the vicinity of Ladder Street or Circular Pathway to let the public know the availability of the venue, and reserve a place for hanging promotional banners to facilitate the promotion of activities held at the venue.
- (b) Ms CHENG Lai-king stated that the site had been left idle for many years and opined that the DC should made up its mind to make good use of it. She pointed out that the current term of DC had set up a Working Group on Concern over Bazaar Policy and suggested that the venue could be used to hold bazaars and set up distinctive stalls to attract the public to visit and use the venue. In addition, she was concerned about the accessibility of the venue and ways to facilitate wheelchair users to access the venue.

100. The Vice Chairman asked the representatives of the HAD to respond to Members’ questions and comments.

101. Mr Eric MAN, Executive Officer (District Management)1, C&WDO responded to Mr KAM Nai-wai’s question, stating that the department had to study option two first to see if the overhead cover could be removed. If the results of the study showed that the existing overhead cover was not structurally safe, it was necessary to construct a brand-new overhead cover. For the time being, however, the structural safety of the existing overhead cover could not be gauged by simple visual observation. If option three was adopted, there was no need to worry about the risks, yet the estimate would increase by some \$200,000.

102. The Vice Chairman asked the representatives of the HAD to respond to Mr KAM Nai-wai and Ms CHENG Lai-king’s other comments related to the venue.

103. Mr Eric MAN, Executive Officer (District Management)1, C&WDO responded that with regard to proposals beyond the project, the department could collaborate as usual. For example, the department would continue to help promoting activities and pay attention to issues related to the accessibility of the venue.

104. The Vice Chairman stated that since the DWFMC had to decide on the three options put forward by the department, he asked whether Members had any comments on the options.

105. Mr KAM Nai-wai asked the department about the costs of the study for option two.
106. Mr Jiv MOK, Senior Executive Officer (District Management), C&WDO responded that the costs of study of option two was about \$20,000 to \$30,000.
107. The Vice Chairman stated that even if Members chose option two in this meeting, study on option two was still necessary. If the findings of the study showed that option two was not feasible, option three would be automatically adopted. The Vice Chairman stated that since there were no more questions and comments from Members, he asked Members to vote on the three options. After voting, option two was adopted. The Vice Chairman asked the department to follow up on the result of the resolution; and asked the departmental representatives to continue to brief on other works items.
108. Mr Eric MAN, Executive Officer (District Management)1, C&WDO stated that the various items were listed in the paper. He suggested to let Members raise questions and comments on individual items first, and then a consolidated response would be given by the department.
109. The Vice Chairman asked Members to put forward their questions and comments. The main points made by Members were as follows:
- (a) Ms Cherry WONG was astonished by the high estimated costs of the item 1 “Installation of visitors’ facilities at Mount Davis” project, involving the use of \$2,690,000 for the installation of about 14 information panels. She asked why the estimated costs of the project was so high. She asked who was responsible for drafting and designing the content of the information panels, and whether the department would consult Members on their content. Ms WONG also inquired about some information of item 10 “Beautification Works at New Praya, Kennedy Town”, such as the extent of railings that needed replacement, as well as the details of the drainage system and seats that required repair.
 - (b) Mr NG Siu-hong raised questions about item 8 “Beautification Works in C&W District – Mural and Staircase Painting” and item 15 “Beautification Works in C&W District – Central to Mid-Levels Escalator and Walkway System”, expressing his hope that the department would provide detailed and specific content of the projects. He also asked whether the department would solicit Members’ opinions on the project design first.
 - (c) Mr Sam YIP would like to know the detailed location of the six sites in the area where item 8 “Beautification Works in C&W District – Mural and Staircase Painting” project would be carried out. He pointed out that the current murals at Hill Road were in poor condition and asked whether the project would cover that area. Besides, he pointed out that the description of item 11 “Optimisation of the Kennedy Town Swimming Pool Sitting-Out Area” in the paper was not clear, so he hoped that the department could provide more information. Mr YIP stated that Members had previously conducted a site visit regarding item 17 “Converting the area fronting the New Praya, Kennedy Town into

a Temporary Sitting-Out Area”. He overtly reminded the department that the old British drains at that place must be kept and their conditions should be monitored at all times.

- (d) Mr PANG Ka-ho inquired about the types and details of water dispensers related to item 12 “Provision of Water Dispensers at the Kennedy Town Community Complex”. He also enquired about the detailed location of item 13 “Enhancement Works at Sands Street”.
- (e) Ms CHENG Lai-king stated that many of the projects listed in this paper were outstanding projects funded by past terms of the DC. She cited examples of item 1 “Installation of visitors’ facilities at Mount Davis” and item 2 “Interpretation Plates for the Central and Western District Literary Trail”, whose progress was very slow. She hoped that the departmental representatives would explain the current progress of the various projects listed in the paper. Regarding item 10 “Beautification Works at New Praya, Kennedy Town” and item 17 “Converting the area fronting the New Praya, Kennedy Town into a Temporary Sitting-Out Area”, she suggested that the detailed location of the items should be specified in the paper to facilitate the public to get a better understanding of the scope of the projects.
- (f) Miss Camille YAM stated that because the works cost involved in item 18 “Provision of a Pet Garden at Pok Fu Lam Road” was quite high, so she hoped that the department could provide the schedule for the implementation of the project. She said that the establishment of the Pet Garden would attract the attention of people in the district. Since a Working Group on Animal-friendly in the Central & Western District was set up by this term of the DC and a meeting would be held soon, so it was hoped that the department could provide more information to facilitate Members’ discussion in the meeting.

110. The Vice Chairman stated that since no Member had signalled to speak, he invited the representatives of the DO to respond.

111. Mr Eric MAN, Executive Officer (District Management)¹, C&WDO stated that he would respond to the items in the paper one by one as mentioned by Members. Regarding item 1 “Installation of visitors’ facilities at Mount Davis”, he said that the department mainly encountered two problems – the poor accessibility of the location and there was no government department responsible for the maintenance of the military facilities. The establishment of information panels at the site would involve issues on land boundary. The department was currently negotiating with the Lands Department (LandsD) for allocation of land for installation of the information panels, the several locations previously chosen were later found to be unviable. Besides, the department had provided a design for Members to choose from during the last term of DC, but it was not good enough. Therefore, the department had once proposed to invite artists to provide some better designs for Members’ selection. He added that the content of the information panels was contributed by individual professors from the History Department of universities. The department would submit the content for review by Members of the BWFMC and for solicitation of public opinions when it was available. Regarding item 2 “Interpretation Plates for the Central and Western District Literary Trail”, Mr MAN stated that the department had selected several locations where historical events had occurred to install the interpretation plates, but later it was found that underground facilities were present in those locations. The

department had also conducted on-site inspections with the staff of the Transport Department (TD) and the Highways Department (HyD) many times to pick suitable locations. The department would submit the content of the interpretation plates for the Literary Trail to Members for comments. Regarding item 8 “Beautification Works in C&W District – Mural and Staircase Painting”, Mr MAN stated that comments from the local District Councillors on the location of the works were sought during the last term of DC. As there were comments that the previous paintings were lacking in creativity, artistic elements and local features, the department hoped to identify art students, young artists or different art groups to provide diversified designs with the support of the DC. The department would also solicit Members’ comments on the designs. Responding to item 10 “Beautification Works at New Praya, Kennedy Town”, Mr MAN pointed out that the current situation there was not ideal. For example, the concrete pipes and railings at the waterfront were damaged and the water drainage conditions were not satisfactory. The department hoped to repair the related facilities by means of this project. Responding to item 12 “Provision of Water Dispensers at the Kennedy Town Community Complex”, Mr MAN pointed out it was temperature-modulated hot and chilled type of water dispenser. Regarding item 13 “Enhancement Works at Sands Street”, Mr MAN stated that the project was carried out at Sands Street near To Li Terrace. Since no handrails were provided at the staircase there and the condition was no good, the department hoped to better the situation through this project. Regarding item 15 “Beautification Works in C&W District – Central to Mid-Levels Escalator and Walkway System”, Mr MAN stated that the department hoped to introduce diversified designs and would consult the views of Members before the project proceeded. Regarding item 16 “Central to Mid-Levels Escalator and Walkway System Greening Project (2019-2020)”, he added that flower baskets would be hanged at the relevant location and the project would end in June. If this term of DC wanted to continue the project, the department would apply for funding for the project after the end of the typhoon season this year and before Christmas. Mr MAN stated that Members were arranged to conduct an on-site visit related to item 17 “Converting the area fronting the New Praya, Kennedy Town into a Temporary Sitting-Out Area” earlier on, and Members were told that the pier at the site was managed by other government departments. The department hoped that through the “DMW” project, the waterfront area could be opened up in a quicker and simpler manner and be available for use by the public as soon as possible. Regarding item 18 “Provision of a Pet Garden at Pok Fu Lam Road”, Mr MAN stated that because the site was equipped with flower pots, planters and wire fences, and there was also a slope below, the department was currently undergoing a topographic survey to confirm that the extent of area that could be used as park. The Works Section of the HAD was expected to complete the work by the end of July. The department would report back when further information was available.

