

(Translation)

Islands District Council
Minutes of Meeting of District Facilities Management Committee

Date : 9 November 2020 (Monday)
Time : 10:30 a.m.
Venue : Islands District Council Conference Room,
14/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong

Present

Mr WONG Hon-kuen, Ken (Chairman)
Mr YU Hon-kwan, Randy, MH, JP
Mr WONG Man-hon
Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, SBS, MH
Mr YUNG Chi-ming, BBS, MH
Mr CHAN Lin-wai, MH
Mr HO Chun-fai (Arrived at around 10:40 a.m.)
Mr HO Siu-kei
Ms WONG Chau-ping
Ms TSANG Sau-ho, Josephine
Mr KWOK Ping, Eric
Mr TSUI Sang-hung, Sammy
Mr FONG Lung-fei
Ms LAU Shun-ting
Mr LEE Ka-ho

Attendance by Invitation

Ms LEUNG So-ping, Selina	Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 21, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr TSANG Wai-man	Administrative Assistant/Lands (District Lands Office, Islands), Lands Department
Ms HUI Shuk-yee	Engineer/Islands 2, Transport Department
Mr YAU San-ping, Peter	Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Islands District Office
Mr LEE Lap-chi, Alfred	District Secretary, Islands District Office
Ms HUI Ka-wai, Minerva	Architect (Works) 5, Home Affairs Department

In Attendance

Ms LEUNG Tin-yee, Christy

Ms LIM Ting-ting, Sylvia

Mr KWAN Chung-wai, David

Ms CHU Po-yee, Polly

Assistant District Officer (Islands)2, Islands District Office
Chief Leisure Manager (New Territories West),
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
District Leisure Manager (Islands),
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Senior Librarian (Islands),
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Secretary

