

**Minutes of the 6th Meeting of  
the Leisure and District Management Facilities Committee  
of Kowloon City District Council**

Date: 10 November 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: Dr KWONG Po-yin

Mr HO Hin-ming, MH (Left at 5:00 p.m.)

Mr CHO Wui-hung

Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming

Mr NG Fan-kam, Tony

Mr LO Chiu-kit (Left at 5:27 p.m.)

Mr TING Kin-wa

Mr LAM Tak-shing

Mr LAM Pok, Jimmy

Mr YUE Chee-wing, Admond (Left at 5:17 p.m.)

Mr YEUNG Chun-yu, Ronald

Mr HE Huahan

Mr YANG Wing-kit

Mr KWAN Ho-yeung, Roger

Mr LAI Kwong-wai

The Hon LEE Wai-king, Starry, (Arrived at 4:37 p.m.)

SBS, JP (Left at 5:25 p.m.)

Mr SIU Leong-sing (Left at 5:09 p.m.)

Mr LUK King-kwong

Mr SIU Tin-hung, Terence

Mr NG Po-keung (Arrived at 3:00 p.m.)

Mr PUN Kwok-wah

Secretary: Miss CHEUNG Wing-yi, Jenny Executive Officer (District Council) 3,  
Kowloon City District Office

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
	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) <sup>2</sup> , Leisure and Cultural Services Department
	Ms HO Wing-sze, Marianna	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:

Item 3	Mr CHAN Tsz-fung	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
	Mr Raymond LAU	Senior Project Manager 332, Architectural Services Department
	Ms LAM Wai-ki, Vicky	Project Manager 376, Architectural Services Department
	Mr Thomas WAN	Senior Architect/25, Architectural Services Department
	Mr LEUNG Kin-hong	Architect/205, Architectural Services Department
	Ms Hoi Ka-wai	Architect/203, Architectural Services Department
Item 4	Mr PONG Wing-ho	Assistant Police Community Relations Officer (Kowloon City District), Hong Kong Police Force
	Mr Chau Hing-lung	Community Liaison Officer (Kowloon City District), Hong Kong Police Force

\* \* \* \* \*

**The Chairman** welcomed Members, representatives of government departments to the meeting. He also welcomed Ms Marianna HO who had replaced Mr CHEUNG Kwok-wai, Alex as Senior Manager (Kowloon West/Cultural Services) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD). **The Chairman** expressed heartfelt appreciation to Mr Alex CHEUNG for his contribution to the Committee in the past.

2. **The Chairman** reminded Members that if matters to be discussed later on should come into conflict with Members' personal interests such as property ownership, occupation or investment, the Member should declare the matter before the discussion, so that the Chairman

could consider whether to request the Member concerned to withdraw from the meeting when discussion or voting was conducted.

### **Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting**

3. **The Secretariat** received a proposal of amendment from a Member prior to the meeting, and the amended minutes of the 5th meeting had been delivered to Members for reference before the meeting. The Secretariat then had received no further amendment or disagreement, and the minutes of the 5th meeting were unanimously confirmed by Members.

### **District Minor Works Projects**

#### **Minor Improvement Works for the Recreation Area under the LCSD in 2016-17 (Paper No. 65/16)**

4. **Ms Brenda YEUNG, District Leisure Manager/Kowloon City** of the LCSD introduced the Paper.

5. After discussion, **the Committee** approved the proposal and allocation of funds for one district minor improvement works.

<u>Work Title</u>	<u>Estimates</u>
Replacement of part of air-conditioning system in Kowloon City Sports Centre	HK\$173,000

6. **The Chairman** requested Members to note the progress of the 15 LCSD-led district minor improvement works projects and the report of expenditure of various projects as contained in Annex II.

### **Discussion Items**

#### **Planning and Design of the Kai Tak Station Square Project (Paper No. 66/16)**

7. **Mr CHAN Tsz-fung, Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 6 of LCSD** and **Mr LEUNG Kin-hong, Architect/205 of the Architectural Services Department (ASD)** introduced the Paper.