112. The Vice Chairman invited Members to raise supplementary questions. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Ms Cherry WONG stated that the departmental representative only responded to the delayed completion of item 1 “Installation of visitors’ facilities at Mount Davis”, but failed to explain why the project cost was up to \$2,690,000. For this reason, she requested the department for the breakdown of the project cost.
- (b) Mr Sam YIP hoped that the department would provide more information on item 11 “Optimisation of the Kennedy Town Swimming Pool Sitting-Out Area”, and asked the

department to provide him the funding application of the project for reference. Regarding item 8 “Beautification Works in C&W District – Mural and Staircase Painting”, Mr YIP agreed to invite designers to participate in the design work and to incorporate local features into the design. He pointed out that the existing column murals at the site were in poor condition, so he requested the department to carry out cleaning.

- (c) Mr PANG Ka-ho stated that he had conducted a visit with TD staff to the site of item 10 “Beautification Works at New Praya, Kennedy Town”. At that time, TD staff said that they would follow up, so he hoped to clarify whether the project was currently followed up by the TD or the HAD. Besides, he inquired the department whether apart from the concrete blocks and the railing, the paving blocks at the site would be revamped as well. Regarding item 13 “Enhancement Works at Sands Street”, he said that besides the widely grown moss, the problem of dog fouling everywhere was also very serious at that place.
- (d) Mr NG Siu-hong suggested adding the C&WDC logo to design-related projects.
- (e) For item 1 “Installation of visitors’ facilities at Mount Davis” and item 2 “Interpretation Plates for the Central and Western District Literary Trail”, the Vice Chairman said that he had heard explanation given by departmental representatives at previous meetings that it was difficult to set up interpretation plates or information panels due to the topography of the project site or underground facilities were found. For this reason, he inquired whether the department had a definite way to solve the problem, so as to complete the projects.
- (f) Ms CHENG Lai-king inquired about Item 4 “Provision of Visitor Signages at Central to Mid-Levels Escalator and Walkway System and Visitors’ Info Map at Conduit Road” and asked whether the department would set up notice boards on both sides of the escalators to provide visitors and traffic information. Regarding item 1 “Installation of visitors’ facilities at Mount Davis” and item 2 “Interpretation Plates for the Central and Western District Literary Trail”, she asked how the funding would be handled in case the projects could not be completed by the end of the current term of DC. She wished that the relevant departments could make up their minds to implement these projects at full speed.
- (g) Mr KAM Nai-wai said that in view of the fact that there were many new District Councillors in this term of the DC and individual projects had been in implementation for several years, some Members might have new ideas towards individual projects and want to know their progress. In this paper, the department had only listed out the title of the projects and some brief descriptions. He opined that it failed to provide enough information for the newly elected District Councillors to fully understand the detailed content of the projects. He suggested the department to provide the latest utilisation of funds in respect of each project and provide separate paper for each project with detailed information, in order to facilitate in-depth discussions among Members. He said that because it was difficult for the DWFMC to discuss all items at the same time, so he proposed the department to explain each and every project by batches in the coming two to three meetings so as to allow new Members to provide novel opinions. The department could discuss with the Chairlady on the priorities of discussion which could be

determined according to the progress of individual items. However, should a Member had particular opinions on individual items, that could also be discussed first.

113. The Vice Chairman asked the representatives of the DO to respond to Members' questions and comments.

114. Mrs Susanne WONG, DO(C&W) said that there were more new and young Members in this term of DC. She also knew that Members wanted some novel designs. She added that colleagues from the District Management Section, C&WDO had been working hard to carry out various maintenance projects and had also completed many innovative projects, including the "WE Park" which was very popular among residents. She pointed out that the Government's usual way of doing things was to hand over the project to contract consultants appointed by the HAD. Although the contract consultants would try their best to meet the requirements of Members, it was common that their perspectives were different from those of young designers. She understood that the C&WDC always had high expectations for the design of the works projects. Therefore, in addition to identifying contract consultants for design works according to the usual procurement procedures, the department had also tried to contact students of design schools including the Hong Kong Polytechnic University and the Vocational Training Council to deliver the designs under the guidance of their instructors. If Members gave their support to the proposal, the department could try to seek the support of the HAD to solicit students, disabled artists and young artists to carry out the design work. She assured that the concept design would be submitted to the Council first in any case, and the mural project would only go ahead subject to the approval of Members. She reiterated that although the works projects must be implemented in accordance with relevant rules, if Members considered that the above approach was worth trying, the department could invite students or young artists to participate in the design work under the normal procurement procedures. Actually, the department had also adopted such practice before. In response to Mr Sam YIP's comments on the "Optimisation of the Kennedy Town Swimming Pool Sitting-Out Area" project, DO(C&W) stated that she had contacted individual NGOs to provide assistance.

115. Mr Eric MAN, Executive Officer (District Management)¹, C&WDO responded to comments on the "Installation of visitors' facilities at Mount Davis" project, stating that the project was carried out through a fixed-term contract consultant of the HAD. He further explained to Members about the department's procedures for project implementation, saying that if individual projects involved few design elements, the department would directly entrust the Works Section of the HAD to take up the project instead of engaging term consultants. He said that because the information panels of the "Installation of visitors' facilities at Mount Davis" project involved more design elements, including how to determine the style, material and colour of the information panels in line with the environment, it was necessary to engage a consultancy team to complete the project, and the cost would also be relatively expensive. He added that the works cost related to the construction of the information panels was about \$1.9 million, inclusive of the design and production of the information panels. He emphasised that the current project budget was only an estimate, and the project cost could only be determined after the tender process was completed. The projected estimate was made with reference to similar projects in the past. Responding to Ms CHENG Lai-king's question on Item 4 "Provision of Visitor Signages at Central to Mid-Levels Escalator and Walkway System and Visitors' Info Map at

Conduit Road”, Mr MAN said that the Tourism Commission had already updated the visitors’ notice board on Conduit Road, containing information about the way and the route to the Peak. The department had planned to build a larger signage next to the current notice board, but after a site inspection, it was found that the site was full of various underground facilities. The department was discussing with the EMSD, HyD and TD about adding notices at different locations along the route to remind visitors of the correct way and route to the Peak. Moreover, Mr MAN stated that if Members found that murals in some places were particularly dilapidated, they could discuss with the department and the department would actively follow up. In response to Mr PANG Ka-ho’s question about item 10 “Beautification Works at New Praya, Kennedy Town”, Mr MAN stated that the land ownership of the place belonged to the TD, but the railings at the waterfront were under the purview of the HAD. In view of this, the department would assume the responsibility of coordinating the project’s overall rehabilitation work, and would deal with the paving blocks and drain covers after communicating with the TD. In response to Mr PANG’s comments on item 13 “Enhancement Works at Sands Street”, Mr MAN expressed his hope that pedestrians could be attracted to pass by the place after the completion of the project. He said that if there were Members who wanted to know the details of individual projects, he welcomed them to conduct on-site visits with colleagues from the District Management Section of the C&WDO.

116. Mr PANG Ka-ho asked the departmental representative to respond to Mr KAM Nai-wai’s suggestion of provision of detailed information for each project.

117. Mr Eric MAN, Executive Officer (District Management)1, C&WDO responded that the department would meet with Members’ request. He expressed that each works project was annexed with a paper at the time of funding application, describing the background of the project, the funding amount and project details. He added that he could discuss with the Chairlady about the way to send the relevant information to Members.

118. The Chairlady suggested the department to provide the site plan of each project and the photos taken during the site visits for Members’ information so that they could read them before the meeting. This could help to shorten the time of the meeting. She said that she could explore further with the department, and suggested that the papers should be sent to Members by email before the next meeting. The Chairlady also asked if Members found that district facilities such as pavilions, benches and the like were too old-fashioned and wished to hold a design competition or invite students from design institutes to provide new designs with local characteristics, what were the procedures involved and whether the department had to consult the HAD.

119. Mr Sam YIP expressed that he had similar ideas with the Chairlady, and he also agreed with the innovative proposition of DO(C&W). He inquired whether in addition to recruiting students or disabled artists to participate in the design work, the department would consider open recruitment. Moreover, Mr YIP said that the current mural paintings were in poor and dirty condition. He requested the department to clean the sites concerned first.