Ms NG Ching-sum

Executive Officer (District Council)2, Islands District Office

Absent with Apology

Ms YUNG Wing-sheung, Amy

Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho

Absent

Mr WONG Chun-yeung

~~~~~

**Welcoming Remarks**

The Chairman welcomed representatives of government departments and Members to the meeting.

I. **Confirmation of minutes of the meeting held on 14.9.2020**

2. The Chairman said that the captioned minutes had incorporated the amendments proposed by the government departments and Members, and had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

3. The captioned minutes were confirmed by Members unanimously.

4. The Chairman said that since the Members related to item II and guests related to item III had not yet arrived, item IV would be discussed first.

IV. **Question on proposal of provision of dog garden or toilet at Chung Yan Road**  
(Paper DFMC 55/2020)

5. The Chairman welcomed Mr KWAN Chung-wai, David, District Leisure Manager (Islands) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to the meeting to respond to the question. Written replies from the Housing Department (HD) and the LCSD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

6. Mr FONG Lung-fei briefly presented the question.
7. Mr Eric KWOK opined that the setting up of a dog garden required long-term planning. He said that in past years, certain households in Yat Tung Estate and Mun Tung Estate were permitted by the HD to keep dogs based on their special circumstances. However, currently there were only two dog excreta collection bins on the footpath along Yu Tung Road, and the design and hygiene of such bins were unsatisfactory as the lid of the collection bin had to be opened by hand to dispose of the dog faeces. He suggested that funnel-shaped dog excreta collection bins should be used to reduce the chance of faeces falling out, and cleaning should be carried out more frequently. He also suggested setting up clear signs indicating that there are dog excreta collection bins nearby. He pointed out that there were only two collection bins on Yu Tung Road, which could not meet the demand, and therefore more collection bins were needed.
8. Mr David KWAN replied that the dog excreta collection bins provided by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) were not under the purview of the LCSD. He guessed that the funnel-shaped design proposed by Members was similar to trash cans currently placed on street for collecting cigarette butts. He said such design could prevent ash from floating out. He would convey Members' suggestion to the FEHD.
9. Mr Sammy TSUI proposed the use of a foot-operated dog excreta collection bin and add additional cover to prevent the odour after opening the collection bin.
10. Ms Josephine TSANG pointed out that the dog excreta collection bins were usually hung on the railings. Many people thought that the collection bins were dirty and therefore reluctant to open the lid by hand, so they just discarded the dog faeces aside, which affected the hygiene. Also, some people would let their dogs defecate on the grass without any cleaning afterwards, thinking that the excreta could work as fertilisers. She considered that it was necessary to improve the design of the dog excreta collection bins and explore other ways for improvement. She asked the Secretariat to convey her views to the FEHD.
11. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that two more housing estates would be built in Tung Chung in the future. It could be envisaged that more dog owners would walk their dogs nearby, leading to an increase in the demand for dog excreta collection bins. He asked what were the criteria for the establishment of pet parks by the LCSD or the government, such as whether there was a need for pet parks based on the population and number of dogs in the district, and whether the LCSD would consider building a pet park in Tung Chung West to tie in with the future development of the district in the future.
12. Mr David KWAN replied that the department currently had no standard criteria for construction of pet parks but subject to the availability of suitable sites. The LCSD would also launch the trial scheme of "Inclusive Park for Pets" in existing or new parks, in which the department would consider designating a suitable area or the

entire park area for pet with leashes. In Tung Chung West, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had included a pet park in its planning project of Area 29A.

13. Mr Sammy TSUI opined that the LCSD and the FEHD needed to review the planning of dog toilets or dog gardens. Although there was a dog garden in Tung Chung North, as far as he knew, residents of the Caribbean Coast, the Century Link and the Visionary would rather take their dogs for walks and runs in the neighbourhood than in the pet park. He thought that in order to tackle the problem of public places fouled by dog excreta, it was necessary to improve the design of dog toilets to allow dogs to have a wider space for movement; to provide sand pools for dogs to defecate; and to increase the frequency of cleaning. He pointed out that there were more and more people keeping dogs nowadays. If a dog garden was far away from residential buildings, no one would make use of it, and as a result, the problem of public places fouled by dog excreta would continue. He opined that the existing facilities should be re-examined and re-planning works should be conducted to avoid unused facilities after they were built.

14. Mr David KWAN said that dog toilets or the problem of dogs defecating in public place were under the purview of the FEHD. He said that dog owners would usually clean the ground with bottled water after their dogs defecated and wrap the faeces in paper towels and put into the dog excreta collection bins, or may dispose of the faeces in rubbish bins, because they cannot find the excreta collection bin, which makes it smelly. The department would convey Members' suggestions on increasing the number of dog excreta collection bins, putting up additional signs and improving the design of the excreta collection bin to the FEHD.

15. The Chairman urged the LCSD and the FEHD to follow up the issue, and suggested that Members from Tung Chung district should discuss with the LCSD on the increase of pet garden facilities in the district, with a view to solving the problem as soon as possible.

(Post-meeting note: The LCSD had conveyed Members' suggestions to the FEHD after the meeting.)

(Mr HO Chun-fai joined the meeting at around 10:40 a.m.)

## II. Question on request for provision of sitting-out area at Pui O Playground (Paper DFMC 53/2020)

16. The Chairman welcomed Ms LEUNG So-ping, Selina, Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 21 of the LCSD to the meeting to respond to the question. The consolidated written reply from the LCSD, the Planning Department (PlanD) and the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

17. Mr HO Chun-fai briefly presented the question.

18. Ms Selina LEUNG said that after receiving the proposal from Mr HO Chun-fai, the LCSD had consulted the departments concerned. The PlanD replied that the proposed site was located in the Coastal Protection Area under the “Approved South Lantau Coast Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SLC/21”. Without the permission of the Town Planning Board (TPB), the provision of sitting-out area and any related filling or excavation works were not allowed in such area. When building new recreational and sport facilities, the department would provide appropriate ancillary facilities in view of the site area, geographical environment and the needs of local residents. Generally speaking, the department would provide auxiliary facilities such as changing rooms, toilets and drinking fountains in newly built soccer pitches depending on the environment at the site. The site proposed by Mr HO Chun-fai was located in the Pui O Wetland. According to the replies from the PlanD and the AFCD, the location was currently covered by plants. The works involved removal of plants and land formation, which might affect the ecology. Therefore, the PlanD did not support the proposal, and the AFCD also had reservation. The department suggested Mr HO Chun-fai to re-examine the proposal.

19. Mr HO Chun-fai asked, as the entire area to the north of South Lantau Road was zoned as Coastal Protection Area, why the construction of the nearby sewage treatment plant could be commenced. He pointed out that the existing changing room of the beach was located in the Coastal Protection Area, and the facility had been overloaded, so he hoped that the Government would renovate and expand the changing rooms in view of the need of the district. If another sitting-out area was provided in Pui O Playground, it was believed that the demand pressure on the beach changing rooms would be alleviated. Moreover, the lack of sitting-out areas and toilets in the playground was undesirable. He urged the department to reconsider the proposal.

(Post-meeting note: The renovation of the toilet and changing room facilities at Pui O Beach was commenced on 2 November 2020 and expected to be completed by the end of March 2021.)

20. Mr Eric KWOK said that the lack of toilets and changing rooms in the Pui O Playground was a misplanning, and the temporary toilets had been removed. He added that the CEDD was responsible for the planning of the sewage strategy mentioned by Mr HO Chun-fai and the strategy aimed to build a large cistern next to the playground to collect sewage. He suggested taking advantage of the cistern, a toilet and a changing room could be built atop. Since the works would not violate the ordinances relevant to Green Belts and Coastal Protection Areas, he hoped that the LCSD would solve the problem of insufficient facilities with flexibility.

(Post-meeting note: There were two temporary toilets in the Pui O Playground, including one squatting type toilet and one pedestal type toilet. In view of the latest development of the COVID-19 epidemic, the LCSD had closed the squatting type toilet to reduce the spread of the virus in accordance with the recommendation of the Centre for Health Protection. Currently, only the pedestal type toilet was open to users of Pui O Playground. Given the latest

situation of the epidemic, the LCSD had closed all non-fee charging venues for team sports including the hard-surface soccer pitch and basketball courts at the Pui O Playground from December 2 until further notice.)

