

**Minutes of the 3rd Meeting of
the Leisure and District Facilities Management Committee
of Kowloon City District Council**

Date: 28 April 2016 (Thursday)
Time: 2:30 p.m.
Venue: Conference Room, Kowloon City District Office

Present:

Chairman: Ir CHEUNG Yan-hong, MH
Vice-chairman: Miss LEUNG Yuen-ting
Members: Miss KWONG Po-yin
Mr HO Hin-ming, MH (Left at 6:48 p.m.)
Mr CHO Wui-hung
Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming
Mr NG Fan-kam
Mr TING Kin-wa (Left at 6:22 p.m.)
Mr LAM Tak-shing (Arrived at 2:42 p.m.)
(Left at 6:48 p.m.)
Mr LAM Pok, Jimmy
Mr YUE Chee-wing, Admond (Left at 6:49 p.m.)
Mr YEUNG Chun-yu (Left at 4:57 p.m.)
Mr HE Huahan (Left at 4:46 p.m.)
Mr YANG Wing-kit (Arrived at 3:05 p.m.)
Mr KWAN Ho-yeung
Mr LAI Kwong-wai (Arrived at 2:42 p.m.)
(Left at 4:48 p.m.)
The Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP (Arrived at 3:04 p.m.)
(Left at 5:02 p.m.)
Mr SIU Leong-sing (Left at 4:58 p.m.)
Mr LUK King-kwong (Arrived at 3:10 p.m.)
(Left at 6:25 p.m.)
Mr SIU Tin-hung, Terence
Mr NG Po-keung
Mr PUN Kwok-wah

Secretary: Miss CHONG Pik-yu, Vivian Executive Officer (District Council) 3,
Kowloon City District Office

Absent: Mr LO Chiu-kit

In Attendance: Ms LAU Mei-yee, Helen Senior Liaison Officer (Special Duties
& Ho Man Tin), Kowloon City District
Office
Ms KWOK Lai-kuen, Eva Senior Executive Officer (District
Management), Kowloon City District
Office
Mr YU Man-chun, Jeff Executive Officer I (District
Management), Kowloon City District
Office
Mr WONG Yik-ho, Vico Executive Officer (District
Management), Kowloon City District
Office
Miss TANG Man-wah, Sylvia Chief Leisure Manager (Kowloon),
Leisure and Cultural Services
Department
Ms YEUNG Yuet-ngor, Brenda District Leisure Manager (Kowloon
City), Leisure and Cultural Services
Department
Ms TONG Tak-yan, Amy Deputy District Leisure Manager
(District Support) Kowloon City,
Leisure and Cultural Services
Department
Mr LEE Pao-wan Deputy District Leisure Manager
(Kowloon City)², Leisure and Cultural
Services Department
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-wai, Alex Senior Manager (Kowloon
West/Cultural Services), Leisure and
Cultural Services Department
Ms LAU Siu-mui, Lily Manager (Kowloon West) Marketing,
Programme & District Activities,
Leisure and Cultural Services
Department

Mr LO Hing-kwan Senior Librarian (Kowloon City),
Leisure and Cultural Services
Department

Ms WONG Ping-ping, Karrie Librarian (To Kwa Wan Public Library),
Leisure and Cultural Services
Department

Attendance by Invitation:

Items 3, 4, 14 and 15 Ms LAW Lai-tan, Linda Principal Assistant Secretary
(Recreation & Sport) 2, Home Affairs
Bureau

Mr MAK Sheung-ching, Senior Architect (Recreation & Sport),
Michael Home Affairs Bureau

Ms LI Shuk-ming, Selina Senior Executive Officer(Planning)6,
Leisure and Cultural Services
Department

Miss YIP Yee-wah, Eva Executive Officer (Planning)6/2,
Leisure and Cultural Services
Department

Item 5 Mr LEUNG Yat-pang, Vincent District Secretary, Kowloon City
District Office

Item 6 Mr LUI Chun-wan, Alex Chairman, Green Deck Dedicated Unit,
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
Ms Tracy NG Director of Communications and Public
Affairs, The Hong Kong Polytechnic
University
Mr SUEN Chung-keung, Director of Campus Development, The
Daniel Hong Kong Polytechnic University
Miss Sara LAI Senior Manager of Communications &
Public Affairs, The Hong Kong
Polytechnic University

* * *

The Chairman of the Leisure and District Facilities Management Committee (LDFMC) welcomed Members and representatives of government departments to the meeting. He also welcomed Ms Helen LAU, who acted as Senior Liaison Officer (Special Duties & Ho Man Tin) of the Kowloon City District Office in place of Ms Jamie CHIU, and Ms Brenda YEUNG, who acted as District Leisure Manager (Kowloon City) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) in place of Ms Jackie LO. He expressed his heartfelt gratitude to Ms Jamie CHIU and Ms Jackie LO for their previous contributions to the Committee. Prior to discussion of agenda items, he reminded Members that if the matters to be discussed gave rise to conflict of interest with their property rights, profession or investment, they should make a declaration prior to the discussion so that the Chairman would consider if it was necessary to ask the Members concerned to exit from the meeting during the discussion or voting.

Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting

2. There being no amendments proposed, **the Chairman** declared that minutes of the 2nd meeting were confirmed.

District Minor Works (DMW) Projects

Minor Improvement Works for the Recreation Areas under the LCSD in 2016/17 (Paper No. 22/16)

3. **Miss Sylvia TANG, Chief Leisure Manager (Kowloon) of the LCSD** introduced the Paper.