120. The Vice Chairman asked the departmental representatives to respond.

121. Mrs Susanne WONG, DO(C&W) thanked Members for accepting and proposing

innovative ideas in the first place. What the Chairlady and Mr Sam YIP had just said duly reflected the difficulty of the department that she was trying to explain. She said that the HAD hoped to make good use of resources. Generally speaking, works project of a simple nature were handled by the staff of the Works Section of the HAD, while projects involving design would be handed over to the successful contract consultants after the tender exercise. She pointed out that under the current system, the practice of holding design competitions not only deviated from the Government's usual tender procedures, but the process was also more complicated. In order to speed up the implementation of the projects, she had adopted a compromise approach before, which was to invite various units such as NGOs and art students to provide quotations. Then, technical and price review in accordance with the government procurement procedures would be conducted in order to identify the suitable partner. She added that the mural painting project was relatively simple. If Members had proposed certain locations, the department could request the HAD for a pilot scheme of an experimental nature and invite young artists to participate in accordance with the procurement process. If the results of the pilot scheme were satisfactory, the department could consider how to further implement the project. DO(C&W) added that six projects had been completed within four months through such similar approach, and suggested Members to consider it.

122. Mr Eric MAN, Executive Officer (District Management)1, C&WDO responded to the Chairlady's question, saying that the department was ready to incorporate new elements into the "DMW" projects. However, since the scope of funding of the "DMW" projects did not cover competitions, so it might be necessary to introduce competition through other sources of funding.

(c) Report on the progress of feasibility studies on LCSD-led district minor works projects in the Central and Western District (C&W DWFMC Paper No. 32/2020)

123. The Vice Chairman asked the representatives of the LCSD to brief on the paper.

124. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD, stated that the department had consulted the works departments concerned with regard to Item 3 "Provision of drinking fountains in West End Park" and Item 4 "Provision of drinking fountains in Caine Lane Garden". It was believed that the said works projects were technically feasible. The department was now discussing the project details and the estimated budget with the departments, and would report back later. She added that the department was still following up on Item 1 "Provision of a canopy providing shelter for outdoor benches in parks and sitting-out areas from rain in C&W District" and Item 2 "Request to increase the height of backstop of the football pitch at Forbes Street Temporary Playground", and would revert to Members later.

125. The Vice Chairman invited Members to raise questions and express opinions.

126. Ms Bonnie NG spoke on the project of "Provision of drinking fountains in Caine Lane Garden", saying that the department had briefed Members on the types of drinking fountain at the last term of the DC. She asked when the department could determine the type of drinking fountain to be used.

127. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD replied that she would revert to Ms Bonnie NG after getting the details.

128. Ms CHENG Lai-king inquired whether it was necessary to keep Item 1 “Provision of a canopy providing shelter for outdoor benches in parks and sitting-out areas from rain in C&W District” in the paper.

129. Ms Susanna YAU, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Central & Western, LCSD replied that the department had been liaising with the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) and would report the progress of the project to Members by means of papers of the meeting.

130. The Vice Chairman stated that since there were no further questions or comments from Members, he would move on to the next paper.

**(d) Report on the progress of studies on proposed C&WDO-led district minor works projects in the Central and Western District
(C&W DWFMC Paper No. 33/2020)**

131. The Vice Chairman asked the representatives of the DO to brief on the paper.

132. Mr Eric MAN, Executive Officer (District Management)¹, C&WDO stated that in the last meeting, Members had discussed Item 2 “Conversion of the Green Area at Ui On Lane into a Sitting-Out Area” and concluded that residents might be affected if the area was opened to public. Therefore, it was proposed to convert the area into a nursery. The department had already conducted an on-site visit there with the Works Section of the HAD. It was found that there were four trees at the site, so further survey was necessary to ascertain the size of the available space. The department would continue to follow up and Members would be consulted after the preliminary design was ready. Mr MAN stated that the department was now dealing with Item 3 “Installation of lights on the overhead cover of the public chess board tables at Lung Wah Lower Street, Kennedy Town” and Item 7 “Provision of seats and overhead cover at Lung Wah Lower Street, Kwun Lung Lau” together, and would first solicit the views of the local District Councillor. He added that because the projects involved the installation of electrical devices, the department had to engage contract consultants to carry out the projects. Regarding Item 8 “Maintenance of the stairs leading from the fire well to the back door of No. 38-44 Witty Street and provision of handrails on the left side”, Mr MAN stated that the HyD had already built railings at the site, so the HAD no longer needed to attend to the project. Regarding item 9 “Beautification works at the location of the demolished hawker pitch on Peel Street next to No. 80 Caine Road”, Mr MAN stated that as the site had already been optimised by the HyD, there was no need to implement the project with DMW funding.

133. The Vice Chairman invited Members to raise questions and express opinions on this paper.

134. Ms Bonnie NG spoke on Item 10 “Erection of information panels for the Hong Kong Museum of Medical Sciences (HKMMS)”, saying that at the last meeting the department indicated that the HKMMS hoped to refer to the design of the information panels of Tai Kwun.

She inquired about the progress of the design work.

135. Mr Eric MAN, Executive Officer (District Management)1, C&WDO responded that the department had requested Tai Kwun to provide the specifications of the information panels, but Tai Kwun had declined DO's request. DO would study with the Works Section of the HAD to complete the design of the HKMMS's information panels on their own and would discuss with the HKMMS about the location of the information panels.

136. Mr NGAN Suen-wa, Inspector of Works (HK)2, HAD added that the department had to carry out the design work of the information panels according to the actual setting and conditions. After the location of the panels was confirmed and the design was completed, the design drawings would be provided for Members' reference.

137. Mrs Susanne WONG, DO (C&W) added that Tai Kwun might have declined DO's request based on intellectual property considerations. She emphasised that DO would take into account the needs of the HKMMS and try their best to meet the requirements. Definitely, DO would not copy the design of a third party.

138. The Vice Chairman stated that as the HyD had already carried out optimisation works related to item 9 "Beautification works at the location of the demolished hawker pitch on Peel Street next to No. 80 Caine Road", DO would not have to report on it at the next meeting.

139. Mr Eric MAN, Executive Officer (District Management)1, C&WDO added that Item 8 "Maintenance of the stairs leading from the fire well to the back door of No. 38-44 Witty Street and provision of handrails on the left side" had been completed.

140. The Vice Chairman stated that since Members had no more questions on the agenda item, he would end this discussion.

Item 7 – Open Space at Eastern Street North, Sai Ying Pun (C&W DWFMC No. 34/2020)

(5:54 pm – 7:05 pm)

141. The Vice Chairman welcomed representatives from the Harbour Office of the Development Bureau, ArchSD, LCSD and One Bite Design Studio to the meeting. He stated that the paper was submitted by the Development Bureau and invited representatives of relevant government departments to brief on the paper.

142. Miss Rosalind CHEUNG, Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau hoped to solicit Members' views on the proposed outline design for the long-term development of the Open Space at Eastern Street North, Sai Ying Pun at this meeting. She said that in the January 2017 Policy Address, it was announced that \$500 million would be earmarked for the development of the waterfront, and that this project was one of the projects to be implemented under the funding. Miss CHEUNG thanked the Chairlady of the DC and the last term of the DC for their support and efforts. Through the funding of the "DMW" project, temporary and simple beautification works had been carried out in the area of the project, allowing the public to use that section of the

waterfront even before the long-term development plan was implemented. Miss CHEUNG said that her team and colleagues from the ArchSD would consult Members on the design concept for long-term development at this meeting.

143. Mr Henry LAI, Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, Development Bureau added that the site was located at the waterfront between Sheung Wan and Shek Tong Tsui, with a total length of about two kilometres. When the Development Bureau's Harbour Office invited the ArchSD to conduct a conceptual design, the department was asked to consider the different facilities and features available at each section of the entire waterfront. For example, the Sheung Wan Section had a Tai Chi park and a pet garden; the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park had a big lawn which was so popular among the public. There were four revitalised idle piers in the Western Wholesale Food Market Section, and each pier had its own characteristics. When inviting the ArchSD to carry out the design, the Bureau specially urged that thoughts on the uniqueness of this Open Space and its integration with other sections should be considered.