21. Ms Josephine TSANG agreed with Mr Eric KWOK's proposal, pointing out that changing rooms and toilets were the basic facilities for a ball court, and the said facilities should be added during the construction of the sewage treatment plant.

22. Mr Randy YU said that the works involved a piece of land commonly known as "Ma Lou Ha", which had been zoned into the Coastal Protection Area 20 to 30 years ago. This was why the PlanD and the AFCD had reservations about the proposal. He opined that the zoning had been hampering the development of the district, yet District Council Members had no choice but to abide by the relevant regulations. However, he thought it was unreasonable that if the Government did not accept the proposal this time, members would have to look for a new site for the relevant purposes. As mentioned by Mr HO Chun-fai just now, there were always campers queuing for the beach toilets, which indicated the urgent need for an additional sitting-out area. He agreed that South Lantau should be conserved and should not be developed excessively. However, since the playground was built, ancillary facilities therein should be improved as much as possible. He said that at present, the Pui O Playground had not yet met its planned usage, and due to the problem of insufficient facilities in Pui O Playground, Mui Wo was usually chosen for inter-district soccer competitions. He hoped that the LCSD would take the lead to discuss solutions with the PlanD and the AFCD. He also asked whether it was feasible to build the toilets during the construction of the sewage treatment plant as suggested by Members. If feasible, the departments should provide the timetable, so that Members could give an account to the residents. If the LCSD was unable to get in touch with the PlanD and the AFCD, the Chairman and the Secretariat might be asked to make an appointment with the relevant departments and arrange for the HAD Works Section and the PlanD representatives to discuss solutions with Members. The department could also look for another site in South Lantau for the re-provision of the Pui O Playground with toilets and other facilities for residents' use.

23. Ms WONG Chau-ping expressed her views as follows:

- (a) Mr HO Chun-fai had written to the LCSD and other departments concerned in April and June last year, and had also raised the issue at the meeting of September 18. The LCSD promised to follow the issue up in its response on June 10. She asked, in addition to the above, whether the department had any follow-up actions with Mr HO Chun-fai. She queried that if Mr HO Chun-fai did not raise the question at this meeting, the department might not intend to respond again, or might explain that the proposal was not accepted because the proposed location was within the Coastal Protection Area. She suggested that the department should review its practice.

- (b) At present, there were no major recreational facilities in South Lantau. Therefore, she supported to add changing rooms and toilets to the ball court and criticised the rationale of the Government in rejecting the proposal. She said that young people from the rural areas of Lantau Island would go to South Lantau for soccer activities, so it was necessary to improve the facilities of ball court.
- (c) Although many sites in the rural areas had been approved for development, not many leisure facilities were provided. She suggested that the department should review and improve the facilities in the rural areas.

24. The Chairman expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He was disappointed at the LCSD's responses. Ball courts in other areas were all equipped with basic facilities, except the one in Pui O. The department only suggested looking for another site in response to Member's question, being regarded as no intention to follow up. The LCSD, as being the department managing the district recreational and sport facilities, if it considered that the existing location was not appropriate for a ball court, it should find a suitable site to build a ball court rather than using conservation as an excuse. He did not understand why a sewage treatment plant could be built next to the ball court while the addition of toilets was not allowed. He criticised the Government for applying double standards. If the Government proposed to build other facilities near the ball court in the future, Members representing the rural constituencies should make careful consideration in supporting the proposals.
- (b) He pointed out that the planning of South Lantau was under the purview of the PlanD and the AFCD, but these two departments only provided simple written replies to the works proposal put forward by Members. He urged the Secretariat to follow up by writing to the departments. The LCSD was responsible for promoting sports activities, but it only provided a ball court without adequate ancillary facilities, which was unreasonable. He hoped that the LCSD would conduct a comprehensive review of whether similar problems existed in other ball courts in the rural areas.

25. Mr Randy YU said that the residents respected the principle of "Development in the North, Conservation for the South" for Lantau Island, and cherished the natural resources of Lantau Island. Public toilets in Ngong Ping had adopted an environmental protection system, in which sewage was discharged after primary treatment, leaving no impact on the environment. Therefore, whether or not the proposal should be adopted depended on whether the Government was determined to tackle the problem. He pointed out that the relevant works project might incur a lot of expenditure. However, as long as it would not pollute the environment and could

benefit the residents, the departments concerned should consider implementing the project.

26. Mr HO Chun-fai said that about 30 shower heads were provided in the changing rooms and toilets at the beach. On Sundays, as many as 6 000 people would queue for taking shower in the three hours from 3:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. These facilities were excessively overloaded, and the waste water often overflow and discharged into the sea. He queried the department's concealment of the problem from the public, and he opined that it was necessary to develop changing rooms and toilets at the Pui O Playground to alleviate the pressure on the beach facilities. He urged the department to reconsider the proposal to meet the needs.

27. Mr WONG Man-hon queried whether the department would respond again if Mr HO Chun-fai had not raised the question. He said that the Islands District Council had maintained a good relationship with the department for many years, but he did not understand why the department always delayed in its response this year. For example, he applied to the LCSD last week for booking a venue to distribute specimen bottles to members of the public for virus testing, but the application was rejected. He opined that the question raised by Mr HO Chun-fai concerned facilities of ball court, the LCSD should not shirk its responsibilities to the PlanD and the AFCD.

(Post-meeting note: According to the records of the LCSD, the Islands District Leisure Services Office had not received any booking application for the distribution of virus test specimen bottles.)

28. Mr HO Siu-kei was also disappointed at the LCSD's response. Residents of Lantau Island often held mini soccer matches at the Pui O Playground. The department rejected the works proposal on the pretext of wetland conservation, failing to consider the needs of the playground users. He agreed that South Lantau should not be developed excessively, but he hoped that the department would understand the public's urgent demand for the sitting-out area.

29. Ms Josephine TSANG was dissatisfied with the fact that the LCSD, the PlanD and the AFCD had only provided a consolidated reply in respect of the proposal so far and shirked their responsibilities with excuses. The departments did not send any representatives to the meeting to respond to the question either. She criticised that under the existing planning, citizens needed to walk for more than ten minutes to the toilet after sports activities, which was unreasonable. The departments only provided a ball court without thinking about the supporting facilities required, such planning defects had left the facility in low utilisation rate. While the Government could construct a sewage treatment plant without any consultation conducted in the district, Members' proposal for building basic facilities was not approved. She thought it was unfair.

30. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) The LCSD might create community conflicts with its rejection to Mr HO Chun-fai's proposal on grounds that Green Belts and Coastal Protection



Areas were not suitable for development. He agreed with Mr Randy YU's suggestion that the Secretariat should invite representatives of the LCSD, the FEHD, the PlanD, the Lands Department (LandsD) and the Islands District Office (IsDO) to conduct an on-site inspection together with all Members of the District Facilities Management Committee and explain why a hotel could be built next to the ball court while no additional sitting-out area could be built.

- (b) As a resident of the district, he believed that his interests were harmed. Some ball court users complained to him that it was very inconvenient to have no toilets at the ball court, and sometimes people would resort to the grassland when in urgent needs.
- (c) Facilities at the Pui O Campsite were overloaded. During golden weeks or holidays, there were frequent queues for the toilets. Also there were complaints from cleaners about the poor toilet hygiene. At the last meeting, he had proposed to connect the Pui O Campsite with the sewage treatment plant under construction, and he also urged the relevant departments to study whether it was feasible.

31. The Chairman pointed out that the LCSD, as the department in charge of managing the relevant facilities, had the responsibility to provide basic ancillary facilities. It should not shirk its responsibilities on grounds that the PlanD or other departments do not support the proposal. As the department had long been aware of the inadequacy of ball court facilities, toilets could have been built on the site adjacent to the ball court before the construction of sewage treatment plant, but the opportunity for solving the problem was missed. He asked the Secretariat to write to the PlanD, the LCSD and the AFCD after the meeting, requesting the departments to send staff to conduct onsite inspection, with a view to solving the problem of insufficient facilities at the ball court, the campsite and the beach altogether. He criticised the LCSD for not considering the necessary ancillary facilities when building such facilities, but looking to Members for solutions when problems arose. However, when members proposed improvements proposals, they started to obstruct, which led to delays in problem solving and even caused pollutions to the Coastal Protection Area.