8. **Mr HE Huahan** said that he supported the design of Kai Tak Station Square (the Square). He also proposed the construction of a covered walkway joining the two primary schools and one secondary school by the side of Tak Long Estate and the residences behind One Kai Tak. In addition, he pointed out that as there were many passive open spaces in the project, and he worried that they might become converging spots for foreign domestic helpers on holidays in the future. In such case, residents' use of the facilities and impression of tourists would be adversely affected. As such, he enquired the Department whether it had corresponding management measures. He was also concerned about the design of the piazza because of its proximity to Kai Ching Estate, Tak Long Estate and De Novo. He proposed that resolution should start at the design level in order to mitigate the future noise nuisance that might be caused by users to residents in the vicinity. Furthermore, he opined that the design of the Square had failed to show the symbolic nature of the landmark. He thus hoped that elements such as the old Kai Tak Airport would be incorporated so that the symbolic nature of the landmark could be strengthened.

9. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** proposed that the design of the Square could consider the planting of ornamental trees such as ginkgo, etc. In addition, he said that two bowling greens might be too many and he proposed that part of the venue should be converted into other recreational and sports facilities. He was also concerned about the potential noise pollution of the Square, and hoped that the relevant departments would learn from experiences and formulate proposals of noise management and options to address the issue so as to prevent the noise nuisance issue at Hoi Sham Park from occurring again.

10. **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** opined that the design of the Square had too many covered walkways and blockage, resulting in a sense of oppression. It also lacked the grandeur of openness and extensiveness, and it was incomparable to piazzas overseas. In addition, there were too many hidden partitions in the Square, which could attract street sleepers and bring forth other problems of security and management.

11. **Mr HE Huahan** opined that there was not adequate land and too large a population in Hong Kong and thus it was hard to speak of grandeur in design of the Square. Maximum use should be made of the land, which could be used for public housing or residences. He said that there were too many lawns, which would bring about the issue of maintenance. He proposed the installation of more covered land and facilities such as pergolas and seats to be used by members of the public. As many people would walk past the Square, he proposed that a large information screen be installed to provide convenience for passers-by. He enquired whether the

Square was to commemorate anything and pointed out that many proposals of landmark or historical landmarks had been put forward at past meetings. He hoped that relevant departments would take note of these. He also hoped that the Department could provide the position of entrances and exits of the underground street so as to ensure that it was suitable for use by residents and elderlies of the district. He also enquired whether ASD had considered that the Planning Department (PlanD) recently proposed to the Town Planning Board (TPB) that the plot ratio of Kai Tak Development Area (KTDA) be increased. He was concerned whether the ancillary facilities of the Square could tie in with the growth in population density brought about by the relevant proposal.

12. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** enquired about the main target of service and goal of the Square. If it mainly served residents of the district, it might turn out to be another rest garden. If its target was mainly to attract tourists, then the existing design might not be able to attract visitors and special design of a landmark should be conceived. She hoped that the Department would determine the positioning of the Square to avoid its lack of use in the future.

13. **Mr CHO Wui-hung** asked if wireless broadband service would be provided at the Square which would be the landmark of Kowloon City in the future. In addition, he was concerned about management issues of the Square, such as noise nuisance, withered plants, street performers raising funds and risk caused by children riding bicycles. The issue of noise nuisance was particularly difficult to manage effectively. He also supported the planting of ornamental trees to give people an impression of splendor and grandeur.

14. **Mr LUK King-kwong** hoped that ASD would clearly determine the positioning of the Square. Apart from making reference to Western architectural aesthetics, consideration should also be given to past experiences in managing parks. This would help avoid losing the original character and ensure that the design of the Square could achieve effectiveness and sustainability for users of the venue. He also enquired whether there would be bicycle rental shops in the Square. He also proposed to the relevant departments that in selecting the species of plants, practical consideration should be accorded to issues of management, life expectancy and risks of plants, etc.