144. Mr Jim CHAN, Senior Architect/22, ArchSD briefed on the outline design of the project, and said that apart from staff of the ArchSD in the design team, One Bite Design Studio had also provided valuable advice as the consultant for recreational facilities. Mr CHAN outlined that the site was connected to the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park on the east, and west of it was the "WE Park" adjoining the waterfront of the Western Wholesale Food Market Section. He pointed out that because the "WE Park" was very popular with the public, the project would adopt the innovative and interesting features of the "WE Park" and incorporate large-scale recreational facilities in the overall design of the project. Mr CHAN added that under the planning of the "Open Space at Eastern Street North, Sai Ying Pun", the respective facilities from west to east were "multi-purpose activity space", "inter-generational connection recreation space", "waterfront open space", passages and the lookout area, lookout platform and snack kiosks, leisure pool, toilets and auxiliary facilities. He pointed out that the location of the "multi-purpose activity space" would be a corner of its own. The department proposed to carry out decoration works on the floor and walls of the place, and the walls would also be equipped with game elements. A rock-climbing wall would also be built at the far end of the place to provide more options for recreation. Besides, in view of the fact that the concrete pipe playground facilities in the "WE Park" were very popular, reprovisioning of some concrete pipes there would be considered. He stressed that the place was highly open and variable. Apart from being used as a place for multi-purpose activities, it could also be transformed into a weekend bazaar or workshop. Mr CHAN continued to brief on the diversified "inter-generational connection recreation space", pointing out that it was a recreational space suitable for people of all ages and abilities. And it was believed that it could give the public some new fun experience. A playing platform below ground level would be provided east of the space, allowing the public to do some physical exercises or using it as a place for storytelling or performance venue for children. A climbing facility would also be provided by the side. A trampoline area would be available there as well to allow people of various ages to have fun, which was relatively new in Hong Kong. To the west of the space was a revolving amusement facility called "Big Toy", which had the distinctive feature of being wheelchair-user friendly. The peripheral of the "Big Toy" would be equipped with fitness facilities designed for all. At the main passage outside the space, the department would plant trees with colourful blossoms, which served to beautify the environment as well as complement the playing facilities there. Mr CHAN then brief on the "waterfront open space", saying that the place would be shaped into a tranquil and

pleasant open space. The most distinctive feature being the wave-shaped leisure seats, where the public could take a rest under tree shade and enjoy the sunset and the sea view. The relatively slender “waterfront open space” at the centre of the park was mainly used as a passageway. The authority would plant shade trees and provide seats there. Mr CHAN pointed out that the “lookout platform” was located at the spacious area rather east of the promenade and divided into the front part and the rear part. There would be green facilities at the rear part which was closer to the highway to buffer the nuisance and noise coming from vehicles at the entrance of the Western Harbour Crossing. The front part of the lookout platform was an arc-shaped structure and its atrium was an activity space with grass lawn. A long slide would also be provided at the back of the lookout platform to further enhance the fun elements there. On the lookout platform, one could enjoy the view of the skyline from West Kowloon to Tsim Sha Tsui. Below the platform, there would be a large covered sitting-out area with refreshment kiosk and water dispenser. Distinctive drop-shaped seats and ceiling lamps would also be installed there to facilitate users to hang out for long time. Finally, Mr CHAN briefed on the leisure pool to the easternmost side, saying that it was close to the waterfront and the area was very spacious. The leisure pool would be divided into three parts, including a shallow leisure pool, a special fountain plaza and a sand playing area. There would also be facilities for placing shoes and washing feet. A low wall would be erected there to add some fun and prevent the sea breeze from blowing away the sand. The fountain plaza on the far east side of this area could also be converted into a multi-purpose activity venue in winter. Mr CHAN said that the proposed fence would adopt slanted design, so that the public could enjoy the sea view from a wider angle. The authority expected that after the completion of the park, five main optimisations could be achieved: first, provision of an innovative and diversified inter-generational connection recreation space; second, enhancement of waterfront enjoyment; third, increase of ancillary facilities like shade and toilets; fourth, provision of numerous multi-purpose spaces to hold community activities; and fifth, improvement of the accessibility of the waterfront.

145. The Vice Chairman invited Members to raise questions and express opinions. The main points made by Members were as follows:

- (a) Mr KAM Nai-wai said he learned from previous minutes of meeting that the project had been discussed in DC meetings in 2015, i.e., two terms ago. He pointed out that the conceptual design illustrations just shown were not attached to the discussion paper and asked why the Bureau had not submitted the conceptual design illustrations to the DWFMC in advance. He also supposed that the conceptual design illustrations should be uploaded to the DC website. He found the conceptual design of the project desirable. He believed that the overall conceptual design of the project did not come from the ArchSD because it did not look like something that was conceived by government officials. Mr KAM stated that the DC had been fighting for the construction of cycling tracks along the waterfront promenade. He demanded explanation as to why the facility for public cycling was not included in the design. He added that the facility for public cycling from Western District to Sheung Wan had been lacking all along and many residents had complained about it. Mr KAM also said that although it was a good idea to set up a leisure pool, he also doubted the feasibility of a sand playing area indeed. It was because the place would be subject to strong wind when hit by typhoon and he worried that the sand would be blown away. He also inquired whether the project could be connected to the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park

and the Western Wholesale Food Market Section of the C&W Waterfront Promenade. On the whole, Mr KAM considered that it was a novel design with positive elements.

- (b) Miss Camille YAM hailed the innovative design proposed and believed that the design was similar to that of West Kowloon. She also agreed with Mr KAM Nai-wai's opinion that the project should add facilities for public cycling. She cited the example of Tseung Kwan O where cycling tracks were now provided to connect various places in the district, which were popular among local residents and helped to promote a low-carbon lifestyle. She again quoted the example of West Kowloon, saying that even though animals were allowed to enter the area, the sanitary condition was still good. Therefore, she enquired whether the Bureau would consider allowing the public to bring their pets into the Open Space at Eastern Street North, Sai Ying Pun. She further quoted the example of the Tseung Kwan O Waterfront where even the paving blocks were washed away after the attack of typhoon. She felt that severe weather in Hong Kong might become more frequent in the future, so she believed that the authorities should consider the feasibility of setting up a sand playing area.
- (c) Mr WONG Weng-chi opined that the design of Open Space at Eastern Street North, Sai Ying Pun made him feel good and also believed that the design could achieve positive effects. He pointed out that in addition to the continuous request for cycling tracks in the district, residents of Western District were also concerned about whether pets would be allowed in the venue. At present, residents were quite dissatisfied with the ban on cycling and pets inside the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park. Since the management of the "WE Park" was less strict, so residents preferred the management model of the "WE Park". Mr WONG enquired how the authorities would conduct public consultation on the project, how long the consultation exercise would last, and how public opinions would be dealt with. He also asked how much money the authorities intended to spend on the entire project.
- (d) Mr Sam YIP expressed that he had many queries about the project and said that he knew that the project had been discussed in the meeting of the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island, Harbourfront Commission held earlier. He questioned why the conceptual design illustrations of the works project were not attached to the submitted paper, and asked the Bureau to submit it to Members after the meeting. Regarding the trees with colourful blossoms intended to be planted under the project, he said that he did not know what types of trees were they, but he worried that the tree species might wither easily due to sea breeze intolerance. Besides, he questioned the effect of the proposed wave-shaped leisure seats in the project, believing that the public would prefer simple and open lawns. Although he agreed that the conceptual design of the project was innovative, the Bureau should also consult residents to understand their needs. Mr YIP stated that more than \$3 million of DC funding was used for the construction of the "WE Park". He also knew that Members understood that the "WE Park" was a temporary facility when the DC approved the funding. He wanted to know how long the "WE Park" could still be used, and hoped that the authorities could incorporate more inclusive elements related to the "WE Park" into the design of the new project. Mr YIP also enquired whether the new project would adopt a softer management model and allow citizens to ride bicycles. He said that the current location of Eastern Street North was originally a parking lot for

dangerous goods vehicles. For this reason, he enquired whether the authorities had plans to relocate the parking lot.

- (e) Mr NG Siu-hong suggested that a cycling track be constructed to connect the Open Space at Eastern Street North, Sai Ying Pun and Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park, and asked whether the public would be allowed to ride bicycles, play scooters and roller skating after the project was completed. Since many people liked to do running exercise there now, he asked whether the design of the new project had reserved enough space for running exercise. He also asked the authorities to ensure that the grassland of the project would be open for public use. He suggested setting up adequate seats at the site so that parents could sit and keep an eye on their playing children. Mr NG wondered why the design illustrations revealed at the meeting were far more than the photos contained in the paper. Therefore, he asked the Bureau to provide the conceptual design illustrations to Members after the meeting so that they could consult the residents in detail.
- (f) Ms Bonnie NG stated that since she started to run for election in 2011, she had been fighting for the addition of cycling tracks and jogging tracks along the promenade. She said that from the conceptual design, she learnt that a snack kiosk would be opened there. For this purpose, she requested the authorities to clearly specify the opening hours of the snack kiosk. She said that the planned recreational facilities were mainly concentrated near the side of Fung Mat Road, while the restrooms were mainly located close to the east, so this might cause inconvenience to children using the recreational facilities. Ms NG also expressed concern about whether the types of trees to be planted under the new project would be compatible with the growing conditions near the sea.
- (g) Ms Cherry WONG stated that as mentioned by many Members in the meeting of the Harbourfront Commission, the shading areas provided under the new project were insufficient. She pointed out that the site was exposed to intense sunlight, and based on the conceptual design illustrations, the number of trees planned to be planted should not be able to provide enough shade. She also said that the public expected the new project could provide cycling tracks, and therefore hoped that the Bureau could consider it seriously. Ms WONG said that she had reservations about the location of the leisure pool and sand playing area under the project because she worried that some people would wash themselves in the leisure pool after playing in the sand playing area. She also pointed out that the wind in the Western District was strong, and she worried that the sand in the sand playing area would be blown to the entrance of the Western Harbour Crossing during the course of typhoon, affecting traffic. Regarding the planned trampoline facility, Ms WONG was concerned about safety issues, including whether adequate safety facilities would be provided and how hygiene could be ensured.
- (h) Mr Jeremy YOUNG hailed the conceptual design of the project presented to the DWFMC. He stated that the area of the waterfront promenade was very extensive, so he proposed to add maps and signage to provide adequate information such as the location of toilets, snack kiosk and water dispenser to the public. He also said that the sunlight there was very strong, so providing shading area was very important. He was interested to know what types of trees would be planted there and suggested increasing the number of pavilions to shelter

from sunlight.