### III. Question on proposal of converting On Tung Street Soccer Pitch into mini-sports ground (Paper DFMC 54/2020)

32. The Chairman welcomed Mr David KWAN, District Leisure Manager (Islands) of the LCSD and Mr TSANG Wai-man, Administrative Assistant/Lands (District Lands Office, Islands (DLO/Is)) of the LandsD to the meeting to respond to the question. Written replies from the LCSD, the PlanD and the DLO/Is had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

33. Mr FONG Lung-fei briefly presented the question.

34. Mr David KWAN expounded on the written reply from the LCSD.
35. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that the situation of the On Tung Street Soccer Pitch was similar to that of the Pui O Playground as mentioned by Mr HO Chun-fai. He pointed out that there was a lack of basic facilities at the On Tung Street Soccer Pitch, and soccer pitch users had to go to the nearby fire station or accident and emergency department for using the toilets, which was extremely inconvenient. He had visited the site last Friday and found that there was an area of five to six meters wide surrounded by trees next to the soccer pitch. He then enquired of the PlanD whether it planned to reconstruct the soccer pitch, but the department replied that it had no development plan for the site and stated that open space was a frequently permitted use. Therefore, he suggested that the soccer pitch should be converted into a mini-sports ground with ancillary facilities such as toilets. He opined that even if a slope maintenance was required, it should be feasible with the current construction techniques. He hoped that the department would consider the proposal.
36. Mr LEE Ka-ho expressed disappointment at the LCSD's written reply and criticised the LCSD for failing to plan the supporting facilities for the convenience of the public during the construction of the recreation facilities. It was unacceptable that no ancillary facilities were provided at the soccer pitch. As the LCSD stated in its written reply that Members could submit proposals for district minor works, he had submitted a proposal for the construction of toilets and changing rooms at the On Tung Street Soccer Pitch. However, LCSD rejected his proposal on grounds of the inclined terrain, saying that setting up temporary toilets at that site would cause dangers. He said that in the long run, the site might have other developments or uses, thus the situation would go into a vicious cycle. He said the LCSD also suggested Mr FONG Lung-fei should submit proposals for district minor works this time, but he was afraid that the department would in the end respond that the proposals were found to be unfeasible after studies. He questioned whether the department had the determination to solve the problem. He urged the department to review the management of recreation areas seriously, such as considering building toilets and changing facilities at the On Tung Street Soccer Pitch or converting it into better sitting-out area as suggested by Mr FONG Lung-fei.
37. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:
- (a) Yat Tung Estate started intake of tenants in 2001. In view of the absence of soccer pitch in the neighbourhood, the LCSD built a standard 7-a-side hard-surface soccer pitch in 2003, with a lighting system added subsequently. Later, the pitch was temporarily closed as it was used to store temporary construction machinery for the construction of the North Lantau Hospital. And it had been deserted since the North Lantau Hospital's commencement of operation in 2012. As soon as he was elected as a District Council Member in 2016, he proposed to revitalise the disused On Tung Street Soccer Pitch. This soccer pitch used to be managed by the LCSD in the past. Now, Mr FONG Lung-fei was only asking the department to discharge its original duties. The PlanD's written reply stated that the site of the pitch had been zoned for

“Government, Institution or Community” uses. He asked whether the LCSD could file a formal application to the PlanD for designating the On Tung Street Soccer Pitch as a standard 7-a-side hard-surface soccer pitch to be managed by the LCSD before proceeding to the proposals of the addition of toilets and fitness facilities put forward by the Mr FONG Lung-fei and Mr LEE Ka-ho.

- (b) He agreed with the department’s statement that there was not enough space for an additional basketball court, but he asked whether it was possible to add fitness equipment and facilities next to the soccer pitch for residents to use. In this way, hospital patients could also do some simple exercises and physiotherapy there. He said that the new public housing estate next to Yat Tung Estate and the Yu Tai Court near the North Lantau Hospital had started intake, but the community was in serious shortage of soccer pitch facilities. To make things worse, the temporary soccer pitch next to Mun Tung Estate would be converted into a games hall complex, a library and a community hall. By then the Hau Wong Temple Football Pitch and the On Tung Street Soccer Pitch would be the soccer pitches left in the entire Tung Chung West district. Therefore, he opined that there was an urgent need to convert the On Tung Street Soccer Pitch into a standard soccer pitch.

38. Mr Randy YU said that the District Council Members representing Tung Chung had clearly explained the function of On Tung Street Soccer Pitch and the required facilities. He thought that the LCSD should take a more proactive attitude towards proposals in relation to this temporary soccer pitch, rather than just encouraging Members to submit proposals for district minor works. He understood that Tung Chung was currently under development. If the department said that there would be a standard soccer pitch with supporting facilities in Tung Chung West or within 500 yards from the district in about five years, he believed that Members would be happy to accept it. However, it was unreasonable to take 10 years for sufficient facilities to be set up at the On Tung Street Soccer Pitch. As Members said just now, even if a basketball court could not be added, other facilities should still be provided. He suggested that the department should go one step further to examine and review the relevant facilities, and then make a briefing to the committee or report to the Chairman and Members through the Secretariat. He suggested that District Council Members of the Tung Chung constituency and Members concerned about this issue should set up a group for informal discussions, so that there would be no need to discuss this issue at committee meetings in the future.

39. Mr David KWAN responded that the On Tung Street Soccer Pitch was not constructed or managed by the LCSD. If the site had no other long-term development, the department could discuss and conduct studies together with the DLO/Is in this regard. Mr FONG Lung-fei and Mr Eric KWOK had just proposed to conduct re-planning of the space next to the soccer pitch and set up facilities such as toilets. He understood that their needs, and the department was willing to explore the feasibility of providing permanent recreational and sport facilities and would ask the DLO/Is whether long-term land use could be granted for building the relevant facilities.

(Post-meeting note: The LCSD was currently working with the PlanD and the LandsD to study the feasibility of application for permanent government land allocation.)

40. Mr TSANG Wai-man responded that upon receipt of the information provided by the relevant departments such as the scope and term of the land use, the DLO/Is would actively study and follow up on the issue.

41. Mr Eric KWOK said that based on the available information, there would be many public housing estates built in Tung Chung West, but the district was in acute shortage of sport facilities, especially standard soccer pitches. He pointed out that if the temporary soccer pitch on On Tung Street was converted into other uses by other departments in the future, the LCSD should look for another place to build a standard sports ground or soccer pitch. He said that the population of Tung Chung West would increase from the current 60 000 to 100 000 by 2025, and the Hau Wong Temple Football Pitch would not be able to meet the needs of the residents. He understood that the temporary soccer pitch on On Tung Street was not under the purview of the LCSD at present, but it used to be managed by the LCSD when it was opened in 2003, so it should be returned to the LCSD for management. Moreover, as the previous revitalisation works were carried out with funds from the District Minor Works Programme, the department had already saved a lot of expenses, so it was time for the department to take over the soccer pitch and make necessary improvements. The PlanD's written reply had stated that the soccer pitch was situated at a "Government, Institution or Community" zone and had no other uses, and the proposed recreational and sport facilities should be considered by another department. He said that the "another department" referred to the LCSD. He suggested to the Chairman that a "Soccer Pitch Facilities Working Group" should be set up for further discussions in the future.

42. Mr FONG Lung-fei said the PlanD had indicated that there was no designated use for the site and had pointed out that "open space" was always permitted, he hoped the LCSD would take the initiative to follow up the issue. He said that across Tung Chung West, there was only one soccer pitch, which was located within Mun Tung Estate. Whenever there were soccer activities at the soccer pitch, there would be complaints about noise nuisance by the residents. He added that there were basketball courts on the rooftops of the three car parks in Yat Tung Estate, and complaints would be received whenever the young people played basketball or chatted in the basketball courts at night. In addition, he asked whether the On Tung Street Soccer Pitch was currently under the purview of the IsDO. He pointed out that there were several collapsed trees on the soccer pitch that were not dealt with for a period of time, and asked which department was responsible for it.

