

(Translation)

Islands District Council
Minutes of Meeting of District Facilities Management Committee

Date : 19 September 2022 (Monday)
Time : 11:00 a.m.
Venue : Islands District Council Conference Room,
14/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong

Present

Mr HO Chun-fai (Vice-Chairman)
Mr YU Hon-kwan, Randy, MH, JP
Mr WONG Man-hon, MH
Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, SBS, MH
Mr YUNG Chi-ming, BBS, MH
Mr CHAN Lin-wai, MH (Left at around 12:30 p.m.)
Ms WONG Chau-ping
Mr KWOK Ping, Eric
Mr FONG Lung-fei
Ms LAU Shun-ting (Arrived at around 11:05 a.m.)

Attendance by Invitation

Mr TSE Ming-por	Senior Engineer/Hong Kong 4, Water Supplies Department
Mr LEE Chun-hung, Roy	Architect (Works)2, Home Affairs Department
Mr LEE Sun-fu, Joe	Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Islands District Office
Ms WONG Yik-ting, Sarina	District Secretary, Islands District Office
Mr CHAN Chak-chung	Senior Inspector of Works, Islands District Office
Ms LEUNG So-ping, Selina	Senior Executive Officer (Planning)21, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr Ken TONG	Senior Architect, Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited

In Attendance

Ms WONG Ka-ming, Grace	Assistant District Officer (Islands)2, Islands District Office
Ms LIM Ting-ting, Sylvia	Chief Leisure Manager (New Territories West), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms SIU Kit-ping, Currie	District Leisure Manager (Islands), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms CHU Po-yee, Polly	Senior Librarian (Islands), Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Secretary

Ms KWONG Tsz-wing, Wing

Executive Officer (District Council)2, Islands District Office

Absent with Apology

Mr WONG Hon-kuen, Ken (Chairman)