4. **The Chairman** asked Members to note the report on the progress of a total of 14 DMW projects led by the LCSD and their expenditures listed in Annex I.

Discussion Items

Kai Tak Station Square Value Management Workshop Report (Paper No. 23/16)

Progress of the Kai Tak Sports Park and the Public Engagement Exercise (Paper No. 24/16)

Strong Call for Providing Swimming Pool Facilities at Kai Tak Area

(Paper No. 34/16)

Call for the Early Construction of Kai Tak Avenue Park

(Paper No. 35/16)

5. Since Papers No. 23/16, 24/16, 34/16 and 35/16 were related to similar issues, Members unanimously agreed to combine them for discussion.

6. **Ms Selina LI, Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 6 of the LCSD** introduced the Paper.

7. **Ms Linda LAW, Principal Assistant Secretary (Recreation & Sport) 2 of the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB)** introduced the Paper.

8. Papers No. 34/16 and 35/16 were jointly signed by Miss LEUNG Yuen-ting and Mr HE Huahan, and were introduced by **Mr HE Huahan** as the representative, who expressed disappointment with the planning of the Sports Park, and pointed out that the planning lacked the theme of “water”.

9. **The Chairman** invited Members to refer to the written response of Tabled Papers No. 8 and 9 as submitted by the LCSD.

10. **Mr HE Huahan** said that he was in favour of the proposed mountain cycling ground and artificial turf bowling green. He also enquired about the related management issues and plans after the completion of the two facilities, as well as their opening and operation modes. He pointed out that members of the public would be disappointed if the facilities were operated by dedicated organisations on a paid membership basis.

11. **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** pointed out that Kai Tak Station Square was a rare large-scale plaza site in Hong Kong. He believed that the various facilities proposed by the LCSD were only intended to meet the needs of different stakeholders and might waste the valuable land. He suggested that a more creative landmark square be built for cultural performances, large gatherings or community activities.

12. **Mr HO Hin-ming** said that the Planning Department (PlanD) had held a consultation meeting on the Square. He enquired whether the LCSD had communicated with the PlanD and taken into account related opinions collected at the

meeting. He opined that the current planning failed to highlight the historical significance of the former Kai Tak Airport. He proposed that the former Kai Tak Airport be set as the theme of the Square by adding landmark features such as miniature runway and control tower. Hopefully it could evoke the public memory of the former Kai Tak Airport. He enquired whether the Civil Aviation Department had participated in the project and provided assistance. He believed that there should not be too many rest gardens on the Square; otherwise there would be a low utilisation rate and a waste of land resources.

13. **The Hon Starry LEE** enquired whether the Square would provide sufficient space for various types of activities. She suggested that dynamic activities, such as bazaars, cultural events and food fairs, be included in addition to open space and various facilities. Besides, she proposed adding historic elements of the district, such as the ancient wells excavated from the construction site of the Shatin to Central Link (SCL).

14. **Mr YEUNG Chun-yu** enquired about the construction schedule and estimated time of commissioning of the Square. He pointed out that as the project involved different stakeholders, and wanted to know whether the LCSD would carry out reviews as appropriate after the commissioning and make adjustments in accordance with the needs of the public.

15. **Ms Selina LI of the LCSD** made the following consolidated reply:

- (i) the LCSD held the workshop for the purpose of understanding the views of various stakeholders on the functions of the Square and to balance the needs of different parties. The stakeholders participated in the workshop, including District Council (DC) Members, representatives of the PlanD and the Kai Tak Office, all hoped that the overall design of the Square would feature an integrated theme and provide sufficient space for various activities. The Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) was currently working on the design based on the relevant views and would consult the Committee after completion of the design;
- (ii) in order to match the ambience, the Square would mainly feature a leisure cycling ground and an artificial turf bowling green for

dynamic activities. Other facilities would be more open and flexible;

- (iii) the Square was still in the preliminary design stage. The management and operation modes in future would be determined upon consulting related associations and making reference to previous LCSD's practices for similar facilities;
- (iv) the ArchSD was currently working on the integration and design based on the opinions collected from the workshop. It would provide the Committee with design drawings and consult Members whenever appropriate. The cultural relics unearthed in Sung Wong Toi were being handled by the relevant railway engineering company and the Antiquities and Monuments Office. The LCSD would pay close attention to the progress;
- (v) the LCSD and the ArchSD would come up with a design in line with the overall development in the vicinity of the Square, which not only needed to connect with other development projects in the district and the park under planning, but should also maintain its development direction as a unique transport hub. On the other hand, the Runway Park, which was already open for use, featured the history of the ex-airport; and
- (vi) since the project involved a number of stakeholders, the LCSD could only provide the relevant works schedule after the ArchSD had finalised the design of the Square. Generally speaking, it would take three to four years to complete the planning and design of a public works project before a funding application was filed. The length of the construction period depended on the land allocation and it generally lasted two to three years.

16. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** said that cycling sites and artificial turf bowling greens under the LCSD were open for public use and were managed by LCSD staff. At this stage, there was no plan to operate the cycling ground or artificial turf bowling green in the proposed Kai Tak Station Square on a membership basis..

17. **The Chairman** said that other DCs had proposed the in-situ preservation of the Song-Yuan historical relics as well as the equipment of the ex-airport control tower. He suggested the matter be discussed again during the design of the Square.

18. **Mr HO Hin-ming** opined that a park at the runway tip would be unnecessary and underused. He asked the LCSD to consider adding miniatures of the runway and the control tower as landmark features of the Square.

19. **The Chairman** asked the LCSD to note Members' views and moved on to discussions about Papers No. 24/16 and 34/16.