43. Ms Josephine TSANG said that no mini-sports ground was included in the development of Tung Chung West for the next five years. She agreed with Mr Eric KWOK's proposal that the existing On Tung Street Soccer Pitch should be put to good use by converting it into a mini-sports ground with toilets and changing rooms. She said that since the relevant departments had indicated that the site would not be used

for other purposes and development in a few years, and it should be used wisely. She pointed out that she had worked for Tung Chung for 14 years, and there had been only one sub-standard Hau Wong Temple Football Pitch which was not equipped with toilets and other facilities. She reiterated that the LCSD should discuss the soccer pitch issue with Members.

44. Mr HO Siu-kei said that there were many young people playing soccer at the Hau Wong Temple Football Pitch in Tung Chung West every night. He opined that after the intake of the newly built public housing estates in the future, the football pitch could not meet the users' needs. He criticised the LCSD, the department responsible for providing recreational and sport facilities, for failing to provide sufficient facilities for local residents to engage in recreational activities and sports, which indeed amounted to a dereliction of duty.

45. The Chairman said that after the completion of the hospital, the site should have been returned to the purview of the LCSD, which was the "original responsible department". He suggested that the LCSD should take the lead to hold a meeting for dealing with the improvement proposals of the Hau Wong Temple Football Pitch and the On Tung Street Soccer Pitch altogether, so as to make an overall planning of the soccer pitches in Tung Chung and for the LCSD to arrange for the redesign of the On Tung Street Soccer Pitch. In addition, he invited the Assistant District Officer to respond to the question about fallen trees.

46. Ms Christy LEUNG responded that the soccer pitch and the surrounding areas were handled by various departments according to their respective spectrum of duties, and she would study how to remove the fallen trees with the relevant departments later.

47. Mr TSANG Wai-man said that he would discuss the issue with the IsDO later.

48. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that next to the chain link fence of the soccer pitch, there was a long-standing bunch of dead branches, which was in the red area of the soccer pitch. He asked which department was responsible for it.

49. Ms Christy LEUNG responded that, be it was within the boundary of the soccer pitch or in the yellow brick areas, it should be handled by the departments concerned according to their respective spectrum of duties. She did not know the actual location of the dead branches, but would look into it and deal with it after the meeting.

50. Mr Eric KWOK suggested that the dead branches should be sawn into halves, with half to be handled by the DLO/Is and the other half by the IsDO, so as to solve the problem.

51. The Chairman said that since the IsDO was responsible for the maintenance of the temporary soccer pitch on On Tung Street, this problem might be the responsibility of the DLO/Is. He suggested that the problem should be re-examined after the meeting. He also added that clearing fallen trees was time-consuming and would take at least six to nine months.

52. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that there were also several fallen trees outside the chain link fence of the soccer pitch, and it was necessary to explore how these trees should be dealt with.

53. The Chairman urged the Land Control Section of the DLO/Is to follow up on the matter.

54. Mr TSANG Wai-man said that he would discuss the relevant arrangements with the IsDO and would report the latest developments to Members.

(Post-meeting note: The fallen trees and dead branches inside the On Tung Street Soccer Pitch and the chain link fence had been removed.)

V. Question on proposal of converting vacant government land into temporary motorcycle parking spaces  
(Paper DFMC 56/2020)

55. The Chairman welcomed Mr TSANG Wai-man, Administrative Assistant/Lands (DLO/Is) of the LandsD and Ms HUI Shuk-yee, Engineer/Islands 2 of the Transport Department (TD) to the meeting to respond to the question. Written replies from the PlanD, the DLO/Is, Islands and the CEDD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

56. Mr FONG Lung-fei briefly presented the question.

57. Ms HUI Shuk-yee said that the location shown in the figure attached was within the work area of the Tung Chung New Town Extension. According to the CEDD, the site would be used for the construction of an open-air car park, which was expected to start in mid-2021 and be completed in 2025. She said that the TD had been monitoring the supply and demand of motorcycle parking spaces in the district and appropriate measures would be taken if necessary.

58. Mr FONG Lung-fei said it took only two to three years to construct a building. He asked why the CEDD mentioned in its reply that the car park construction would take four years. Given that the works would not commence until 2021, he asked the DLO/Is if the land could be temporarily used for parking before the construction commenced. He opined that without affecting the residents, if the DLO/Is agreed to open the site for half to one year for the TD to set up a temporary parking space, the problem of illegal parking of motorcycles would be alleviated. Therefore, a win-win situation would be achieved. He hoped the relevant departments would consider this suggestion.

59. Mr TSANG Wai-man noted the concerns of Members and said that the proposal would be considered subject to the time when the relevant department returned the land.

VI. Report on the Services of the Public Libraries in Islands District by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department between August and September 2020  
(Paper DFMC 49/2020)

60. The Chairman welcomed Ms CHU Po-yee, Polly, Senior Librarian (Islands) of the LCSD to present the paper.

61. Ms Polly CHU briefly presented the paper.

62. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that the department representatives had mentioned at a meeting of the Community Affairs, Culture and Recreation Committee (CACRC) that the public libraries in the Islands District had held a total of four events between August and September this year and the events were attended by over 5 000 visitors, with one of the them attracting more than 1 000 visits. However, the number of visits as stated in this report was only over 200. He questioned whether such a discrepancy in the figures was a result of misrepresentations.

63. Ms Polly CHU clarified that the figures mentioned in the CACRC meeting were the total numbers of visits to the exhibitions, while the numbers provided in this report were the daily average attendance and numbers of loans of library materials which were different.

VII. Utilisation and improvement works of Community Halls in Islands District  
(Paper DFMC 50/2020)

64. The Chairman welcomed Mr YAU San-ping, Peter, Senior Executive Officer (District Management) and Mr LEE Lap-chi, Alfred, District Secretary of the IsDO to the meeting to present the paper.

65. Mr Peter YAU drew Members' attention to the details about the utilisation and improvement works of the Community Halls in the Islands District as set out in the paper and invited Members to raise questions.

66. Mr Eric KWOK asked whether the renovation of the audio facilities in the Man Tung Road Community Hall was completed.

67. Mr Peter YAU said that as the required funding approval was still pending, the renovation had not started yet.

VIII. Proposed arrangements on the opening hours of Community Halls in Islands District during public holidays in 2021  
(Paper DFMC 51/2020)

68. The Chairman welcomed Mr Peter YAU, Senior Executive Officer (District

Management) and Mr Alfred LEE, District Secretary of the IsDO to the meeting to present the paper.

69. Mr Peter YAU briefly presented the paper.

70. The Chairman invited Members to vote by a show of hands on the paper and the funding of \$97,344 for the implementation of the proposal. The paper and funding were endorsed unanimously by Members.

(Members voted for included: the Chairman Mr Ken WONG, Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Josephine TSANG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting and Mr LEE Ka-ho; Mr HO Chun-fai and Mr Sammy TSUI left the meeting temporarily.)

IX. Arrangement on opening of the conference room of Discovery Bay Community Hall as study room (extension of the pilot scheme)  
(Paper DFMC 52/2020)

71. The Chairman welcomed Mr Peter YAU, Senior Executive Officer (District Management) and Mr Alfred LEE, District Secretary of the IsDO to the meeting to present the paper.

72. Mr Peter YAU briefly presented the paper.

73. Mr LEE Ka-ho pointed out that the scheme was launched on a trial basis in 2016. He queried why the scheme was extended again and again, what the purpose was, and whether it would be turned into a regular scheme.

74. Mr Peter YAU said that the opening of the conference room as a study room was a temporary arrangement. As it was not a basic service of the IsDO, such arrangement would continue to operate in the form of a pilot scheme for the time being. If the Home Affairs Department agreed that study room services should be provided in all districts in the future, the IsDO would turn this arrangement into a regular scheme.

75. The Chairman invited Members to vote by a show of hands on the paper and the funding of \$193,680 for the extension of the pilot scheme. The paper and funding were endorsed unanimously by Members.

(Members voted for included: the Chairman Mr Ken WONG, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Josephine TSANG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting and Mr LEE Ka-ho; Mr Randy YU, Mr HO Chun-fai and Mr Sammy TSUI left the meeting temporarily.)



X. Report on the management of Leisure and Cultural Services Department's recreational and sports facilities in Islands District (Aug to Sep 2020)  
(Paper DFMC 57/2020)

76. The Chairman welcomed Mr David KWAN, District Leisure Manager (Islands) of the LCSD to the meeting to present the paper.

77. Mr David KWAN briefly presented the paper.

78. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that after reading the paper, he felt sorry for the resident of Tung Chung West because they were not treated as well as pets. He had once raised a question about building additional pet parks. As stated in his proposal, there was no need to set up many pet facilities in the pet parks. All that needed to be done was to fence some existing green areas, lay turves thereon, and build sand pools for pets to defecate. Residents would be satisfied even though the parks were not in beautiful designs. He pointed out that the grassland behind the park on Chung Wai Street was currently fenced off. He asked the department whether a dog park and related facilities could be set up in such area so that dogs could defecate there. He said that the contents of the paper were quite detailed, but Tung Chung West had been left out. He hoped the department would follow up.

79. Mr LEE Ka-ho welcomed the plans about pet parks and inclusive parks for pets. He said when he raised the relevant issues earlier, the department replied that no toilets and changing rooms would be built at the Pui O Playground, and suggested the public using the toilets and changing rooms at Pui O Beach instead. But this paper revealed that maintenance works would be carried out for the toilets and changing rooms at Pui O Beach, which was inconsistent with what the department had previously said. He hoped the department would plan the supporting facilities properly to facilitate the users of the ball court.

80. Mr David KWAN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) With regard to Mr FONG Lung-fei's proposal, he would invite Mr FONG Lung-fei to conduct an on-site inspection at the proposed site later to explore if facilities could be provided there for dogs to use.
- (b) The works to be carried out for Pui O Beach were regular improvement works that would be done annually. He pointed out that septic tanks were used there. Although the excrement was cleared regularly, there was still a chance of overflowing. He said that Pui O was within the project scope of the Outlying Islands Sewerage Stage 2, which included connection with the central sewage system. It was hoped that the sewage problem in the area could be solved in the long run.
- (c) Pui O Playground was a temporary facility, and the result was indeed unsatisfactory. The department would invite the Chairman, Members and the relevant departments for an on-site inspection and joint discussions, with a view to improving the toilets and changing rooms

without affecting the marine reserve. The PlanD would also be consulted.

81. Mr Eric KWOK pointed out that as stated in Annex II, greening works would be carried out at locations including the Tung Chung Road Soccer Pitch. However, since the soccer pitch was surrounded by hard grounds, he queried how greening works could be carried out there.

82. Mr Randy YU agreed with Mr LEE Ka-ho's views. He was pleased to know that the toilets at Pui O Beach would be refurbished, but he also hoped that the department would take the initiative to solve the problem of facility shortage in Pui O. He asked which court was refer to the "Tai O Road Playground No. 3" in Annex II, and he reminded the department to, when conducting greening works at the Tai O Road Playground No. 3, Hang Mei Sitting-out Area and Ngong Ping Piazza, carefully select some plants that would not be eaten by cattle, otherwise the plants would be eaten up by the cattle soon after planted.

83. Mr David KWAN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The department would plant a total of 7 500 plants at different locations evenly but only a few shrubs would be planted in the Tung Chung Road Soccer Pitch. He could provide the detailed information to Mr Eric KWOK after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The LCSD had provided the relevant information to Members through e-mails.)

- (b) He would provide information in relation to the Tai O Road Playground No. 3 to Mr Randy YU after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The LCSD had provided the relevant information to Members through e-mails.)

- (c) When carrying out greening works in the Lantau Island, Tung Chung and Mui Wo, the department would select plants that the cattle did not like to eat. The department would also set up fences around the flowers and tree trunks to prevent cattle from damaging the plants.

XI. Fourth Batch of District Minor Works Projects proposed by Leisure and Cultural Services Department for 2020/21  
(Paper DFMC 58/2020)

84. The Chairman welcomed Mr David KWAN, District Leisure Manager (Islands) of the LCSD to the meeting.

85. Mr David KWAN briefly presented the paper.

86. Mr Randy YU invited Members to express their views on the department's plan to install LED panels at various beaches in the Islands District. He thought that it was not a bad idea to install display panels showing time, temperature and water quality at sites 4 to 8 set out in Appendix III of the paper, and he also considered the height of display panels (i.e. about 450 mm) in option 1 more suitable because when in the sunlight, a display panel of about 900 mm high as proposed in option 2 would be rather glaring. In addition, he asked if the lifeguards would turn off the display panels when they got off work to avoid light pollution. Given that sites 1 to 3 in Annex III were not in his constituency, he was not in a position to comment, but he reiterated that excessively large display panels were not recommended.

87. Mr Sammy TSUI expressed disagreement. He indicated that the power consumption of a LED panel was very low. If it was turned off when there were no lifeguards, swimmers would have to check the bulletin board for information about the beach. He asked if the display panels could operate round-the-clock, and whether other information, such as whether the beach was open, could be displayed alongside the time, temperature and water quality; if so, he opined that the display panels should not be turned off in order to allow swimmers to see the latest updates from a distance.

88. Mr LEE Ka-ho asked which type of display panels were usually installed at other beaches in Hong Kong and the on/off time of such devices. In addition, he asked whether the quotations contained in the paper were the prices offered only when the same option was selected for the eight beaches, and whether the prices would vary if different options were selected for the beaches.

89. Mr Eric KWOK said that it would be more cost-effective if one option was adopted for all beaches. If a type of display panels could display other information alongside temperature, then this type of display panels should be installed at all beaches to reduce construction costs. He opined that the hearing-impaired could benefit from the project. Swimmers might not be able to hear the broadcast clearly when swimming in the water, but they could quickly grasp the useful information via such display panels.

90. Mr HO Chun-fai said that the installation of display panels should suit local conditions. The panels should not be installed rigidly at fixed locations. Taking the Pui O Beach as an example, it was not ideal to put up a display panel at the entrance as beach users would feel uncomfortable when watching the display panel under the sunlight. He urged the department to further consider the proposal.

91. Mr David KWAN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) A 24-hour display panel had been installed at the Hung Shing Yeh Beach. Its functions were similar to the display panels at the sports ground, displaying time and temperature. He pointed out that the panels in option 2 could display water quality and capture the information from the Environmental Protection Department, which would be updated weekly. If other information was to be displayed, a large amount of data would need to be processed. In order to disseminate information

effectively, the department would continue to use red flags and broadcasts to inform the public about the presence of sharks close to the shore. There were also lifeguards on duty at beaches who could advise all swimmers to go back to the shore in a timely manner.

- (b) As to whether different options could be adopted for different beaches, he said that the quotations from the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) were provided individually for each beach, so Members could choose different options. As to the issue of light pollution, the existing display panel at the Hung Shing Yeh Beach was facing the sea and in moderate luminosity. The display panels proposed in the paper would be hung on the outer walls of buildings and would not face residential buildings, so it was believed that light pollution would not be caused.

92. Ms LAU Shun-ting pointed out that the Hung Shing Yeh Beach was in her constituency. She thought that the installation of display panels would be conducive to the receipt of messages by the swimmers and residents. She had not received any complaints thereof and welcomed the installation of such devices at other beaches in the outlying islands.

93. The Chairman stated that the quotations set out in the paper were all separate quotations and he suggested that the works for beaches in Cheung Chau should be dealt with separately from those for other beaches.

94. Mr David KWAN asked the Chairman if he meant that sites 1 to 2 should be dealt with separately from sites 3 to 8. The motion put forward by Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho at the previous meeting only included the Cheung Chau Tung Wan Beach (Site 1) and the Kwun Yam Beach (Site 2); and the other six beaches, including the Lo So Shing Beach (Site 3), were added to the motion when amendments were made thereto.

95. The Chairman said that sites 4 to 8 were located in Lantau Island, so they should be dealt with together. As for the Lo So Shing Beach in Lamma Island, since a display panel had been installed for the Hung Shing Yeh Beach in the same area, he suggested that the discussion over the option for the Lo So Shing Beach should be held later. He had noticed that display panels in option 1 would not show the water quality, and he asked which type of display panel was being used at the Hung Shing Yeh Beach.

96. Ms LAU Shun-ting said that the display panel in option 1 was used in the Hung Shing Yeh Beach.

97. Mr Sammy TSUI pointed out that the display panel in option 1 was of smaller size, and that in option 2 was believed to have a higher definition. Since it might be difficult to replace the display panels in the future, he reminded Members not to choose a lower-quality model just for saving a bit of cost.