- (i) Ms CHENG Lai-king was excited about the effect of the conceptual design illustrations of the project. She said that the authorities had strongly promoted the “WE Park” when it was completed in 2019 and the park had now become one of the landmarks in the C&W District. For this reason, she enquired whether the park would be completely closed during the construction of the new project. She added that the “WE Park” was currently managed by the C&WDO. At present, as long as no disturbance was caused to other users, the public could ride their bicycles there. Ms CHENG also expressed concern about the “WE Park” which was constructed with subsidised funding of several millions from the DC, and considered its three-year operation period too short. She worried that the public would say that the DC was wasting money. Therefore, she proposed to keep the current facilities in the “WE Park” as far as possible and remove them only when they had become dilapidated. She enquired whether the new project would be a permanent one, and hoped that the authorities would consult tree experts for the selection of wind-tolerant tree species suitable for planting at the waterfront. Ms CHENG believed that the newly planned sand playing area would be very popular among the public, but she worried that sand particles may be blown away by strong winds. She suggested that the location of the proposed toilets be used to build an entrance to connect to the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park, so that the public could use the toilets in the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park Sports Centre. In this way, no toilets would need to be provided under the new project and more space could be released for recreational facilities. She also suggested the authorities to build a sundial and add signages and maps. Apart from indicating the location of various facilities in the venue, information such as historical background of that section of waterfront, the relationship between the site and the Drainage Services Department (DSD)’s “Harbour Area Treatment Scheme” and information on the landscape across the Victoria Harbour could also be included. Finally, Ms CHENG hoped that a cycling park could be added under the new project and suggested the authorities to refer to the model of the Kowloon Bay Park Cycling Ground.
- (j) The Chairlady believed that the design concept of the “multi-purpose activity space” was good. In order to facilitate the public to do fitness exercises there, she suggested the authorities to use resilient materials to floor the ground. She also suggested that transparent materials be used as railings on the upper level of the lookout platform to facilitate the public to take pictures of the sea.

146. The Vice Chairman asked departmental representatives to respond to the questions and comments of Members.

147. Miss Rosalind CHEUNG, Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau had heard the views of Members and said that they would forward the conceptual design illustrations to Members via the Secretariat as soon as possible after the meeting. She said that the design was undertaken by colleagues from the ArchSD and it was encouraging that it had won the support of Members. Responding to the proposal of adding cycling tracks, Miss CHEUNG said that the construction of cycling tracks connecting the northern part of Hong Kong Island was the common aspiration of the DC and the Harbourfront Commission. The authorities had

commissioned consultants to study and explore ways to build a continuous cycling track. She said that the relevant research was ongoing and hoped that after the consultants submitted the report at the end of this year or early next year, the Bureau would start to hear the views of Members on the consultants' recommendations and the implementation plan. She held an open attitude to the mode of management of the project upon its completion, including allowing the public to ride bicycles and bring in their pets. The Bureau was discussing with the LCSD about how the arrangements could be implemented. Responding to Ms CHENG Lai-king's question, Miss CHEUNG said that the plan was a long-term and permanent development. In response to the comment that whether the cessation of operation of the "WE Park" would be a waste, Miss CHEUNG said that the project was still in the design stage and would not start until 2021 or even 2022 at the earliest. Therefore, the current status of the "WE Park" would not change until 2021 or 2022. The authorities also hoped to improve the existing facilities at the said site through the implementation of this project. She emphasised that at the commencement of the works, efforts would be taken to reduce the scope of the works site and arrangements be made to allow public movement at any time as far as possible. Responding to Mr KAM Nai-wai's question, Miss CHEUNG said that the above site was already a session linking up the promenade between Sai Ying Pun and Wan Chai. She also welcomed comments from Members on the opening hours of the snack kiosk. She added that the project was still in the preliminary design stage at this moment. After listening to Members' opinions, the ArchSD would continue to work with the consultants to improve the current design. The authorities could only calculate the budget of the works project after the formal detailed design was ready, and the relevant information would be released at that time. Responding to the suggestion to provide more signages, Miss CHEUNG said that in addition to providing useful information, the Bureau also hoped to make it interesting and better people's experience of enjoying the seaside. Responding to Ms CHENG Lai-king's suggestion to include a sundial and facilities with historical elements in the design, Miss CHEUNG said that it could be considered when it came to the detailed design stage. In response to a Member's concern about the safety of trampoline facilities, she said that the Bureau had consulted the consultants in charge of amusement facilities and pointed out that such facilities were very common abroad. She assured that the Bureau would pay attention to the safety of trampoline facilities and would ask the consultants to conduct further study.

148. Mr Jim CHAN, Senior Architect/22, ArchSD firstly thanked Members for their comments and said that the ArchSD was in charge of the overall design of the works project. One Bite Design Studio, as the consultants for recreational facilities, had also provided innovative and valuable suggestions. The department also hoped to bring a brand new waterfront experience to the community and the public through this project. In response to comments about the sand playing area, Mr CHAN said that a curved low wall was planned to block the sea wind or waves. The next study would be about adding buckles on the sides of the sand playing area to facilitate the management to cover the area with protection facilities in the event of a typhoon. Responding to comments on the types of trees to be planted, Mr CHAN stated that tree varieties suitable for Hong Kong's climate and compatible with the waterfront environment would be planted at the site. At the initial design, the tree species proposed to be planted was Pink Trumpet Tree. He added that the professional landscape architects among the team members had already provided their preliminary opinions and would conduct thorough studies in the next stage of detailed design. In response to comments on shading facilities, he stressed that the current design was still in the initial stage, and there were three main shading places in the current design, including a large shaded

space next to the “inter-generational connection recreation space”. He continued that the planned grassland would be open to public and members of the public could sit and lie on the grass freely. Responding to comments on flooring materials, he said that more sturdy and durable materials such as concrete would be used at places intended for holding various activities. At places where climbing facilities were provided, resilient materials such as rubber matting would be used to ensure safety. He also said that he would conduct further studies on the selection of railing materials to facilitate the public to take pictures. In response to comments about the toilets, Mr CHAN stated that there would be toilets in the middle of the park, and another public toilet was currently available somewhere near Pier 4 of the Western Wholesale Food Market. He further said that it was an intentional design to detach the sand playing area from the leisure pool. Besides, there would be feet washing facilities and a low wall to demarcate the two amenities.

149. Mr Henry LAI, Assistant Secretary (Harbour)¹, Development Bureau added to the comments on the addition of a cycling track, saying that there would be a six-metre-wide passage in the centre of the park. Quite different from the cycling tracks in the New Territories, he stressed that the authorities anticipated that the cycling tracks on both sides of the Victoria Harbour would adopt an inclusive design. He added that it was mentioned in the meeting of the Working Group on the Central & Western District Harbourfront held on 20 May that it was more appropriate to adopt the GreenWay design since the waterfront promenade on both sides of the Victoria Harbour was relatively narrow. The GreenWay design was used at the West Kowloon Cultural District now and the same design would also be adopted at the 13-kilometre long cycling track actively pushed by the authorities in Kai Tak. The width of the two main passages at the two places was 6 to 8 metres. The study on the introduction of cycling track facilities connecting Hong Kong Island North would also follow similar benchmarks.

150. The Vice Chairman stated that apart from caring whether the venue would allow cycling, Members were also very concerned about the management-in-charge of the venue. For this reason, he asked whether the representative of the LCSD would respond.

151. Mr Henry LAI, Assistant Secretary (Harbour)¹, Development Bureau stated that it was mentioned on the first page of the paper that the project had been handed over to the Development Bureau’s Harbour Office for processing since 2017.