20. **Mr HE Huahan** pointed out that there were two indoor sports centres under the planning in the Kai Tak Development Area, including one within the Sports Park and the other on the road section opposite the building of the Electrical & Mechanical Services Department (EMSD). He believed it was unnecessary and wondered whether the LCSD would consider converting one indoor sports centre into an indoor swimming pool. He supported the construction of the Sports Park and believed Hong Kong, as a cosmopolitan city, needed venues for major international events and revitalisation of the tourism industry. He pointed out that the Sports Park would be able to accommodate a large number of spectators, but the transport planning mainly relied on the To Kwa Wan MTR Station. He enquired whether the HAB would have other ancillary transport facilities under planning. He also proposed the construction of a Sports City Pier, which could be connected with the Cruise Terminal and the piers in Admiralty and Hung Hom by water, so as to divert pedestrian flows. In addition, he hoped that the HAB could provide a noise data analysis report for Members' perusal.

21. **Mr HO Hin-ming** pointed out that there was a 600-metre-long nullah covered with grass inside the Metro Park. He suggested the HAB enquire of the PlanD or the Civil Engineering & Development Department (CEDD) about the land development opportunities over the area. In addition, he pointed out that the design of the Sports Park did not include ancillary transport facilities such as the monorail and coaches as previously mentioned. Some citizens, such as the elderly and the weak, women and children, and sports teams would need to access the sports centre by coaches.

22. **The Hon Starry LEE** opined that a swimming pool would be necessary in view of the actual needs of local residents. She thus hoped that the LCSD could consider the proposal. In addition, she hoped that the LCSD could confirm that the Sports Park had introduced the idea of “social integration between the disabled and able-bodies” by providing facilities for the disabled in the Sports Park. She also enquired about the possibility of setting up a tennis court in the Park.

23. **Mr LUK King-kwong** acknowledged the necessity of an international sports centre. However, given the high construction costs, he was concerned about the utilisation rate of the sports centre when there were no major events taking place, and worried about the possible idling situation. He thus proposed allocating more resources into sports development in order to boost the utilisation rate. He also proposed organising windsurfing events since the Sports Park was near the waterfront.

24. **Mr KWAN Ho-yeung** pointed out that the indoor sports centre was pretty large in size. Therefore, apart from venues for conventional ball games, he wondered whether indoor venues would be provided for less popular sports such as handball, indoor football and netball.

25. **Miss KWONG Po-yin** expressed concern about the future traffic conditions. She hoped that the HAB could provide a detailed transportation plan. In addition, she hoped that the Sports Park would include facilities for some less popular sports such as rock climbing, boating and rowing for residents' use.

26. **Miss LEUNG Yuen-ting** said that she did not object to the development of the Sports Park, but the HAB must improve the ancillary transport facilities. She pointed out that the existing transport facilities in Kai Tak were definitely not enough to accommodate tens of thousands of people.

27. **Ms Linda LAW of the HAB** made the following consolidated reply:

- (i) the land for erecting structures within the Sports Park had been used up. The remaining land, including seven hectares of open space, could not be used for erecting structures. The HAB promised to study the feasibility of building an indoor swimming pool at the proposed indoor sports centres, in order to meet the residents' aspiration;

- (ii) the SCL would be a major transport means to the Sports Park, which would be covered by To Kwa Wan Station and Kai Tak Station. She said that the Sports Centre would not be commissioned until the SCL was open to traffic. The project would feature two public transport interchanges, which were both about 700 metres from the main stadium. The consultancy study estimated that the interchanges would be able to divert 50,000 people within 30 to 45 minutes. The HAB would consider the possibility of opening up water links. It called on members of the public to use public transport instead of private vehicles for major events whenever possible. There would also be a large number of coach parking spaces inside the Sports Park for use by organisations.
- (iii) the Environmental Impact Assessment Report would present the relevant noise data and would be released for public information upon completion;
- (iv) the HAB had been maintaining contact with Hong Kong Paralympic Committee and the Hong Kong Society for Rehabilitation for their opinions on the design of the Sports Park, which would feature not only facilities for all members of the public, but venues for Paralympic events as well;
- (v) when there were no major sports events, the venues would be open for public use in order to improve the utilisation rate. The indoor sports centre would adopt a multi-purpose design which could accommodate all indoor sports, including less popular items such as rock climbing, handball, indoor football and netball;
- (vi) the HAB would actively study the feasibility of constructing a water sports centre within Metro Park. Accordingly, the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter and the Kai Tak Approach Channel could be used for some water sports activities such as dragon boat racing and boating on calm waters, which, however, might be unsuitable for windsurfing events;

- (vii) since the CEDD was still studying the monorail alignment, no specific route or station could be provided at the moment; and
- (viii) space had been reserved at the Sports Park for various outdoor ball game courts.

28. **Mr HE Huahan** thanked the HAB for its active search for land for the swimming pool. He hoped that the HAB could speed up the feasibility study for the indoor swimming pool construction and disclose the relevant implementation timetable.

29. **Mr HO Hin-ming** wondered whether the public engagement activities would allow members of the public to express their views so as to foster interactive exchanges.

30. **Ms Linda LAW of the HAB** made the following consolidated reply:

- (i) the proposal on the indoor swimming pool construction would be planned under the procedures of public works projects in general, and the LCSD was having preliminary discussions with relevant departments; and
- (ii) the public engagement activities and the Sports Park website would feature a questionnaire to collect public views on the related positioning, functions, facilities and usage. There would also be interactive discussions with the public during roving exhibitions.