Mr HO Siu-kei

~~~~~

**Welcoming Remarks**

The Vice-Chairman said that the Chairman was unable to attend the meeting due to other commitments, so he would preside over the meeting.

2. The Vice-Chairman welcomed representatives of the government departments and Members to the meeting and introduced Ms KWONG Tsz-wing, Wing, Executive Officer (District Council)2 of the Islands District Office (IsDO), who succeeded Ms NG Ching-sum, Rain as the Secretary of the Committee.

3. Members noted that Mr Ken WONG and Mr HO Siu-kei were unable to attend the meeting due to other commitments.

I. **Confirmation of minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2022**

4. The Vice-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.

5. The captioned minutes were confirmed unanimously without further amendments proposed by Members.

(Members who voted in favour included: the Vice-Chairman Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Mr Eric KWOK and Mr FONG Lung-fei.)

(Ms LAU Shun-ting arrived the meeting at around 11:05 a.m.)

II. Question on the Water Supplies Department's follow-up on the repairs of water pipes  
(Paper DFMC 27/2022)

6. The Vice-Chairman welcomed Mr TSE Ming-por, Senior Engineer/Hong Kong 4 of the Water Supplies Department (WSD) to the meeting to respond to the question.

7. Mr WONG Man-hon briefly presented the question.

8. Mr TSE Ming-por responded as follows:

- (a) In accordance with Section 17 of the Waterworks Ordinance (Cap. 102) (WWO), a consumer should bear the cost of constructing, installing, maintaining, altering, repairing or removing an inside service. The WSD might alter or repair an inside service at the request of a consumer, and the cost thereof should be payable by the person at whose request such alteration or repair was carried out. The relevant provisions came into force under the Waterworks Ordinance 1938. Section 7 of the WWO also stipulated that a consumer should accept responsibility for the custody and maintenance of an inside service. When applying for water supply, a consumer signed an agreement to undertake to be responsible for the custody and maintenance of the above-mentioned service and the custody of any meter installed.
- (b) To outline the maintenance responsibilities to the public, the WSD produced a pamphlet for their information. The pamphlet clearly stated that the WSD maintained the government water supply systems up to the control valve nearest the main outside the land boundaries of private buildings. To put it simply, the maintenance responsibilities were delineated by the land boundaries. The maintenance of the water supply systems on government land outside the land boundaries was undertaken by the WSD while the private pipes within the land boundaries should be constructed, repaired and maintained by the relevant people of the premises.
- (c) In the past, many water meters were installed near the land boundaries, which gave rise to a misunderstanding that the WSD was responsible for the maintenance of pipes before the meter and the consumer was responsible for the maintenance of pipes beyond the meter. However, nowadays most of the meters were not installed near the land boundaries. For example, meters in major development projects would be installed in different buildings and on different floors. Nevertheless, the consumers' maintenance responsibilities were delineated by the land boundaries.
- (d) Fire services and salt water flushing supply systems were not installed

with meters. According to the above principle, the maintenance and construction responsibilities within the land boundaries should be undertaken by consumers.

9. Mr WONG Man-hon expressed his views as follows:

- (a) In the recent two years, the WSD had suspended meter readings due to the epidemic. The readings were obtained by estimation instead, but the estimated charges were often several times higher than usual. The geographical environment of Lantau Island, where there were many village houses, was different from that of urban areas. Many villagers said that they had come across the above situation. Last year, a resident sought his assistance, saying that the water charge, which was usually around \$300, suddenly increased to \$1,500. His office therefore wrote to the WSD to request a follow-up. Initially, the WSD replied that the charge was estimated on the basis of the consumer's past water consumption and requested that the consumer pay. However, upon receipt of a complaint, the WSD changed its tone and said that the consumer was not required to pay for the time being. This year, he also received a similar request for assistance. After receiving his enquiry, the WSD gave the same reply that the consumer was not required to pay the charge for the time being. However, the WSD wrote to the consumer later, saying that the valve and the pipe before the consumer's meter had to be replaced due to ageing, otherwise the WSD would cut off the water supply. In his opinion, the WSD was worried that the pipe before the meter would be affected when the meter was being replaced (for example, if there was a burst), the WSD would have to bear the responsibility for repair. That was why it requested that the consumer replace the pipe first.
- (b) The aim of his question was to clarify the maintenance responsibilities, and the WSD had to examine the issue seriously. He opined that had the consumer not sought assistance from his office to request the WSD follow up on the water charges, the WSD would not have asked the consumer to replace the pipe. He queried why the WSD did not carry out maintenance of the pipe regularly and why the consumer had to repair the pipe before the meter on government land at his own expense. He considered it was reasonable for the WSD to ask consumers to replace pipes that was on private land and connected into their houses. However, the WSD had to take the responsibility for repairing pipes that fell on government land. The WSD could not request that consumers replace pipes on government land simply because they complained that the water charges were too high. He called the WSD to gain a better understanding of the situation, but the staff of the WSD acted in a perfunctory manner. He disapproved of such a working attitude displayed by the government department, which was unfair to the occupants concerned.