152. The Vice Chairman asks DO(C&W) to provide supplementary information.

153. Mrs Susanne WONG, DO(C&W) said that the Development Bureau and the LCSD would discuss the management-in-charge of the work project in detail later. Yet she was quite sure that the management model of the site would base on the fine tradition of the C&W District – not setting too many rules of use as far as possible and managing in a communicative and innovative mode. She was grateful for Members’ support for the project and also hoped to thank the C&WDC on behalf of the Government. In response to the comments of Ms CHENG Lai-king, DO(C&W) stated that DO had always been cautiously dealing with the use of DC funding, and pointed out that the completion of the “WE Park” had not only bring immediate benefits to the community, but also shaped a long-term impact. She further explained that when the DC was considering supporting the construction of the “WE Park”, it had already understood that the Harbourfront Commission would further develop the place in the long run. She said that after getting the land

from the DSD, DO already knew that the site had to undergo improvement works and set up various basic facilities before it could be opened for use by the residents. Such works included setting up the lighting systems, levelling the ground, installation of railings and provision of shading facilities and seats. She added that the DC had approved a total of about \$6.8 million for the construction of the relevant facilities, and some \$4 million was spent in the end. Most of the expenditure was for the installation of lighting systems. DO(C&W) stated that when the “WE Park” was planned, DO wanted to add some appealing elements to attract residents to use the park. Therefore, the last term of the DC approved a total of about \$3.7 million for the construction of the “WE Park” for setting up unique concrete pipes and laying colourful matting. Moreover, four containers were provided at the “WE Park” for various NGOs to organise innovative educational courses for participation by children in the district. DO(C&W) added that the “WE Park” would cater to different Hong Kong-related themes every month, including Hong Kong movies and Hong Kong’s micro-architectures. DO would prepare different tailor-made game books for different themes so that parents could bring home some fun of the “WE Park” after having played at the park with their children. DO(C&W) emphasised that the “WE Park” was not just to provide hardware facilities. By opening up these hardware facilities, it was used as a platform to support the creative design of Hong Kong young people. Up to now, tens of thousands of people had used the relevant facilities. She emphasised that in addition to the innovative educational courses undertaken by commissioned NGOs, any organisation could make advance booking to use the facilities of the “WE Park”.

154. The Vice Chairman stated that a written Impromptu Motion from Ms Bonnie NG related to this discussion item was received. He stated that the Impromptu Motion must be approved by one third of the Members present before it could be discussed at the meeting. After consulting Members if they supported the discussion of the Impromptu Motion at the meeting, he announced that the Impromptu Motion was accepted by one third of the Members present at the meeting. He invited any Member who wanted to amend the Impromptu Motion to indicate his intention and raise it up within two minutes.

155. Miss Camille YAM suggested shortening the countdown.

156. The Vice Chairman stated that since no Members raised any objections, he announced that he agreed with the proposal to shorten the countdown. He asked Members to consider whether to adopt the Impromptu Motion. After voting, the Impromptu Motion was adopted:

Motion: The District Works & Facilities Management Committee of the Central and Western District Council strongly requests the inclusion of a design for cycling facilities in the “Open Space at Eastern Street North, Sai Ying Pun” works project.

(Proposed by Ms NG Hoi-yan, Bonnie and seconded by Mr KAM Nai-wai)

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

(0 dissenting vote)

(0 abstention vote)

157. The Chairlady stated that Members only learnt about the conceptual design of the project at the meeting, and asked whether the Bureau would attend meeting of the DWFMC at a later time to account for the follow-up work on the opinions raised by Members. She also asked the Bureau to provide relevant conceptual design illustrations to Members so that they could study them in details and conduct public consultation on the works project.

158. Miss Rosalind CHEUNG, Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau responded that the present work arrangement was to refine the design after receiving comments from Members at this meeting, and then to proceed with the detailed work and apply for funding from the Legislative Council. If Members had further comments, she urged them to submit their comments to the Bureau as soon as possible. The Bureau would also send the conceptual design illustrations to the Secretariat as soon as possible after the meeting for distribution to Members through the Secretariat.

159. Mr KAM Nai-wai pointed out that the Legislative Council was about to change its term, and believed that the Bureau would not be able to submit the project to the Legislative Council before the end of its term. He stated that Members could complete the relevant public consultation work within this year and then submit their opinions to the Bureau. He stated that as the authorities had not submitted the conceptual design illustrations of the project to the DWFMC any sooner, the responsibility for slowing down the work should lie with the Bureau, and the Bureau should not blame the DC.

160. Miss Rosalind CHEUNG, Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau stated that the Bureau had no problem allowing sufficient time for Members to consider the content of the project and collect opinions.

161. The Chairlady requested the Bureau to provide the conceptual design illustrations as soon as possible for Members to proceed with community participation and consultation, and expected the Bureau to report the progress of the project to the DWFMC in due course.

162. Mrs Susanne WONG, DO(C&W) believed that the Bureau was very willing to give Members the conceptual design illustrations of the project. Yet she reminded the Bureau to add provisions on the protection of intellectual property rights to the conceptual design illustrations. Besides, she said that the conceptual design illustrations were preliminary design, and it was expected that the Bureau would modify the design content after the meeting. She suggested that if Members had received any public comments on the project, they could pass them to the Development Bureau through the Secretariat. Vice versa, the design team of the Development Bureau could also report progress to the DWFMC through the Secretariat, such as the latest changes in design.

163. The Chairlady thanked the representatives of relevant government departments for attending the meeting. She said that because Miss Camille YAM had to leave early, she suggested to swap the agenda items and discuss the item "Request for repairing the dilapidated facilities in Lung Fu Shan Country Park and looking into improving the ancillary facilities near the war relics

in Lung Fu Shan” proposed by her first.

164. Mr KAM Nai-wai stated that he did not oppose the proposed swapping of agenda items, and suggested that the Secretary could accord priority to agenda items attended by many government department representatives in order to save their waiting time.

165. The Chairlady asked the Secretary to make more flexible arrangements when arranging the agenda of the meeting in the future.

Item 9 – Request for repairing the dilapidated facilities in Lung Fu Shan Country Park and looking into improving the ancillary facilities near the war relics in Lung Fu Shan (C&W DWFMC No. 25/2020)

(7:05 pm – 7:24 pm)

(From this item on, the Chairlady would preside over the meeting)

166. The Chairlady welcomed representatives from the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD), C&WDO and LCSO to the meeting. She stated that the paper was submitted by Miss Camille YAM, the Vice Chairman and Mr PANG Ka-ho, and asked whether Members who submitted the paper had anything to supplement.

167. Miss Camille YAM explained the reason for submitting this paper. It was found that many facilities in Lung Fu Shan Country Park were damaged, and the relevant departments had not dealt with wartime relics such as the lookout left by the former British army in the country park. She pointed out that the government departments concerned had not responded directly to the questions raised in the paper. She asked the department to provide information on the frequency of routine checks of the facilities in the country park. She added that they had visited various locations in the Lung Fu Shan Country Park twice and found that more and more facilities were being damaged. She wondered why such situation had occurred even the place was regularly checked by government departments. Miss YAM stated that the paper had also raised questions about the number of wartime relics, but no government department could provide any answers, and believed that the issue of wartime relics was not dealt with. She said that if government departments wished to seek expert advice, she could refer experts to them. However, she believed that the departments themselves should have sufficient resources to deal with the problem.

168. The Vice Chairman stated that he was more concerned about the conditions of the wartime remains, and believed that if conservation work was not carried out now, the remains may be gone at the time we wanted to conserve them. He stated that he had conducted a visit there together with Ms CHENG Lai-king and found that the wartime relics in the Lung Fu Shan Country Park, including the lookout and the stone stairs, were still in good condition, but some structures had collapsed due to disrepair or damage by typhoons. He believed that the authorities should carry out early conservation when the structures were still structurally sound. Although the Antiquities and Monuments Office had not sent any staff to attend the meeting, it was still hoped that the AFCD, as the manager of country parks, could look squarely at the wartime relics with historical and conservation value in the country park.

169. Ms CHENG Lai-king stated that the mossy stone walls shown in the photos of the paper should be part of the British military installations. She stated that she had visited the place under the guide of a faculty staff of the University of Hong Kong before. It was considered that the wartime relics should be rehabilitated and the access to the wartime relics should be improved. Since the site was within the scope of the Lung Fu Shan Country Park, she requested the AFCD to deal with the above problems. Moreover, Ms CHENG believed that funds from the “DMW” projects could be used to repair the dilapidated pavilions as soon as possible.

170. The Chairlady invited representatives from the AFCD to respond first.

171. Dr KWONG Kim Hung, Ric, Country Parks Officer (HK), AFCD replied that the AFCD had been regularly inspecting the facilities provided by the department in country parks. When any damage to the facilities was found, the staff would make a report and arrange maintenance as soon as the materials were procured. He took the facilities in the Lung Fu Shan Country Park as an example. Their staff had discovered that there were signs of aging on the boards and railings at Pavilion No. 2 earlier, and maintenance work was arranged in May. Besides, he said that the department had also removed the information panel off the Hatton Road Public Toilet. Regarding the information panel of the Pinewood Battery, Dr KWONG said that its frame was designed with an antique look to match the theme, so its condition had nothing to do with neglect and disrepair. For facilities managed by other government departments, he would leave it to representatives of the departments concerned to respond.

172. Ms STEWART Mariah Beth, Country Parks Ranger Services Officer (HK), AFCD said that the Pinewood Battery was a statutory Grade II historical building. Therefore, after consulting the Antiquities and Monuments Office many years ago, the department had introduced the Pinewood Battery Heritage Trail near the site and set up interpretation plates there to let the public understand the history of Hong Kong. She added that with regard to the relics within the country parks, the department would seek the advice of relevant professional departments to assess their historical and conservation value to see whether they were worth promoting to the public. After obtaining the expert opinions and having taken into consideration the safety of visitors and the outing experience, the department would then actively react.