31. **The Chairman** suggested Members invite HAB representatives to introduce Kai Tai Sports Park at local schools and residents' meetings. He summarised that Members noted the progress of Kai Tak Sports Park, and moved on to discussions about Paper No. 35/16.

32. **Ms Selina LI of the LCSD** introduced the Paper.

33. **Mr HE Huahan** pointed out that the site of Kai Tak Avenue Park had been enclosed by wire fences for more than three years, which caused serious

environmental hygiene problems. He opined that the project was urgent. He pointed out that the expenditures on the site had amounted to more than \$400,000 between 2014 and 2016 and that acceleration of the project could reduce further unnecessary expenditures. He said the project was not complicated and was supported by Members. He thus enquired about the reasons for the delay in implementation.

34. **Ms Selina LI of the LCSD** expressed her understanding of Members' concerns. She promised to reflect their views to relevant departments for the sake of more appropriate allocation of resources.

35. **Mr HE Huahan** further questioned about any particular difficulties that LCSD encountered in implementing the project.

36. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** said that there might be much further waiting based on the current funding approval progress, and that the related expenditures during the process might suffice for the construction of Kai Tak Avenue Park. He thus hoped that the LCSD could consider allocate resources to facilitate the project.

37. **The Chairman** enquired about the waiting time for upgrading a project from Category B to Category A. He also wondered whether there were any other means to expedite the project apart from the capital works projects.

38. **Ms Selina LI of the LCSD** replied that the LCSD understood Members' concerns and the residents' expectations. Although the ArchSD had completed the design of Kai Tak Avenue Park, the project was included into the capital works projects due to its scale, it thus was subject to related procedures and a funding application should be submitted to the Legislative Council. However, the time required to implement a capital works project depended on a number of factors, including the urgency, scope, complexity and available resources of the project concerned. The LCSD was working hard to file funding application under the established mechanism, so that the project could commence and the facility could be open for public use as early as possible.

39. **Mr HE Huahan** suggested writing to the LCSD in the name of the Committee to express its concern about Kai Tak Avenue Park and the urgency of its construction.

40. **The Chairman** asked the Secretariat to send a letter to the LCSD in the

name of the LDFMC to express the concern about the expenditures on Kai Tak Avenue Park and the hope for the LCSD to expedite the implementation of the project.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat had sent a letter to the LCSD on 2 June 2016 in the name of the LDFMC to relay the Committee's views.)

Expenses for Replacement Works for the Audio Equipment at Hung Hom Community Hall

(Paper No. 25/16)

41. **Mr Vincent LEUNG, District Secretary of the Kowloon City District Office (KCDO)** introduced the Paper.

42. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** expressed his consent to and support for the project, but he hoped that the responsible departments would carefully consider the quality and useful life of audio equipment when making procurement, so as to avoid wasting public money.

43. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** enquired why the audio equipment was damaged and whether the existing equipment did not meet the needs of venue users. He suggested acquiring a set of audio equipment which could meet the needs of users for the better use of resources.

44. **Mr YEUNG Chun-yu** enquired whether audio equipment of the same brand was used in other community halls and the length of its useful life.

45. **Mr LUK King-kwong** asked the KCDO to investigate the cause of damage to the audio equipment.

46. **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** suspected that the damage was caused by human factors. He suggested that the KCDO should find out the mode of operation by users and take the initiative to contact the manufacturer to ascertain the cause of damage.

47. **Mr Vincent LEUNG of the KCDO** said that he would need to contact relevant departments for further information before reporting back to the Committee.

48. **The Chairman** pointed out that if the funding application concerned could not be approved at this meeting, the community hall would be unable to provide audio

equipment for venue users. He enquired whether Members agreed to firstly approve the related funding application, while the KCDO would give an explanation by papers later.

49. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** pointed out that most venue users had their own audio equipment. He opined that the KCDO should first understand their needs in that regard.

50. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** hoped that the KCDO would identify the cause of damage to the audio equipment. He suggested that a decision be made only after relevant departments had collected more information and provided a better purchase proposal.

51. **Mr LAI Kwong-wai** enquired about the number of loudspeakers at Hung Hom Community Hall. He suggested the KCDO examine all the loudspeakers in the community hall as well.

52. **Mr Vincent LEUNG of the KCDO** responded that there were only two sets of audio equipment, including the left one and the right one, at Hung Hom Community Hall. But the bass sound function of the equipment was not working any more.

53. **Mr SIU Leong-sing** suggested that the views of Members be sought later by circulation of the Paper and that the funding application be approved.

54. **Mr HO Hin-ming** asked the KCDO to provide a detailed report on the performance of the audio equipment and a detailed quotation for the replacement. He also suggested the KCDO consider a repair option.

55. **The Chairman** asked the KCDO to obtain all the above required information from the EMSD. He authorised Mr HO Hin-ming and Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming to contact the KCDO for details and to make decisions on behalf of all Members regarding the purchase of audio equipment.

56. **The Committee** unanimously endorsed the above proposed authorisation.

(Post-meeting note: On 14 June 2016, the KCDO invited the representatives of the EMSD and Shun Hing Technology Co. Ltd., the audio system contractor, to meet with Mr HO Hin-ming and Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming at Hung Hom Community Hall, in

order to explain the cause of damage and the proposed improvements in detail to the two councillors. After the meeting, Mr HO Hin-ming and Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming agreed that a sum of \$200,000 be allocated from the LDFMC's DMW fund to the project.)

Social Innovation Project of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University: Green Deck - Innovative Plan for Solving the Problems in Areas around Hung Hom (Paper No. 26/16)

57. **Mr Alex LUI of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University** (PolyU) introduced the Paper.