98. The Chairman said that the motion was proposed by Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho, and Mr YUNG Chi-ming from the same constituency also agreed to use the display

panels of about 900 mm high in option 2. Mr Sammy TSUI has just expressed concerns that the display panel in option 1 was too small and might not be able to clearly display the information, he suggested that display panels in option 2 should be installed at the beaches of Cheung Chau, and Members should see whether the option was suitable for other beaches after assessing the actual effect. He asked when the installation works would be completed if the proposal was endorsed.

99. Ms WONG Chau-ping asked whether the department had looked for cheaper options in the market as she thought the prices set out in the paper were not low.

100. Mr Randy YU agreed with the Chairman's proposed approach. Since Cheung Chau had a keen demand for the facility and Mr YUNG Chi-ming also agreed to install the display panel of about 900 mm high in option 2 there, he suggested that installation works should be carried out in the area first, followed by a feedback survey among residents living near the beaches. It was noted that there was no light pollution in Cheung Sha at present, and if a display panel was installed hastily, the residents might object to it. It was believed that it would be more appropriate to make a decision after the display panels were set up in Cheung Chau. He said that most people did not care about water quality, and as long as the red flag was not hoisted, they could swim at ease. Citizens who were concerned about water quality knew where to look for the relevant information. He opined that if option 2 was adopted to display information on water quality, it might not be desirable for places with zero light pollution such as Cheung Sha and Tong Fuk.

101. Mr Eric KWOK agreed with Mr Sammy TSUI's view that the display panels in option 1 were too small and residents might not be able to see clearly the information displayed. Besides, poor water quality might exacerbate the conditions of swimmers with skin diseases or other chronic illness. Therefore, it was necessary to provide such information. He supported option 2.

102. The Chairman said that since Members of the Cheung Chau constituency agreed to install the display panel in option 2 at the two beaches in the area, he suggested that Members should vote on the project first and then proceed to decide whether to adopt this option for other beaches with reference to the effect of the relevant facilities after the installation works were completed.

103. The Chairman invited Members to vote by a show of hands on the installation of display panels in option 2 at the Cheung Chau Tung Wan Beach and the Kwun Yam Beach. With 13 votes in favour and one abstention, the proposal was adopted.

(Members voted for included: the Chairman Mr Ken WONG, Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr HO Chun-fai, Ms Josephine TSANG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting and Mr LEE Ka-ho; Ms WONG Chau-ping abstained; and Mr HO Siu-kei left the meeting temporarily.)

104. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that the representative of the LCSD had not yet responded to her question about the quotations.

105. Mr David KWAN responded that after the facilities' specifications were ready, the EMSD had invited the suppliers to offer quotations in accordance with the procurement criteria of the Government. The quotations listed in the paper included construction costs. The department would select the contractors according to the "lowest bid wins" principle. Taking option 1 as an example, if the final quotation was less than \$150,000, the price to be paid by the department would not exceed \$150,000.

106. The Chairman invited Members to vote by a show of hands on the papers (Annex I and Annex II) and the funding for implementation of the project.

107. The paper and funding were endorsed unanimously by Members.

(Members voted for included: the Chairman Mr Ken WONG, Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr HO Chun-fai, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Josephine TSANG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting and Mr LEE Ka-ho; and Mr HO Siu-kei left the meeting temporarily.)

## XII. Progress report on DC-funded District Minor Works Projects (Paper DFMC 59/2020)

108. The Chairman welcomed Ms HUI Ka-wai, Minerva, Architect (Works) 5 of the Home Affairs Department, Ms LEUNG Tin-yee, Christy, Assistant District Officer (Islands)2 of the IsDO, and Ms Selina LEUNG, Senior Executive Officer (Planning)21 of the LCSD to the meeting to present the paper.

109. Ms Christy LEUNG briefly presented the paper.

110. Mr Randy YU pointed out that the "Construction of shelter at the open space next to South Lantau Rural Committee Office" project (Project code: IS-DMW116) was put forward ten years ago and he questioned why it was not until recently that the project was remarked as "the relevant location is not suitable for the project". He said that the District Council had allocated a funding of more than \$380,000 for the design and archaeological work. He opined that if there were problems with the site selection, the District Council should have been informed ten years ago. It was unimaginable that this issue was handled in such a way. He hoped the departments concerned could respond to this. In addition, he thanked the Central and Western District Leisure Services Office for assisting in removing the trees opposite the Central Ferry Piers, and asked whether the planters could be removed as scheduled in November as stated in the remarks.

111. Mr Eric KWOK said that regarding the "Addition of a shelter to the new taxi stand at Yat Tung Street" (item 11 of the Annex), the paper stated that the addition of a shelter to the taxi stand would narrow the pedestrian way. However, he and Mr FONG Lung-fei, after an on-site inspection earlier, thought that adding a shelter at that position would not affect the pedestrian way. The paper also stated that a shelter at the taxi

stand would obstruct the emergency vehicular access. However, after the on-site inspection, he found that the proposed location of the shelter was far away from the emergency access and the addition of the shelter would not have any impact on it. He said that as the content of the paper in relation to these two issues deviated from the facts, he requested such content be deleted from the paper. Staff from the works section of the IsDO, after inspecting the site earlier, reported that the roots of the trees nearby might have problems. He criticised that the IsDO was only identifying the problems but was not solving any, and he opined that a conclusion could only be made after inspections were carried out.

112. Ms LAU Shun-ting said that regarding the “Yung Shue Wan Multi-purpose Arena for Children and Youth in Lamma Island” (item 7 of the Annex), the PlanD stated that the planning did not tie in with the surrounding land uses, so it did not support the project and advised her to re-examine the proposal. She pointed out that she had visited the site twice together with the LCSD and she believed that the location was very suitable for the project. Also, it was difficult to find other suitable sites. Therefore, she hoped to learn more about the reasons for the PlanD’s objection.

113. Mr FONG Lung-fei said, it was reported that trees collapsed after typhoon because the tree pits were only one meter wide by one meter deep, and also because the tree roots protruded from the ground and grew towards both sides. Therefore, he considered that it was unlikely for the tree roots to be affected by the project, and he hoped the IsDO would conduct further studies.

114. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that regarding the “Provision of fitness equipment for adults in Tung Chung North Park” (item 24 of the Annex), the LCSD indicated that the site would be zoned as a pet garden, so adult fitness equipment could not be provided. He said that in the paper, the project proponent was suggested to re-examine the site selection. After communicating with the LCSD on many occasions, he had identified other suitable sites. Hence, he asked whether he should put forward his suggestions at the meeting or submit a new works proposal.

115. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that with regard to the project numbered “IS-DMW116”, not only the villagers and District Council Members of South Lantau but also residents in other districts were surprised by the progress of the project. She indicated that the project was initiated ten years ago, and part of the funding had been approved, but it was not until recently that the project was suspended on the ground that its location was within a marine reserve. This was indeed a laughing stock. She opined that the department should respond and face up to the problem.

116. Ms Christy LEUNG made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Regarding the project numbered “IS-DMW116”, the IsDO and the PlanD had held a meeting with Mr HO Chun-fai earlier to discuss the probability of the project being approved after submission to the TPB. However, the TPB had indicated that the chances of the project being approved by it were slim. The TPB learnt that, according to the recent assessment results, the site was not suitable for carrying out the relevant works.

The IsDO would continue to find out whether there were other suitable sites for the works.

- (b) Regarding the “Improvement of the pedestrian link at the Central Piers” (Project code: IS-DMW286), the latest estimated completion date provided by the Central and Western District Leisure Services Office was November. Members would be informed should there be any further updates.
- (c) Regarding item 11 of the Annex, the IsDO was still following up with other departments. During an on-site inspection conducted earlier, the IsDO found that the middle part of the taxi stand area was located right between a lay-by and the emergency vehicular access, where there was only a narrow space. The IsDO noted that the proposed project location was at the head of the taxi stand. Since a certain space needed to be reserved between the footpath and the lay-by to avoid collisions when the vehicles turned, and the shelter also needed to maintain a certain distance from the emergency vehicular access, the remaining space available for the construction was limited. As a result, the width of the proposed taxi shelter might be less than one meter, and its function of rain protection would be substantially weakened. Therefore, the IsDO had to review the relevant project. For this reason, the IsDO and the departments concerned had invited Members to make another on-site inspection to further study the proposal and follow up.