15. **Mr LAM Tak-shing** hoped that the Square could provide wireless broadband service. He was also concerned about the transport ancillary facilities of the Square, such as whether public transport and parking spaces would be able to meet the needs of additional pedestrian flow and those of nearby Kai Tak residents. He said that as the area of the Square was large, clear and easily comprehensible signs should be erected. Barrier-free accesses had to be

installed for needs of various users. Seasonality and sustainability of species should be taken into account by the Department in their selection of flowers and trees, as that would avoid high maintenance fees. In addition, he opined that the design of the Square should be able to display the historical values and changes of Kai Tak, and that a most representative district logo should be selected.

16. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** said that he accepted the design of the Square but he was particularly concerned about management issues such as noise nuisance, as the incident at Hoi Sham Park had reflected that existing legislations could not effectively regulate noise nuisance. He also proposed that trees of different seasonality should be planted at various sections so that views would not be affected when most plants withered in winter. He pointed out that the design of the pool was too passive and he hoped that dynamic elements such as a pond for model boats, a small music fountain and light projection could be incorporated to attract crowds.

17. **Mr NG Fan-kam** proposed that trees could provide shade better than covered walkways as the latter might lead to the accumulation of withered leaves and garbage. He anticipated that the Square would attract a large amount of tourists, so the departments concerned had to ensure that there were adequate parking spaces for tourist coaches and toilets to meet the needs. He supported the introduction of automated bicycle rental service at the Square. With regard to the conception of transforming level land into slope, he opined that the effects would be unsatisfactory and inconvenience would be caused to users such as the elderlies.

18. **Mr Terence SIU** said that he supported the design of the Square in principle. He opined that the design of ASD was ambitious and as it hoped that a major international square would be built. However, the Shatin to Central Link Kai Tak Station (Kai Tak Station) alone might not be adequate to attract tourists to the Square. Furthermore, there were not adequate transport facilities travelling between Sung Wong Toi, Ma Tau Kok and Kowloon City old district, and residents there might not use the Square. The pedestrian flow at Kai Tak Station alone might not be able to support the usage rate of a major Square, and he hoped that the departments concerned would improve its transport accessibility.

19. **Mr LAI Kwong-wai** pointed that there was a large piece of lawn in the design of the Square. He hoped that more pergolas be installed for use in rainy weather. He was also concerned that there were many pavilions in the Square and hidden spaces would be created. He thus proposed that an open design be adopted to ensure the safety of users. He enquired whether cycling was allowed in the Square, and whether there were cycling tracks and parking spaces in the Square. In addition, he opined that there was a lack of symbolic landmark in the

design, nor was the historical value of Lung Tsun Stone Bridge be presented. He proposed that apart from exhibition boards, other elements should be incorporated in order to introduce the history of the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge and the old airport. He enquired the Department what the use of the twin towers was and whether the multi-usage lawn could be rented out for shows and carnivals.

20. **Mr KWAN Ho-yeung** said that the design of the Square was world-class. However, as it was surrounded on four sides by residences and population density was high, it might not be able to achieve the design concept and leisurely ambience of “garden in the city”. Thus it was hoped that ASD would take into account the actual needs of the residents nearby.

21. **Mr LO Chiu-kit** opined that the design of the Square was a hotchpotch concept so that it could meet the demand of various stakeholders. It lacked uniqueness and was no different than other parks. He enquired the Department whether it had conducted a survey on the demand for bowling greens and whether the district needed two such facilities. In addition, he was disappointed with the lack of children recreational spaces and facilities in the Square. There were many residences in KTDA, and it was hoped that the design could satisfy the needs of families in the district and increase children recreational facilities. He also opined that the Square should have a special theme and he agreed that the element of the old airport should be blended into the design to let children understand the historical value of KTDA. He further proposed that the water theme, such as fountain, be introduced to enhance the entertainment value, and that the number of toilets and nurseries should also be increased.