58. **Mr HO Hin-ming** expressed support for the PolyU's plan, but he opined that, unlike underground shopping malls, the plan would not easily obtain support from the Government due to its lack of economic incentives.

59. **Miss KWONG Po-yin** opined that the PolyU should explain specifically how the Green Deck could be aligned with the transport network system to address the bus waiting problem faced by members of the public. She also suggested the PolyU carefully consider how to address the problems deriving from the enclosure of the Hung Hom Cross Harbour Tunnel (CHT) when constructing the Green Deck. Besides, she was concerned about the future management of the Green Deck.

60. **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** was worried that the construction cost of the Green Deck would be too high. He opined that although the air quality around the CHT would improve, the air pollution on the ground might virtually become more severe.

61. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** opined that the PolyU needed to study the problems arising from the enclosure of the CHT. And he expressed concern about the accumulation of emissions and the bus waiting problem.

62. **Mr NG Fan-kam** doubted whether members of the public would use the Green Deck and whether the plan could improve the congestion of the CHT. He enquired about the time needed to build the deck.

63. **Mr Terence SIU** suggested the PolyU explain in detail how the plan could deal with air pollution by means of technologies. He opined that there would be great difficulties in implementing the plan, and that the PolyU needed to actively

coordinate with the Government in that regard.

64. **Mr TING Kin-wa** opined that the construction cost of the Green Deck would be too high and that the plan could not gain public support unless it would generate sufficient economic benefits.

65. **Mr Alex LUI of the PolyU** thanked Members for their support and made the following consolidated reply:

- (i) he agreed that the construction cost of the deck would be high, but pointed out that the mezzanine floor of the deck could be used for commercial purposes;
- (ii) he acknowledged the bus waiting problem and promised to find further solutions if the plan was considered worthy of further studies. He also pointed out that the plan would not solve the CHT's congestion problem. But he believed that the congestion would be greatly relieved after the commissioning of the SCL and after the return of the Eastern Harbour Crossing to the Government for management in 2017;
- (iii) he acknowledged the severe air pollution near the CHT. Therefore, it was proposed in the plan that the exhaust gas below the Green Deck be collected and cleaned before it was discharged. He said that the PolyU could arrange an introduction of the study on air purification by the dedicated professor to Members if they were interested; and
- (iv) he said that members of the public could easily reach the Green Deck through the green pedestrian walkway.

66. **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** pointed out that congestion of the CHT was mainly caused by buses. He believed the plan would gain greater support if it could guide buses through the deck and then into the CHT in an orderly manner.

67. **The Chairman** thanked the PolyU for the presentation and expressed support for the PolyU to continue with the plan.

Complaints against Noises from the Pet Garden at the Sitting-out Area in Hung Ling Street Late at Night

(Paper No. 27/16)

68. Paper No. 27/16 was submitted by **the Chairman**, who asked the Vice-chairman to preside over the discussion of the agenda item for the avoidance of conflict of interest.

69. **The Chairman** introduced the Paper.

70. **The Vice-chairman** invited Members to refer to the written response of Tabled Paper No. 1 as submitted by the LCSD.

71. **Mr HO Hin-ming** enquired whether Member of the constituency concerned had promised to embark on a site inspection with LCSD staff and members of the Owners' Committee of Royal Peninsula late at night.

72. **The Chairman** expressed his strong support for the LCSD's arrangement and recommended the LCSD invite Mr LAM Tak-shing, Member of the constituency concerned, to participate in the site inspection.

73. **Mr LAM Tak-shing** agreed to the above arrangement.

74. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** welcomed all Members to take part in the site inspection.

Call for Renovating Facilities at the Playground in Oxford Road and Sitting-out Area in Ngai Tsin Wai Road

(Paper No. 28/16)

75. Paper No. 28/16 was jointly signed by Mr TING Kin-wa and Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming, and was introduced by **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** as the representative.

76. **The Vice-chairman** invited Members to refer to the written response of Tabled Paper No. 2 as submitted by the LCSD.

Request for the Early Construction of a Heritage Trail in Kowloon City

(Paper No. 29/16)

77. Paper No. 29/16 was jointly signed by the Hon Starry LEE, Mr LUK

King-kwong, Mr PUN Kwok-wah, Mr NG Po-keung, Mr NG Fan-kam, Mr Terence SIU, Mr KWAN Ho-yeung and Mr LAM Tak-shing, and was introduced by **Mr Terence SIU** as the representative.

78. **The Vice-chairman** invited Members to refer to the written response of Tabled Paper No. 3 as submitted by the Development Bureau (DEVB).

79. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** expressed disappointment that the DEVB did not send representative to attend the meeting. He pointed out that according to the written response by the DEVB, if a heritage trail was to be set up in Kowloon City District, the Government would be more than pleased to provide related information and technical advice so as to assist in the implementation of the setting-up work. He opined that the DEVB did not clearly state the stance of the Government and did not provide a specific direction for the facilitation of the Heritage Trail in Kowloon City District.

80. **Mr Terence SIU** expressed regret that the DEVB did not send representative to attend the meeting. He opined that the Government should play a leading and coordinating role on the issue. He said that the Kowloon City DC (KCDC) would be willing to communicate with the Government on the issue, but the Government just took an evasive attitude. Therefore he expressed disappointment on behalf of Kowloon City residents. He pointed out that compared with textbooks, the Heritage Trail would be a good way to develop and enhance the sense of belonging of local students.