10. Mr TSE Ming-por responded as follows:

- (a) Due to the epidemic, the WSD suspended meter readings and determined water charges by estimation. If the WSD received a dispute raised by a villager on the water charge, the WSD would follow up and suspend the water charge. After meter reading was resumed, the outstanding charges from the past bills would be collected in one go. If Members wanted the WSD to continue following up on any individual case, they could inform the WSD to carry out an investigation again.
- (b) The WSD was responsible for the installation of meters and bore the cost thereof. If the WSD found that a pipe had to be replaced due to seepage or damage when replacing the meter, the party responsible for the cost would be subject to the land boundaries. He reiterated that pipes within the land boundaries had to be maintained by consumers whether they were located before or beyond the meter, whereas government pipes on government land would be the responsibility of the WSD.

11. Mr WONG Man-hon said that village houses on Lantau Island were usually more than 100 to 200 metres away from the water main. The WSD often requested consumers to connect the pipes in their houses to the main by themselves. However, that section of pipe was before the meter, so it should be installed by the WSD. He did not understand why government departments could assist buildings in urban areas to connect pipes to the main, but occupants of village houses had to be responsible for the pipes before and beyond the meter. To avoid trouble, some villagers had no choice but to make concessions and replace the pipes at the request of the government. However, the provision of water service by the government was supposed to bring convenience to the public instead of increasing their burden. He opined that the government's practice was unfair. As the issue affected the whole of Lantau Island, he hoped that the WSD would take it seriously.

12. Mr CHAN Lin-wai expressed his views as follows:

- (a) If the leaking or ageing part before the meter fell on government land, the maintenance cost should be payable by the WSD. He enquired whether the WSD would notify consumers after completing the maintenance and, if the pipe beyond the meter had to run through government land to be connected to a village house, whether the WSD would be responsible for the maintenance work and pay for the cost when the pipe had a problem.
- (b) He said that since the government was responsible for water supply and residents paid their water charges, he did not understand why they had to bear the maintenance cost. He pointed out that the circumstances of village houses were different from those of urban buildings. If the delineation of responsibilities was subject to whether

a pipe was located before or beyond the meter, there would be a problem.

13. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Although the WSD said that pipes on private land should be maintained by consumers, if the connection pipes had to run through private land, the WSD was reasonably supposed to have obtained approval from the owners concerned before laying the pipes. Since the pipes on private land were laid by the WSD, the WSD should be responsible for the maintenance work and the cost thereof.
- (b) He said that Mr TSE, the representative of the WSD, might not be able to respond to the questions immediately. He suggested that Mr WONG Man-hon or Mr Randy YU refer the questions to the Heung Yee Kuk New Territories (Heung Yee Kuk) for discussion because presumably the disputes involved not only one single case and might even involve the construction of small houses. He asked, in a scenario where a dozen small houses filed applications for laying pipes and many of the pipes had to run through private land, whether the WSD would refuse to supply water to them simply because any one of the private land owners raised an objection. He said that since the government approved the construction of small houses, it had the obligation to provide the occupants with infrastructure. He urged the WSD to solve the problem.

14. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that he used to live in a village. According to past experience, if a pipe had to run through private land, the village representative would be responsible for coordination and the WSD would take the lead to resolve the problem. The resident might connect the pipe to the house after obtaining approval from the WSD. If the pipe burst, the part before the meter would be repaired by the WSD. In view of the WSD's response, he queried whether, if an entire village fell on private land, all the utilities in the village had to be built at the residents' own expense. He said that it was the obligation of government departments to discuss and clarify the responsibility with land owners. It was unacceptable for the departments to evade their responsibilities solely on grounds that the pipe before the meter fell on private land. He hoped that the WSD would further look into the issues Mr WONG Man-hon mentioned.

15. Mr TSE Ming-por gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The WSD would handle the applications for water supply in a fair and consistent manner. The WSD's water supply points for both villages and buildings were located at the land boundaries. The initial construction and installation of the pipes within the land boundaries were of private responsibility. If different private property rights were involved, for example, in a case where the pipes of a village house consumer had to run through the private land of someone else,

the WSD would ask the owners to negotiate among themselves and would grant approval for the application only after obtaining the owners' consent. If the pipes had to run through both private land and government land, the initial construction and installation of the pipes on private lots would be carried out by licensed plumbers rather than the WSD.

- (b) In accordance with Section 17 of the WWO, the WSD might repair a pipe on private property on behalf of a consumer in case of emergency and recover the cost thereof from the consumer.