117. Ms Selina LEUNG responded that with regard to item 7 of the Annex, upon receipt of the proposal from Ms LAU Shun-ting on 13 May, the department had immediately inquired the departments concerned about the existing use and planning intention of the proposed site. The PlanD replied that the site had been designated for other uses, and the proposed facilities did not tie in with the designated uses (such as drainage facility, sand depot, LPG cylinder storage, etc.) of the surrounding sites. Upon receipt of the replies from the relevant departments, the department reported the latest updates to Members in writing and informed the District Council of the PlanD’s comments on the proposal.

118. The Chairman asked the IsDO to respond to the question raised by Mr LEE Ka-ho.

119. Ms Christy LEUNG responded that, generally speaking, if a proposed site was not suitable for the works and there were other feasible locations for carrying out works of a similar nature, there was no need to resubmit the works proposal if other Members had no comments.

120. Mr Eric KWOK indicated that the Assistant District Officer misunderstood what he had just said. He said that he knew the location of the head of the taxi stand well after two on-site inspections, and he added that at a meeting during the previous District Council term, the Link and the HD both had reservations about the construction of a shelter over the waiting area but were open to the construction of a shelter at the



head of the taxi stand. He reiterated that the addition of a shelter at the head of the taxi stand would not affect the emergency access because the actual distance in between was quite long. He also pointed out that the pedestrian way was spacious and there was no such a problem of insufficient width. He clarified that he only asked to delete the above-mentioned two remarks rather than the entire project, and said that as for the problem of tree roots, he had contacted the HD, the IsDO, the Link and the TD for conducting an on-site inspection next week to understand the situation.

121. Mr HO Chun-fai said that the application for the “Construction of shelter at the open space next to South Lantau Rural Committee Office” project was submitted more than ten years ago. After two or three years of study, the DLO/Is and the IsDO both indicated that the project was feasible. It was later found that an application had to be submitted to the Antiquities and Monuments Office and such application was approved a few years later. Following a series of approval procedures, the Islands District Council finally approved the project and the funding for a feasibility study. Unfortunately, the project was then delayed for several years. He had been constantly following up with the departments concerned, hoping to build the shelter as soon as possible for the residents to hold festive events. However, this year, the DLO/Is suddenly said that there were unauthorised buildings at the site and demolition was required. He then asked the department to provide the project timetable for him to follow up, and had approached various departments during the year. It was not until September this year that the PlanD sent an officer to the Rural Committee to communicate with him, stating that the TPB would not approve the addition of a shelter at the location. The news was a bolt from the blue to him, and he did not dare to tell the villagers about it. He criticised the Government for deceiving the residents of South Lantau. Although multiple approvals had been obtained for such a basic facility, the Government was contradicting itself in the end. He continued to criticise the Government for disregarding the residents after the Shek Kwu Chau incinerator project was approved, and questioned why the building development behind the ball court was approved. He urged the departments concerned to assist and discuss ways to resolve the problems.

122. The Chairman said that the planning of the project had spanned over ten years with many departments involved, but no department had ever indicated that the project was infeasible. He asked whether the TPB refused to approve the project due to omissions in the application process or failure to consult some departments. He opined that the IsDO had the responsibility to explain whether it was due to any procedural mistakes or changes in the rules of the game, or as Mr HO Siu-kei had said, that the residents could be ignored as the incinerator project had already been approved. He pointed out that the DLO/Is had explained on that day that an application could be lodged with the TPB after the unauthorised buildings were demolished, but now the PlanD indicated that the application would not be approved by the TPB. He thought it was unacceptable as the efforts in the past ten years had gone in vain.

123. Mr Randy YU expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He indicated that the project numbered IS-DMW164 had been completed and he suggested that it should be removed from the paper.

- (b) Regarding the project numbered DMW116, he criticised that it was the department's mistake that led to the delay of the project indefinitely. He pointed out that if it had been made clear in 2010 that the site was not suitable for the project, Members would accept it anyway. However, it was puzzling to learn that the project proposed 10 years ago could not be carried out after public fund of \$380,000 was spent thereon. He pointed out that the project would be included in the progress report only after studies had concluded that the project was feasible and sufficient funding had been secured for its implementation. He opined that it was necessary to find out the cause and identify the root of problem. He said that the site was not zoned as a marine reserve today, and the PlanD should be the first government department to be informed of the zoning. He was puzzled by the current situation.
- (c) Regarding the project numbered IS-DMW286, he asked whether the Central and Western District Leisure Services Office could put up notices to notify residents using the flyover escalators that the planter works would be carried out in November and some road and drainage works would also be carried out later, together with a notice to the pedestrians and the timetable for the works.

124. Mr HO Chun-fai criticised that the Government's support for the construction of infrastructure was simply deceiving the public. If such situations continued to arise, it would be meaningless to hold meetings for discussion. He emphasised that the cause of such situations must be identified.

125. Ms WONG Chau-ping expressed regret over the issue because the proposed location was the only venue in South Lantau where events could be held. Currently, without the unauthorised shelter mentioned above, residents had to purchase canopy tents at their own expense when holding events. Therefore, all residents of South Lantau had high expectations for this project. She pointed out that if the project was unfeasible, Members should be informed in advance so as to avoid Mr HO Chun-fai from giving false hope to villagers by telling them that the works were about to commence. What's more, this had also led to a waste of ten years and more than \$300,000 on studies.

126. Ms Josephine TSANG said that the project was considered at a meeting in 2010, and more than \$300,000 of public funding had been spent on studies. She criticised that the Government had deceived Members, and there was a lack of communication between departments. She said that Mr HO Chun-fai, as the chairman of the Rural Committee, was often asked by the residents about the progress of the project, and he would reply that the works were about to commence. Now it was said that the project had low probability of being approved by the TPB, making it difficult for him to explain to the residents. Worse, his credibility might therefore be damaged, and it would be difficult for him to continue to serve as a communication channel between the Government and the residents. She said that the Government made many promises to Members and the residents when seeking to construct the Shek Kwu Chau

incinerator, however, it was trying to “remove the bridge after crossing the river”, which was unacceptable.

127. The Chairman asked the IsDO to make a response or to check the files after the meeting to find out if there were any procedural omissions. He pointed out that, as the usual practice, if a works proposal was not feasible, it should be rejected immediately, just like the one proposed by Ms LAU Shun-ting. However, the PlanD initially stated that the project was feasible. That was why Members would further ask the department about the reasons for opposing the project.

128. Ms Christy LEUNG made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) She understood the difficulties and anger of Members. She said that she would carefully study the works proposal after the meeting, including the problems involved and the development of the situation, and would give Members an account of the situation later.
- (b) She would convey to the Central and Western District Leisure Services Office the proposal about putting up notices on the planter works at the Central Piers.

129. Mr Eric KWOK said that he was a resident of South Lantau, so he had already expressed concern about this meaningful project during the last term of the District Council. He had made enquiries with the then Assistant District Officer, and he was told that if the Rural Committee demolished the unauthorised shelter in accordance with the instruction, the IsDO would then follow up on the project. He criticised that, in view of the current situation, the IsDO was “moving the goalposts”, but he said that he would wait for the IsDO’s explanation after it had reviewed the information. If any maladministration was found, it might need to be reported to the Office of the Ombudsman, so as to investigate which department had the administrative problem and therefore to set things right.

### XIII. Any other business

130. No other business was put forward by Members.

### XIV. Date of Next Meeting

131. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m. The next meeting was scheduled for 10:30 a.m. on 11 January 2021 (Monday).

-END-