81. **The Vice-chairman** asked the Secretariat to reflect Members' views to the DEVB.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat had already reflected Members' views to the DEVB at the request of the Committee.)

Requesting the LCSD to Build a Flower Corridor at Parks in Kowloon City District for the Enjoyment of the Public
(Paper No. 30/16)

82. Paper No. 30/16 was jointly signed by the Hon Starry LEE, Mr LUK King-kwong, Mr PUN Kwok-wah, Mr NG Po-keung, Mr NG Fan-kam, Mr Terence SIU, Mr KWAN Ho-yeung and Mr LAM Tak-shing, and was introduced by **Mr LAM Tak-shing** as the representative.

83. **The Chairman** invited Members to refer to the written response of Tabled Paper No. 4 as submitted by the LCSD.

84. **Miss KWONG Po-yin** suggested the LCSD consider planting flowers of more different colours.

85. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** said that Members' advice was noted.

Call for Enhancing the Management of the Rest Garden at the East Kowloon Corridor
(Paper No. 31/16)

86. Paper No. 31/16 was jointly signed by the Hon Starry LEE and Mr KWAN Ho-yeung, and was introduced by **Mr KWAN Ho-yeung** as the representative.

87. **The Chairman** invited Members to refer to the written response of Tabled Paper No. 5 as submitted by the LCSD.

88. **Mr KWAN Ho-yeung** would like to have more specific and detailed information, including the frequency of the LCSD's regular cleaning of the park, as well as the number of advice or summons issued by duty officers against smoking offenders. He also pointed out the problem of mismatch of resources in the rest garden. He proposed re-planning of the rest garden, for example, elderly fitness area could be added and the Community Garden Programme could be implemented in the rest garden, so as to encourage nearby residents and students to appreciate flowers or grow fruits and vegetables in the garden.

89. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** said that East Kowloon Way Flyover Rest Garden was located underneath a flyover and the air quality was poor. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, it was not intended for dynamic activities; therefore it mainly featured passive facilities. The rest garden was not qualified for the LCSD's Community Garden Programme, in that there was no venue management staff and sufficient sunlight, for example. Staff of the Kowloon City District Leisure Services Office patrolled and inspected the site every day and would immediately stop any illegal smoking discovered. The LCSD planned to conduct a joint operation with the Tobacco Control Office (TCO) on 11 May 2016 and would maintain close cooperation with the TCO to prosecute offenders for the sake of effective deterrence.

90. **Mr KWAN Ho-yeung** said that there was still the problem of mismatch of resources about the garden. He asked the LCSD for advice on other passive activities. He said that the rest garden was full of cigarette butts and strange odour. He asked the LCSD to provide a plan for the re-planning of the rest garden. In addition, he enquired about the number of prosecutions against smoking offenders and that of the LCSD's cleaning of the rest garden. He requested the LCSD to provide related information after the meeting.

91. **Mr LUK King-kwong** opined that there had been already adequate sunshine and water in the rest garden. The LCSD only needed to deploy venue management staff before it could implement the Community Garden Programme in East Kowloon Way Flyover Rest Garden, just like Kowloon Tsai Park. He suggested the LCSD study the feasibility in that regard.

92. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** promised to provide Members with relevant data after the meeting. She explained that Kowloon Tsai Park was a large leisure facility, with sufficient manpower to manage the day-to-day operation. That was why the LCSD chose the park for the Community Garden Programme. Plants in East Kowloon Way Flyover Rest Garden were not growing well because of the unsatisfactory environment, so that shade-tolerant plants were grown there. With regard to creating a permanent post for East Kowloon Way Flyover Rest Garden, it would require sufficient workloads and grounds. The LCSD understood the needs of local residents for the Community Garden Programme and would actively study and identify suitable places for community gardens.

(Post-meeting note: The LCSD had already provided Mr KWAN Ho-yeung with relevant information after the meeting.)

Call for Improving the Facilities of the Sitting-out Areas in Kwei Chow Street / Yuk Yat Street
(Paper No. 32/16)

93. Paper No. 32/16 was submitted by Mr PUN Kwok-wah. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** pointed out that the sitting-out area was covered with luxuriant plants and was barely visible from outside, which posed safety problems. He also enquired whether the LCSD could firstly take remedial measures to address the problems of water leakage at shade structures and of worn-out seats.

94. **The Chairman** invited Members to refer to the written response of Tabled Paper No. 6 as submitted by the LCSD.

95. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** promised to work with the ArchSD on improvement measures.

(Post-meeting note: The LCSD had already provided Mr PUN Kwok-wah with relevant information after the meeting.)

**Upgrading the Facilities of the Park at Ho Man Tin East Service Reservoir
(Paper No. 33/16)**

96. Paper No. 33/16 was submitted and introduced by **Mr LUK King-kwong**.

97. **The Chairman** invited Members to refer to the written response of Tabled Paper No. 7 as submitted by the LCSD.

98. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** said that residents complained about how they could easily trip over the anchorage point of the boundary fence of the soccer pitch. He enquired whether the LCSD could carry out the improvement works at the same time in order to avoid accidents.

99. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** said that Members' views were noted and that the LCSD would work with the ArchSD on improvements.

100. **Mr LUK King-kwong** said that he could not understand why it was inappropriate to install drinking fountains at the sitting-out area. He pointed out that the lack of foul sewers was not directly related to the installation of drinking fountains. He asked the LCSD to further study the feasibility with the ArchSD.