16. Mr YUNG Chi-ming said that he had worked for the WSD for many years so he was more familiar with the issue. If the WSD's replacement of a meter caused a pipe to leak, the meter and the pipe would both be handled together. However, if the pipes before and beyond the meter were found to be damaged before the meter was replaced, the owners would be required to replace the pipes by themselves. He pointed out that under all circumstances, plumbers had to connect the pipes to a location near government land before the WSD would supply water. Therefore, the responsibilities concerned were delineated by whether the land was private land or government land.

17. Mr Randy YU said that urban buildings were easier to handle as their land boundaries were clearly defined. He understood Mr TSE's explanation, but Members did not understand why the WSD had assisted with the maintenance of pipes before the meter previously but was unwilling to do so this time. In addition, when there were seepages in some of the pipes running through private land, the contractor of the WSD might have already assisted in solving the problem before the staff of the WSD found it out. Therefore, the actual operation might be different from what the representative of the WSD described. He understood that Mr WONG Man-hon needed to help the residents to clarify the responsibilities concerned, so he suggested that Mr WONG Man-hon study the matter further by researching precedent cases and how they were handled at Heung Yee Kuk. He said that there could be a further exchange on the issue on another occasion (such as Heung Yee Kuk) if necessary. He thanked Mr TSE for his detailed explanation of the issue.

### III. Question on the concurrent construction of sewers and fibre-based networks (Paper DFMC 28/2022)

18. The Vice-Chairman said that the written replies of the Office of the Communications Authority (OFCA) and the Drainage Services Department (DSD) had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

19. Mr Eric KWOK briefly presented the question.

20. Mr Eric KWOK express his views as follows:

- (a) He said it was regrettable that OFCA and the DSD did not send

representatives to attend the meeting. Even though communications service was an important livelihood issue, no officials attended the meeting to respond to Members' questions, he regarded that the departments did not attach enough importance to the District Council. He pointed out that government departments should communicate with the local community to solve livelihood issues together instead of sitting back and doing nothing.

- (b) According to the written reply of OFCA, the fibre-based networks of the Hong Kong Telecommunications (HKT) Limited (HKT) had covered Ham Tin Tsuen, and the villagers could choose between the 30 Mbps or 100 Mbps broadband services. He said that he lived in the village but the HKT had never provided the above options. He hoped that OFCA would provide an explanation.
- (c) In addition, OFCA said that the villagers of Ham Tin Tsuen might consider contacting the HKT to carry out optical fibre wiring works on the private land to connect the network of houses in the village. He enquired what the villagers should do if the optical fibre wiring works involved someone else's private land.
- (d) Although the DSD was not the main responsible department, he hoped that the DSD would pay attention to the minutes of the meeting and assist in the implementation of the proposal. The sewers to be laid in the South Lantau Sewerage Works would be connected to the village and the main drain. If the DSD considered reserving a duct next to the proposed sewers in the design stage for laying fibre-based networks or carrying out other works on communications network facilities, excavation would not be required again in the future, thus saving both time and money.

21. Mr Randy YU expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Under the current utilities policy and the liability system under the common law, if the DSD carried out drainage works and laid fibre-based networks concurrently, the DSD could hardly be held responsible when there was a problem with the fibre-based networks. Moreover, there were many bends at the location concerned and the DSD had to carry out trench excavation by itself. Also, the underground utilities at different depths were provided by different departments, so it was difficult to ascertain responsibility. If it was like the Tung Chung East Reclamation in which a box culvert was laid underground first before the utilities were safely placed at suitable locations, the situation might be different. He believed that having regard to policy and responsibility considerations, the DSD would not easily agree to lay the fibre-based networks and the sewers concurrently. Even if the DSD sent its staff to attend the meeting, they might not be able to answer Mr Eric KWOK's question.



- (b) The written reply of the DSD responded to the issue of network coverage in Shap Long and Ham Tin Tsuen. The DSD said that the fixed network operator (FNO) had completed the laying of fibre-based networks to Shap Long via Chi Ma Wan Road. In other words, FNOs did not have to lay fibre-based networks there again. In addition, the written reply mentioned that the DSD would coordinate with public utilities and operators regarding the alignment of the sewers. He explained that this was an established procedure to avoid damaging other utilities. It did not mean that the DSD would coordinate with the relevant departments to lay sewers and fibre-based networks concurrently.
- (c) Due to rigid bureaucracy and departmental policy considerations, there was no coordination between work projects, which was not ideal. He agreed with Mr Eric KWOK's suggestion, opining that it could save public money and was more environmentally friendly.
- (d) In addition, he was dissatisfied that the departments had not sent representatives to attend the meeting to respond to the question. However, he believed that it was difficult for the departments to implement the suggestion under the constraints of the current policy. He suggested tackling the issue in other ways. When he met with the Secretary for Development, he would put forward the suggestion on behalf of Members.

22. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He thanked Mr Randy YU for his explanation and suggested to relay Members' views to the Secretary for Development. He said that the suggestion was put forward to him by foreign villagers. Besides, some engineers mentioned that some individual drainage works had been carried out with the cooperation of OFCA in laying drainage pipes and fibre-based networks concurrently. That was why he submitted the question.
- (b) He understood the issue of responsibility Mr Randy YU mentioned, but he said that the responsible departments could lay the fibre-based networks and the sewers concurrently according to their own respective requirements and standards, so as to avoid repeated excavations and make proper use of resources.
- (c) In addition, the village sewerage system of the DSD would be connected to Ham Tin Tsuen. Laying the fibre-based networks concurrently during the works could solve the issue of private land mentioned above.

23. The Vice-Chairman said that the issue of fibre-based networks in villages had existed for a long time. The DSD should take the opportunity of the meeting to conduct a review and formulate targeted solutions. Also, the rural committees could express their views on the issue and find a solution together to improve the service level of fibre-based networks in villages.

24. Mr Randy YU supplemented as follows:

- (a) Regarding the individual works Mr Eric KWOK mentioned, he speculated that the contractors of the fibre-based networks and the sewer works might have coordinated themselves to carry out the works concurrently in order to save cost and make a higher profit, rather than being led by policy bureaux or works departments.
- (b) The DSD was carrying out drainage works at Tai O. From his observation, the DSD was willing to follow up on the work beyond the scope of drainage services. He believed that the DSD would actively consider Members' views. He would suggest to the Director of Drainage Services that the DSD, when laying sewers in South Lantau, should also lay a duct above so that fibre-based networks could be laid in the future without having to carrying out excavation again.

25. Mr WONG Man-hon expressed his views as follows:

- (a) At present, there were still villages without fibre-based networks in Mui Wo. Even though some villages were covered by fibre-based networks, the service quality varied. He was also using the fibre-to-the-home service, but the actual network speed was very slow, which did not conform to what the service provider promoted. In addition, the mobile network signal was also very weak indoors. Residents paid the full cost, and yet the quality of the service provided by the telecommunications operators was often not up to standard. It was unfair to the residents.
- (b) Due to the epidemic, there was a surge in resident demand for fibre-based networks. Many school children had to attend online classes at home, so broadband service was of paramount importance to them.
- (c) OFCA and telecommunications operators had to consider how to improve the quality of network services in rural areas. In this connection, he hoped that the Council would write to OFCA to urge them to address the issue of network signal in rural areas squarely.

26. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that there was a village where fibre-based networks could not be built due to excavation problems. With coordination by the village representative, the engineering staff connected the optical fibres above ground and protected them with plastic tubes to solve the problem. She suggested that the

DSD or the telecommunications operator concerned could consider the approach. Otherwise, it would be difficult to roll out fibre-based networks. In the meantime, departments and Members could share their experience and views to improve the network service in rural areas together.

IV. Question on the provision of fitness equipment in the park in Chung Wai Street  
(Paper DFMC 29/2022)

27. The Vice-Chairman welcomed Ms SIU Kit-ping, Currie, District Leisure Manager (Islands) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) and Mr LEE Chun-hung, Roy, Architect (Work)<sup>2</sup> of the Home Affairs Department (HAD) to the meeting to respond to the question.

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

29. Mr Roy LEE responded that the consultant was currently conducting a feasibility study on the project of the children's playground in Chung Wai Street. The feasibility study was expected to be completed at the end of this year. If the progress was satisfactory, the detailed study and design of the project would commence in the first quarter of 2023.

30. Mr FONG Lung-fei thanked the departments for following up on the matter proactively. He said that there was a shortage of recreational and sports facilities for young families in Tung Chung West. The project could address the public's needs and encourage them to exercise. He hoped that the project would be completed smoothly.

31. Mr Eric KWOK supported Mr FONG Lung-fei's proposal. He hoped that if the area allowed, the Chung Wai Street Children's Playground could be refurbished by drawing reference from the Mui Wo Children's Playground. He praised the LCSD for the project of the Mui Wo Children's Playground, saying that the playground had a wide range of facilities suitable for families. He hoped that the LCSD would provide a similar playground in Tung Chung West.

32. Mr Roy LEE noted Members' views.

V. Question on the provision of an additional staircase next to the lifts in Yu Tai Court  
(Paper DFMC 30/2022)

33. The Vice-Chairman said that the written replies of the Highways Department (HyD) and the Transport Department (TD) had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

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

35. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that although no guests attended the meeting to respond to the question, he still wanted to relay residents' views for Members to note and the departments concerned to consider. He cited the residents' views that the rear entrance of Yu Tai Court was connected to the footbridge only by a lift. If there was a major fire or a serious incident at Yu Tai Court when the lift was out of order, the residents would have no direct escape route to the footbridge. They would have to return to the main entrance to look for other escape routes. That would make residents gather at the open space at the main entrance and the path next to it, hindering rescuers from entering Yu Tai Court. In addition, if the open space at the main entrance and the adjacent path were also affected by the incident, the residents could only use the driveway to escape. The residents requested the TD and the HyD to take fire safety and risk management into consideration and review whether it was an appropriate decision not to provide a staircase next to the lift at the rear entrance of Yu Tai Court. He requested the departments concerned respond to the residents' views, work out a solution for the above situation and consider conducting a stress test, so as to prepare a sound contingency plan.

36. Mr Eric KWOK said that the above situation involved safety issues. The request of the residents of Yu Tai Court was reasonable, so he supported the proposal for the provision of a staircase. He pointed out that the footbridges in Tung Chung District generally had a staircase next to the lift. Although not many people used the staircase, the provision of a staircase next to the lift was a standard design. He was baffled by the TD's reply which stated that the design of the footbridge was appropriate. He hoped that the TD would explain to Members in detail with respect to regulations, safety considerations and the design of the footbridge. In addition, since the TD would provide a bus bay on Chung Yan Road next to Yu Tai Court, the pedestrian flow there was expected to increase. He therefore proposed creating a junction at the location onto Chung Yan Road to facilitate residents' access to the bus stop. He said that the departments concerned should send their staff to attend the meeting to listen to Members' views. He hoped that the TD would refer to the minutes of the meeting and consider the above proposals.

37. Ms WONG Chau-ping supported the proposal of providing a staircase next to the lift at the rear entrance of Yu Tai Court. She pointed out that most of the residents of Yu Tai Court used the lift at the rear entrance to go up and down the footbridge. If the lift was out of order, the residents would have to turn back to the main entrance for exit and entry, which was inconvenient. She requested the departments concerned conduct a site inspection to study the feasibility of the proposal.

38. Mr Randy YU said that three Members had strong demands in relation to the issue. He suggested that Mr FONG Lung-fei, Mr Eric KWOK and Ms WONG Chau-ping submit their questions to the Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) after the discussion. Given the regular attendance of the representatives of the HyD and the TD at the TTC meetings, Members might request the departments to give an immediate response at the meeting.

VI. Report on the Services of the Public Libraries in Islands District by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department between June 2022 and July 2022  
(Paper DFMC 23/2022)

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

40. Ms Polly CHU briefly presented the paper.

41. Members noted the paper.

VII. Report on the management of Leisure and Cultural Services Department's recreational and sports facilities in Islands District (June to July 2022)  
(Paper DFMC 24/2022)

42. The Vice-Chairman welcomed Ms SIU Kit-ping, Currie, District Leisure Manager (Islands) of the LCSD to the meeting to present the paper.

43. Ms Currie SIU briefly presented the paper.

44. Mr Randy YU said that according to the number of users of various beaches set out in item 4 of Annex I of the paper, five beaches had been closed temporarily in July. He enquired whether those beaches had been reopened.

45. Ms Currie SIU responded that the LCSD would open beaches having regard to manpower arrangements. Lifesaving service had been provided at Lower Cheung Sha Beach since 6 August. The relevant information would be set out in the next report.

VIII. Utilisation and improvement works of Community Halls in Islands District  
(Paper DFMC 25/2022)

46. The Vice-Chairman welcomed Mr LEE Sun-fu, Joe, Senior Executive Officer (District Management) and Ms WONG Yik-ting, Sarina, District Secretary of the IsDO to the meeting to present the paper.

47. Mr Joe LEE briefly presented the paper.

48. Mr Randy YU said that paragraph 4 of the paper mentioned that the number of users under the pilot scheme of the "opening of the conference room of the Discovery Bay Community Hall as study room" from 1 July to 9 August was 0. He attributed the decrease in the number of users to the summer vacation. However, judging by the cumulative number of users, the scheme still had a certain effect. He suggested that the IsDO should review the relevant data. If it was found that the number of users from July to August was low, the IsDO could consider suspending the scheme in those two months to save resources. He asked the IsDO to provide the

data to Members for perusal after the meeting.

49. Mr Joe LEE noted the Member's views.

(Post-meeting notes: The IsDO had provided the relevant data to Members for perusal.)

IX. Progress report on DC-funded District Minor Works Projects  
(Paper DFMC 26/2022)

50. The Vice-Chairman welcomed Ms WONG Ka-ming, Grace, Assistant District Officer (Islands)<sup>2</sup> and Mr CHAN Chak-chung, Senior Inspector of Works of the IsDO, Ms LEUNG So-ping, Selina, Senior Executive Officer (Planning)<sup>21</sup> of the LCSD, Mr LEE Chun-hung, Roy, Architect (Works)<sup>2</sup> of the HAD and Mr Ken TONG, Senior Architect of Ho & Partners Architect Engineers & Development Consultants Limited to the meeting to present the paper.

51. Ms Grace WONG briefly presented the paper and asked Members to note the paper.