173. The Chairlady invited DO(C&W) to respond on the stone chairs managed by DO.

174. Miss Erika YAU, Executive Officer (District Management)2, C&WDO replied that the DO had provided sheltered seats in the vicinity of the Lung Fu Shan Country Park. After an inspection earlier on, the department had found that some stone chairs were damaged. The department had already requested the contractor to carry out maintenance and cleaning work, which was expected to be completed by July. Moreover, she said that regarding the map sign on Hatton Road, it was found that the sign was intact but just covered with moss. Cleaning work to it had been done.

175. Miss Camille YAM pointed out that the interpretation panels were designed with sharp corners, which may cause potential danger to hikers. Therefore, she suggested that attention should be paid to the use of rounded corners when designing similar interpretation panels or information panels in the future. She also said that in addition to discussing the Pinewood Battery, this paper also hoped to discuss other historical sites being overlooked. However, she found that

no government department had addressed the issue squarely so far. For this reason, she asked whether the relevant government departments would undertake to conduct studies on them including the former British military lookout. She emphasised that the relevant historical sites were part of Hong Kong's history, and therefore hoped that government departments would pay attention to them. Miss YAM said that the stone chairs managed by DO were damaged since long, so she enquired DO how often they would check on them, and she suggested that checks should be conducted more frequently.

176. The Vice Chairman hoped that the authorities could attach importance to the value of historical sites in the Lung Fu Shan Country Park, and pointed out that the Lung Fu Shan Military Fortress covered not just the Pinewood Battery, it was composed of military installations in various locations on the knoll. He believed that the authorities should fully demonstrate to the public the aspects of Hong Kong during the war. In order to do so, conservation of the Pinewood Battery alone was not enough. Other wartime relics on Lung Fu Shan should also be conserved in order to showcase the military installations of Hong Kong during the war. The Vice Chairman was pleased to see that government departments had expressed that they would consult expert advice, study whether interpretation panels could be set up and improve the passages linking up the historical structures. He hoped that the departments could follow up related work seriously.

177. The Chairlady stated that since there were no more comments from Members, representatives of government departments were invited to respond to the questions raised.

178. Ms STEWART Mariah Beth, Country Parks Ranger Services Officer (HK), AFCD responded that the department noted the opinion related to the interpretation panels and would pay more attention in the future. She added that the department would consult the relevant professional departments on heritage conservation and would take appropriate measures during planning to ensure safety of visitors and good outing experience.

179. The Chairlady asked representatives from relevant department to respond to questions about the frequency of inspection of stone chairs.

180. Miss Erika YAU, Executive Officer (District Management)², C&WDO replied that the Works Section of the HAD had dedicated teams to conduct regular inspections on facilities managed by the HAD. DO would increase the frequency of inspections as proposed.

181. The Chairlady signalled to give Members the last round of questioning time.

182. Miss Camille YAM asked the department to report to the DC after inspecting the former British military lookout and other historical sites, and expressed her wish to know whether the historical sites were duly conserved and regarded.

183. The Chairlady expressed that the voting procedures for C&W DWFMC No. 25/2020 would proceed, and asked all members to vote on the following two motions. After voting, the following two motions were adopted.

Motion 1: "Strongly request the departments concerned to immediately follow up on and

repair the dilapidated facilities; conduct inspection regularly in future and carry out necessary maintenance work.”

(Proposed by Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille and seconded by Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus)

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

(0 dissenting vote)

(0 abstention vote)

Motion 2: “Request the departments concerned to conserve war relics in Lung Fun Shan other than the Pinewood Battery Compound, and look into improving the ancillary facilities near the relics with a view to opening to the public.”

(Proposed by Miss YAM Ka-yi, Camille and seconded by Mr LEUNG Fong-wai, Fergus)

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

(0 dissenting vote)

(0 abstention vote)

**Item 8 – Request the Government or District Council to finance the operation of the public lift at Hollywood Terrace which connects Queen’s Road Central and Hollywood Road
(C&W DWFMC No. 20/2020)**

(7:24 pm – 7:32 pm)

184. The Chairlady pointed out that this discussion item was a matter arising from the last meeting. As Members requested more information from relevant government departments to decide whether to adopt the motion, the DWFMC had not voted on the motion at the last meeting. She added that in addition to the original motion moved by Ms Bonnie NG and seconded by Mr KAM Nai-wai, the Secretariat had also received an amended motion proposed by Mr HO Chi-wang and seconded by Mr Victor YEUNG and Mr PANG Ka-ho. She said that although the relevant government departments did not send anyone to attend the meeting, Members could have further discussion before voting for the motion.

185. Mr KAM Nai-wai raised a point of order, stating that Members requested to get more information about Hollywood Terrace, Island Crest and The Belchers at the last meeting. He did not understand why the Secretariat asked about the “lifts” of Island Crest and The Belchers when enquiries were made to government departments. It was learnt from the previous discussion that Island Crest and The Belchers had no lifts opened for public use and only escalators were available. He had posed supplementary questions later but the information obtained was still

inaccurate. For the sake of fairness, Mr KAM suggested to further postpone the paper until there were officials from government departments including the LandsD attending the meeting to explain. He quoted the written reply from the LandsD stating that the land lease did not require the owner of the Hollywood Terrace lot to provide “escalators” or “pedestrian passages” or “right of way” for public use. The reply from the department could possibly be “playing on words”. Therefore, Member must wait for a clear explanation from the departmental representatives before adopting the motion. So, he suggested that the paper should be postponed until the department concerned would attend the meeting to answer questions from Members.

186. Mr HO Chi-wang expressed his support for the proposed postponement of the discussion.

187. Ms Bonnie NG agreed with the proposal to postpone the discussion, and pointed out that the department’s response was very brief and she could not figure out what the department was trying to express. Besides, she added that in the last term of the DC, study on the construction of lift or escalators at the staircase next to Hollywood Terrace under the “Universal Accessibility Programme” had been discussed. She would like to know whether implementation of the plan would continue and hoped to continue the discussion after obtaining relevant information.

188. Mr Victor YEUNG believed that there was no choice but postponed the discussion of this paper. He was dissatisfied with the department’s attitude and response. He said that the DWFMC made inquiries to the department, but the department simply responded with one sentence. Therefore, he opined that the department was not sincere at all. He believed that the department should provide more detailed information. There was no excuse why such a casual answer was provided and they had reacted perfunctorily. He reiterated his disappointment with the department’s reply and hoped that the department could attend the next meeting to give a detailed explanation, which could help to solve the problem.

189. The Secretary replied to Members’ questions, saying that the Secretariat, based on the discussion results of the last meeting, had sent a letter to the LandsD to inquire about the comparative terms of the land lease of Hollywood Terrace, Island Crest and The Belchers in order to know whether the title owners were obliged to provide lift services. In return, the LandsD provided a relatively simple answer. The Secretariat later received a written supplementary question from Mr KAM Nai-wai. The Secretariat immediately forwarded the relevant question to the LandsD, and the LandsD’s written response to the supplementary question about lifts, escalators and walkways with handrails was sent to all Members on 17 June for reference. The Secretary added that he had also relayed questions about the “Universal Accessibility Programme” to the HyD, and the department’s reply had also been sent to Members.

190. Mr KAM Nai-wai suggested that departments in charge of the “Universal Accessibility Programme”, like the LandsD and HyD, must send their staff to attend the next meeting and explain clearly to Members. He also proposed to invite the Planning Department to send representatives to attend the meeting to respond to matters related to land use. He requested the LandsD, HyD and Planning Department to send staff to attend the next meeting and prepare papers related to Hollywood Terrace, Island Crest and The Belchers. If the government department concerned still refused to send staff to attend the meeting, he suggested writing to the Director of departments concerned to request them to send staff to attend the meeting.

191. Mr HO Chi-wang suggested that in addition to Hollywood Terrace, Island Crest and The Belchers, the departments concerned should provide a summary table indicating whether there were other properties in the C&W District, including residential buildings or commercial buildings, equipped with elevators or lifts that were open to the public, regardless of whether the elevator or lift facilities were in operation.

192. Ms CHENG Lai-king said that some kaifongs asked her whether Centre Stage had once opened their lifts for public use, facilitating them to go between Hollywood Road and Bridges Street without resorting to the stairs of Shing Wong Street.

193. The Chairlady asked the Secretary to follow up the questions raised by Mr HO Chi-wang and Ms CHENG Lai-king, and invite the government departments mentioned by Mr KAM Nai-wai to send officials to attend the next meeting. The Chairlady stated that this paper and its related motions would be deferred to the next meeting.