101. **Mr NG Po-keung** cited the example of drinking fountains installed at Kowloon Walled City Park. He pointed out that the ArchSD had said how pipe connection would increase the project cost, which proved the technical feasibility of the drinking fountain installation. He suggested the LCSD obtain the quotation from the ArchSD to assess whether the proposal was value-for-money before making a decision.

102. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** pointed out that drinking fountains were generally installed near water sources. Arrangements could be made for the ArchSD

to explain the matter to Members and to provide technical advice in that regard.

103. **Mr LEE Pao-wan, Deputy District Leisure Manager (Kowloon City) 2 of the LCSD** added that according to the ArchSD's advice, water flowing from the drinking fountains should be treated as sewage. Therefore, the installation of drinking fountains would be subject to the connection to a sewerage system. The ArchSD said that there were technical difficulties in installing drinking fountains at Ho Man Tin East Sitting-out Area, where no sewerage system was available.

104. **The Chairman** enquired whether there were stormwater drains at Ho Man Tin East Sitting-out Area.

105. **Mr LEE Pao-wan of the LCSD** responded that generally there were stormwater drains within such a venue.

106. **The Chairman** said that the construction of foul sewers was high. He suggested the LCSD enquire of the ArchSD about the feasibility of building a filter well to treat water flowing from the drinking fountains or coming in contact with the mouths of users, before it was discharged to stormwater drains.

107. **Mr LUK King-kwong** said that he supported the Chairman's proposal and asked the LCSD to study the addition of drinking fountains.

108. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** said that Members' views were noted and that the ArchSD's representatives and related Members would be invited for a site inspection.

Inadequacy and Ageing of the Facilities at Hutchison Park (Paper No. 36/16)

109. Paper No. 36/16 was submitted and introduced by **Mr Admond YUE**, who asked the LCSD to re-plan the park.

110. **The Chairman** invited Members to refer to the written response of Tabled Paper No. 10 as submitted by the LCSD.

111. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** said that some improvement works would be completed between April and June this year. Since the re-planning of the park was a large-scale project, it would take time to negotiate with the ArchSD and to

apply for funding. Besides, it would be necessary to tie in with the planning and working schedule of related departments. The LCSD noted Members' opinions and would submit improvement and maintenance proposals to the ArchSD.

112. **Mr Admond YUE** pointed out that Mr LEE Pao-wan, Deputy District Leisure Manager (Kowloon City) 2 of the LCSD, had promised to actively apply for funding in phases to improve the park. He hoped that the LCSD could address the ageing problem of the park as soon as possible.

113. **The Chairman** enquired how often the LCSD renovated a park and whether there were any internal guidelines for reference.

114. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** said that there was no fixed frequency for park renovation. Generally speaking, refurbishment and improvement works were carried out in phases in order to effectively utilise the resources, as well as to minimise the impacts on the overall operation and users of the park. The LCSD would carry out improvement works on the park based on the actual conditions.

115. **Mr Admond YUE** asked the LCSD to provide the working schedule in response to residents' enquiries.

116. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** said that the LCSD would review the conditions of facilities and work with the ArchSD on the repair or replacement of any facilities which were damaged or had exceeded the utilisation period. The Kowloon City District Leisure Services Office would further exchange views with Mr Admond YUE on his concern.

Call for Extinguishing Mosquitoes at Kau Pui Lung Road Playground (Paper No. 37/16)

117. Paper No. 37/16 was jointly signed by Mr YANG Wing-kit and Mr Jimmy LAM, and was introduced by **Mr YANG Wing-kit** as the representative.

118. **The Chairman** invited Members to refer to the written response of Tabled Paper No. 11 as submitted by the LCSD.

Request for Placing More Locker Cabinets near Ko Shan Road Park Soccer Pitch (Paper No. 38/16)

119. Paper No. 38/16 was jointly signed by Mr YANG Wing-kit and Mr Jimmy LAM, and was presented by **Mr Jimmy LAM** as the representative.

120. **The Chairman** invited Members to refer to the written response of Tabled Paper No. 12 as submitted by the LCSD.

Departmental Reports

The LCSD's Report on the Sports and Physical Recreation Activities Organised in Kowloon City District and the Management of Facilities (Paper No. 39/16)

121. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** introduced the Paper.

122. **The Chairman** proposed firstly discussing the morning opening hours of Hoi Sham Park.

123. **Mr KWAN Ho-yeung** said that he had previously visited the site together with the Hon Starry LEE and Mr PUN Kwok-wah between 5:30 a.m. to 7:30 a.m. to observe the residents' reactions. He pointed out that most users objected to the delay in the opening time and the closure of one of the washrooms. They said it was inconvenient for wheelchair users. He hoped that the LCSD's arrangements could be more people-oriented. He also suggested the LCSD explain related arrangements to park users on a regular basis and take the opportunity to listen to residents' views. He pointed out that there were more users of the basketball court and the soccer pitches of the park in the morning during summer time. He opined that the LCSD should adjust the opening hours in a more flexible manner.

124. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** suggested that, after the trial period, the LCSD should invite different stakeholders, including park users and nearby residents, to jointly communicate and address problems arising from the adjustment of the opening hours.

125. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** suggested the LCSD resume the original opening hours, so that morning exercisers could continue to use the basketball court and the soccer pitches. Besides, he suggested that in the morning hours, the LCSD only allowed users with bookings into the basketball court, so as to minimise nuisance to residents. He also supported opening up the basketball court to users participating in passive activities.