52. Mr Randy YU agreed that the "Maintenance/replacement of the gateway of Peng Chau Ferry Pier" (IS-DMW207) had been followed up under another programme. In addition, the project of the "Improvement of the pedestrian link at the Central Piers" (IS-DMW286) was completed in April 2021. He suggested that the item be deleted from the progress report.

53. Ms Grace WONG noted the Member's views.

54. Members discussed the "Conversion of the cycle parking area adjoining Tung Chung Road Soccer Pitch into children's playground and fitness corner" (IS-DMW370).

55. Mr Eric KWOK hoped that the LCSD would make amendments to the project because, after conducting a site inspection with the LCSD, he found that the area of the site was not large enough to accommodate both the children's playground and the fitness corner. Moreover, as fitness room facilities would be provided in the nearby indoor sports centre to be built in Area 107 next to Mun Tung Estate, he suggested deleting the fitness corner from the project. In addition, he said it had been mentioned at the previous meeting that the progress of the project was affected by a cable of the CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (CLP), but the matter was not mentioned in the remarks of the report. It was also discussed at the previous meeting that there might be safety concerns if the children's playground was to be built above a high-voltage cable. He opined that it was necessary to seek the CLP's professional advice on the issue. From his discussion with the CLP staff, he learned that the cable would not be affected if the construction of the playground did not require deep excavation. However, that was not a formal reply given at the meeting. He pointed out that if the CLP engineers and the departments concerned considered that the

excavation would not be deep enough to touch the cable, then relocation of the cable would not be required. However, the consultant kept saying the construction of the proposed facility above the cable would pose a danger. He found it puzzling and hoped that the consultant could provide an explanation.

56. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that Members had conducted a site inspection with the LCSD to have a better understanding of the details of the project. As the issue of underground cable was involved, the LCSD had to study in detail how to relocate the cable and confirm the relocation schedule. At the current stage, the site would be kept in its existing state. She enquired whether the LCSD had noticed that there was a large banyan tree surrounded by a triangular granite kerb which was about four feet tall. The tree was at the centre of the site, and its roots had lifted some of the bricks there. Some of the tree roots even protruded from the ground by about half a foot. In addition, as there was insufficient lighting, it was difficult for members of the public to notice those protruding tree roots in low light after dark. She opined that while the site remained open, that would pose a threat to the safety of members of the public. She requested the LCSD to review the issue seriously. She suggested that, if the project had not been commenced, the LCSD should enclose the location where the tree roots were protruding with cones or red and white barrier tape to alert members of the public and also improve the lighting there to avoid accidents.

57. Ms Selina LEUNG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) She first thanked Mr Eric KWOK for his views on the fitness corner. She said that the constraints of the site had been mentioned during her previous discussion with Mr Eric KWOK about the scale of the project. The LCSD would discuss with the Works Section of the HAD and the consultant whether the works could include the facilities provided under the original plan. After the review, the project title might be revised with regard to the scope of the project.
- (b) Regarding the issues of insufficient lighting and protruding tree roots that Ms WONG Chau-ping mentioned, as the location was a bicycle parking area of the TD, the LCSD would relay the situation to the TD. As for the issue of tree roots, the LCSD would also relay it to relevant departments or the section concerned for follow-up.
- (c) Regarding the issue of the CLP cable, she asked the Works Section or the consultant to give a response.

58. Mr Ken TONG said that he had explained to Members at the previous meeting that there was a high-voltage CLP cable beneath the construction site. The consultant had written and communicated with the CLP. If the cable concerned was to be retained, space had to be reserved on both sides so that the CLP staff could carry out maintenance. Moreover, the play equipment or arbours in the project required the provision of a small base. The consultant would study whether the base would occupy the space reserved for the CLP to carry out maintenance and discuss it with

the CLP. In addition, the consultant would also study the impact of the base on the tree roots at the site.

59. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that the LCSD had just responded that the location was not under its purview at the moment. She asked the Secretariat to contact the responsible department and requested the department to enclose the location or erect some notice boards as soon as possible to prevent members of the public from being tripped by the tree roots.

(Post-meeting notes: The Secretariat had relayed Members' views to the HyD. In early October, the HyD replied that the location where the tree roots protruded had been enclosed with railings. The HyD was applying for an excavation permit and would commence the levelling works promptly after the permit was issued. The LCSD had referred the issues of the protruding tree roots, uneven ground and insufficient lighting inside the cycle parking area to the relevant departments and the sections concerned under the LCSD for follow-up.)

(Mr CHAN Lin-wai left the meeting at around 12:30 p.m.)

X. Any Other Business

60. No other business was put forward by Members.

XI. Date of Next Meeting

61. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:28 p.m. The next meeting would be held at 2:00 p.m. on 14 November 2022 (Monday).

-END-