**Item 10 – Comments on district facilities management made by the elderly
(C&W DWFMC Written Question No. 1/2020)**

(7:33 pm)

194. The DWFMC noted the above paper.

**Item 11 – Leisure and Cultural Services Department Report on the Usage and Extension
Activities of the Public Libraries in the Central and Western District
(C&W DWFMC Paper No. 27/2020)**

(7:33 pm)

195. The DWFMC noted the above paper.

**Item 12 – Report on the Management of Facilities in the Central and Western District by the
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
(C&W DWFMC Paper No. 35/2020)**

(7:33 pm)

196. The DWFMC noted the above paper.

**Item 13 – Financial report on district minor works projects in the Central and Western
District
(C&W DWFMC Paper No. 36/2020)**

(7:33 pm)

197. The DWFMC noted the above paper.

Item 14 – Any other business

(7:33 pm – 7:54 pm)

198. The Chairlady stated that Ms CHENG Lai-king, Chairlady of the C&WDC would discuss the procurement of masks with Members under “Any other business”. She asked Ms CHENG to chair the discussion on the issue.

199. Ms CHENG Lai-king stated that the DC had approved in an earlier meeting that each District Councillor’s Office would be allocated 10 000 masks. She would like to discuss with Members whether the remaining masks should be handed over to local NGOs for distribution, in order that the Secretariat could carry out the work. She invited Miss Charmaine CHENG, EO (District Council)3, C&WDO to brief on it.

200. Miss Charmaine CHENG, EO (District Council)3, C&WDO stated that after deducting the 10 000 masks allocated to each District Councillor, there were about 62 000 masks left. She would like to consult Members’ views on whether to follow the usual practice and let the NGOs in the district to deal with distribution of the remaining masks.

201. Ms CHENG Lai-king asked whether the Secretariat had checked on the practices of other DCs, whether all masks were distributed by District Councillors or some masks would be allocated through NGOs.

202. Miss Charmaine CHENG, EO (District Council)3, C&WDO stated that the primary understanding of the Secretariat was that different DCs had different practices. Some DCs handed over all the masks to District Councillors for distribution, while some DCs handed over the masks to District Councillors as well as NGOs for distribution.

203. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that he noticed that only “ASTM Level 1” certified was marked on the packaging of the boxed masks distributed by the Secretariat, but the specifications listed in the email sent by the Secretariat were not printed. He asked whether they were the same. He said that because the DC was under public scrutiny, so the DC should handle the distribution of masks carefully and upload the information on the distribution of masks to the DC’s website. Besides, Mr KAM found that NGOs in the district had distributed DC’s cleaning kits through various channels such as churches. He said that District Councillors would clearly inform the public about the channels for distribution of supplies. For this reason, he enquired if the Secretariat had asked the NGOs how they had distributed the cleaning kits and alcohol hand sanitisers provided by the DC. He also believed that NGOs should also be accountable to the DC and the public. He hoped to understand whether the NGOs had properly distributed the epidemic-related supplies provided by the DC first, before deciding whether to arrange for NGOs to assist in the distribution of masks and the number of masks to be allocated. Mr KAM said that Members should also exercise self-discipline and check whether the distribution channels were the same as those published on the DC website.

204. Regarding the remarks made by Mr KAM Nai-wai related to NGOs distributing DC’s cleaning kits, Ms Bonnie NG stated that she had received photos showing that an NGO had transported 25 cartons of cleaning kits to other places for distribution. She hoped to know how many NGOs had been entrusted by the DC to assist in the distribution of cleaning kits before, as well as the performance of those NGOs in the distribution of materials. Their performance would affect her decision on whether to allocate masks for distribution by NGOs or not.

205. Mr Sam YIP pointed out that some residents in his constituency told him that an NGO had knocked on their doors to distribute cleaning kits with the DC logo, and asked why the kits were not distributed by District Councillors through the Owners' Corporation of the building. He said that he had no idea about the number of cleaning kits allocated to various NGOs and the criteria for such allocation. He also knew that some NGOs already had too many supplies, so they handed over the cleaning kits of the DC to the Owners' Corporations of individual buildings for distribution. He believed that the current method of distributing epidemic-prevention resources by the DC was not clear and Members should grasp more information.

206. The Chairlady asked the representative of the DO to respond to Members' questions.

207. Miss Charmaine CHENG, EO (District Council)³, C&WDO responded to Mr KAM Nai-wai's enquiry about mask specifications, stating that the specifications listed in the Secretariat's email were based on the test report provided by the supplier, and the supplier had already uploaded the report to its website. Members could refer to the relevant information on the supplier's website. According to her understanding, the specifications of "ASTM Level 1" marked on the packaging of the boxed masks were equivalent to BFE and PFE 95%. Regarding the distributing of masks, the Secretariat had received replies from Members on the target recipients and distribution method earlier, and had uploaded the relevant information to the DC website. Miss CHENG responded to Members' opinions on the distribution of cleaning kits by the DC earlier, saying that the Secretariat would, after the meeting, ask NGOs to notify the Secretariat once they finished distributing the materials so that the Secretariat could understand the distribution situation. Moreover, the Secretariat would also follow up the case of individual NGOs mentioned by Members.

208. Mr KAM Nai-wai suggested that the Secretariat send a letter to various NGOs to inquire about their intent to receive masks and the method of distributing masks; so as to find out whether they were using a simple and clear method to distribute masks. It would be a fair practice if the relevant information was also uploaded to the DC's website to facilitate the public to monitor the use of public funds. If a particular NGO declined to receive the masks, he suggested that ways to deal with the remaining masks could be further discussed by the DC.

209. Mr Victor YEUNG said that it was not obligatory to entrust NGOs to help distributing the masks. As a Councillor, he was very willing to help distributing the remaining masks. He also reflected that some kaifongs pointed out that the number of masks distributed by District Councillors was too few.

210. Mr KAM Nai-wai added that due to the huge demand for masks from the public, if all the masks were left to be distributed by District Councillors, the masks could also be gone quickly. Since NGOs had their own channels to get in touch with the public, which were different from those of District Councillors, so they could reach out to different residents in the district. He proposed keeping a certain number of masks for distribution to NGOs to help expand the extent of contact and avoid criticism that only District Councillors got masks to distribute. If, after consulting NGOs, some individual organisations indicated that they were unwilling to assist in the distribution, the DC could then decide how to deal with the remaining masks.

211. Ms CHENG Lai-king stated that according to her understanding, the Social Welfare Department (SWD) should have provided enough masks to private residential care homes for the elderly. She suggested that the DC's masks should only be distributed to NGOs and elderly centres, and hoped that the Secretariat would check with the SWD.

212. The Chairlady inquired whether the representative of the DO could implement the suggestions of Mr KAM Nai-wai and Ms CHENG Lai-king.

213. Miss Charmaine CHENG, EO (District Council)³, C&WDO replied to Ms CHENG Lai-king's question, stating that the Secretariat had asked the SWD earlier and learned that the department had provided resources to private residential care homes for the elderly. She noticed that Members had different opinions on whether to distribute the remaining masks to NGOs. The Secretariat would wait for the outcome of their discussion before following up.

214. The Chairlady inquired whether Members had any conclusions on the allocation of masks.

215. Miss Charmaine CHENG, EO (District Council)³, C&WDO added that if Members decided to allocate the remaining masks to various NGOs, the Secretariat would refer to the earlier practice of distribution of cleaning kits and hand sanitisers. Based on a preliminary calculation, each large NGO would be allocated 140 boxes of masks, while small NGO would each receive 40 boxes of masks. If the above distribution method was approved, the Secretariat would write to various NGOs to inquire whether they would assist in distributing these masks, and then arrange collection of the masks.

216. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that if Members decided to distribute masks to NGOs, he suggested that NGOs, like District Councillors, must provide information on how to distribute the masks and upload it to the DC's website so that the public could obtain the information for the purpose of monitoring the use of public funds.

217. The Chairlady proceeded to vote on whether the remaining masks should be distributed by NGOs or by District Councillors. After voting, the Chairlady announced that there were five votes for the option of distributing the remaining masks by District Councillors, and six votes for the option of distributing the remaining masks by NGOs. Therefore, the Chairlady announced that the option of distributing the remaining masks by NGOs was adopted. The Chairlady asked the Secretariat to write to various NGOs to arrange distribution.

218. Mr KAM Nai-wai suggested that if any NGOs indicated that they were not getting the masks, the remaining masks could be evenly allocated to the 15 District Councillors for distribution to residents.

219. The Chairlady stated that since no Members raised any objection to the proposal, she requested the Secretariat to proceed accordingly.

Item 15 – Date of the next meeting

(7:54 pm)

220. The Chairlady announced that the items on the agenda of the meeting had all been discussed, the date of the next meeting would be 10 September 2020. Paper submission deadline for government departments would be 20 August 2020 and paper submission deadline for Members would be 26 August 2020.

221. The meeting was adjourned at 7:54 pm.

The minutes were confirmed on 10 September 2020

Chairlady: Miss CHEUNG Kai-yin

Secretary: Mr HO Kai-yin

Central and Western District Council Secretariat
September 2020