126. **Mr Jimmy LAM** suggested the LCSD deploy staff to encourage basketball players to go to the nearby venue in King Wan Street instead. He opined that people playing Tai Chi on the basketball court and the soccer pitches only generated very little noise. He also enquired whether the LCSD could install sound-proof basketball backboards instead, so as to reduce the noise nuisance. Besides, with the arrival of summer, more residents went to morning exercise before work. Therefore, with a delay in the opening time, some employees might have to settle for walking or running outside the park. And with less space for exercise, they would be more likely to bump into elderly citizens. Therefore he hoped that the LCSD could adjust the opening hours of the park.

127. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** pointed out that members of the public could use the basketball court even without bookings, they could use the basketball court which was unbooked. The LCSD would monitor the washroom arrangements and make appropriate improvements. The LCSD could arrange an exchange session for different stakeholders and Members to exchange their views, while the trial period could also be presented and explained to stakeholders at the same occasion. In view of the fact that not a single programme could meet the requirements of all stakeholders, mutual understanding and concession between stakeholders would be required to reach a consensus and to balance different needs. For example, basketball players might felt dissatisfied if they were asked to go to King Wan Street instead and give up the court to morning exercisers. However, the proposal could be discussed at the exchange session. At the previous LDFMC meeting, it was decided that the later opening time would be effective for four months on a trial basis and would be reviewed at the end of July. She suggested that the pilot scheme be continued and promised to report on views from the exchange session at the next meeting.

128. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** suggested the LCSD firstly open up the soccer pitches, then gradually some parts of the basketball court for public use, so as to observe the residents' reaction.

129. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** said that the LCSD conducted a headcount of users of the basketball court and the soccer pitches between 6 and 20 October 2015, during that time the weather and temperature were suitable for outdoor activities. The LCSD had replaced the backboards, which resulted in a significant decrease in the noise of ball bouncing compared with the old type. The LCSD

respected Members' advice and would follow the KCDC's decision.

130. **The Chairman** pointed out that the four-month trial period was determined at the previous meeting, and that any change should be decided upon at this meeting.

131. **Mr KWAN Ho-yeung** was in favour of the establishment of a discussion platform, so that stakeholders could exchange views for appropriate adjustments.

132. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** opined that the decision on large-scale enclosure was made because it might be difficult to enclose certain parts of the basketball court. He said that he would support partial enclosure if it was feasible.

133. **Mr LEE Pao-wan of the LCSD** said that partial enclosure would be feasible with cordons and mills barriers. The LCSD had received complaints from residents about the noise of basketball players as well as the music from morning exercisers.

134. **The Chairman** suggested the LCSD set up a communication platform as soon as possible and invite concerned residents and stakeholders for an exchange of views. He also proposed inviting Members who had spoken on the matter to attend the session for discussions on adjusting the opening hours of the basketball court and to report the results at the next meeting.

135. **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** declared that he was a dog owner and that his residence was closed to the Fat Kwong Street Flyover near Sheung Shing Street Park or Pui Ching Road Rest Garden. He pointed out that neither place fell under his constituency, and said that Mr NG Fan-kam, Member of the constituency concerned, did not find them as appropriate sites. He reflected that the LCSD handled the matter inappropriately and leaked out the proposal of constructing pet parks at the said places. As a result, local residents blamed him and were discontented. He felt that it was unfair to him. He said the KCDC would eventually have only two options, either to cease the discussion on the proposal of building a pet park in Ho Man Tin, or to request the KCDO to conduct a public opinion survey to see if the proposed sites were suitable for a pet park. He also said that he had found a possible new site for the pet park but could not disclose further details at KCDC meetings.

136. **Mr NG Fan-kam** said that Member who suggested the related proposal should take the initiative to find a suitable place for a pet park within his own constituency rather than in other areas. He disagreed with the proposal of building a

pet park under the flyover near Fat Kwong Street at Pui Ching Road Rest Garden. He opined that the construction of a pet park in such a bustling place would cause controversy among the residents. He hoped that the LCSD would continue to search for another suitable site for the pet park.

137. **Miss Sylvia TANG of the LCSD** acknowledged that setting up a pet park was a controversial issue. However, the LCSD had been working hard to find a suitable site and opinions from Members were welcome. She said that the LCSD would consider various proposals and send staff to inspect proposed sites to study their feasibility. She enquired whether the KCDC decided not to consider the construction of pet parks at Sheung Shing Street Park or Pui Ching Road Rest Garden (under the flyover near Fat Kwong Street) at the moment.

138. **The Chairman** opined that the LCSD should continue with the district consultation on Sheung Shing Street Park and should not go back on its words. Besides, he suggested the LCSD continue to follow up on the new site discovered by Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming.

(Post-meeting note: The LCSD had consulted Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming after the meeting but found the site inappropriate for a pet park.)

The LCSD's Report on the Free Local Civic Programmes, District Arts and Cultural Activities Organised in Kowloon City District and the Use of Cultural Facilities

(Paper No. 40/16)

139. **Mr Alex CHEUNG, Senior Manager (Kowloon Western/Cultural Services) of the LCSD** introduced the Paper.

140. **The Committee** noted the Paper.

The LCSD's Report on Public Library Promotion Activities and Use of Library Facilities in Kowloon City District

(Paper No. 41/16)

141. **Mr LO Hing Kwan, Senior Librarian (Kowloon City) of the LCSD** introduced the Paper.

142. **The Committee** noted the Paper.

Date of Next Meeting

143. **The Chairman** declared that the time and date of next meeting would be at 2:30 p.m. on 30 June 2016 (Thursday) while the deadline for submission of documents would be 15 June 2016. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

144. The minutes of this meeting were confirmed on 30 June 2016.

The Chairman

The Secretary

Kowloon City District Council Secretariat
June 2016