22. **Mr CHAN Tsz-fung, Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 6 of LCSD** gave a consolidated reply as follows:

- (a) the position of the Square had been set as the hub of Kai Tak City according to the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and the project was based on that position. In addition, some specific facilities might not be shown on the layout at the current stage of planning design, but that did not mean that they were not considered or would not be provided. These covered proposals raised by Members, such as selection of species of plants, provision of barrier-free accesses, seats, pavilions, pergolas and cycling facilities. The Department would proactively take into account Members’ opinions;
- (b) the entire KTDA would become Hong Kong’s future landmark and there would be various landmark structures, such as the twin towers located at the northeast of



the Square. The positioning of the Square was one of the infrastructure of the area;

- (c) there would be a cycling track of 13 kilometres in length, part of which would pass through the Square. In addition, the planning of cycling track included automated bicycle rental system;
- (d) members of the public of all kinds were welcome to use the parks that were open to the public. If nuisance was caused to others, the Department would take law enforcement actions in accordance with the Pleasure Grounds Regulation. The Department's District managers were well-experienced in park management and handling of relevant complaints;
- (e) Kai Tak Station would be the backbone of the future Kai Tak railway. In its vicinity were mainly a combined development of offices, retail outlets and residences, which would bring considerable pedestrian flow to the Square. The OZP had planned various transportation links with Sung Wong Toi, Ma Tau Kok, Kowloon City old district and KTDA. As the links were not inside the Square, they were not mentioned;
- (f) as there were various themes for KTDA, thus the Department hoped that different themes would be shown in different sitting-out areas. For example, there was a Kai Tak Runway Park which would use Lung Tsun Stone Bridge as the theme and the historical background of the old airport would be set out. The design of the Square, on the other hand, would be positioned as the hub of Kai Tak new city. Despite the above, the Department learnt that there were opinions that the historical elements of the airport should be enhanced at Kai Tak Runway Park. Thus, exhibition boards would be erected to introduce the history of the old airport;
- (g) the Department would install an adequate number of toilets and directional signs at the Square; and
- (h) there was no bowling green under LCSD in Kowloon district at present. The utilization rate of bowling greens in the New Territories and on the Hong Kong Island was very high. The Department opined that there was a need to set up two bowling greens in Kowloon. In addition, opinions gathered at the Workshop on

the Value Management of Kai Tak Station Square supported the construction of bowling greens. In earlier meetings, the Committee also supported the provision of such facilities.

23. **Mr Thomas WAN, Senior Architect/25 of ASD** replied that the Department had taken into account the issue of noise and the entire Square was thus located at the north-east corner of the Square, which was farthest away from residences. Trees would also be planted on the surrounding edges of the Square to reduce noise as well as provide shade and lower temperature in the summer. The Department would consider the suggestions of installing fountains at the pool and prudently designing directional signs.

24. **Mr Raymond LAU, Senior Project Manager 332 of ASD** gave a consolidated reply as follows:

- (a) The square was situated in the covered area of Smart City Pilot Scheme in Kowloon East. The Government would provide ancillary facilities of wireless broadband service in the Square;
- (b) the Department noted that PlanD had proposed to TPB that the plot ratio of KTDA be increased. However, the proposal would not affect the development of the Square; and
- (c) the Department anticipated that the most of the external pedestrian flow would enter the square via Kai Tak Station, whereas the south-west end of the Square (near Sung Wong Toi Park) was also close to To Kwa Wan Station of the Shatin to Central Line. In addition, there was public transport interchange on the east side of Kai Tak River near the north of the Square. As such, there would be adequate transport ancillary facilities to cope with external pedestrian flow. In addition, while there was no car park at the Station Square, private vehicles could park at the underground car park of the twin towers. The Kai Tak Sports Park was also designed to provide around 700 private car park spaces.

25. The consolidated reply of **Ms Brenda YEUNG, District Leisure Manager/Kowloon City of LCSD** was as follows:

- (a) the Kai Tak Station would adopt a public square management model and would be open to the public around the clock;

- (b) the Department would consider the proposals related to seats, pergolas, bicycle parking spaces and an information display screen when it made an in-depth review of the design of the Square;
- (c) the Tree Team of LCSD would provide opinions in respect of the Square's greening master plan, which would be related to the designer for consideration; and
- (d) the Department noted the opinions about noise, lawn, bicycles parking and other management issues, and it would learn from past experience of Hoi Sham Park and enhance the management of noise nuisance.

26. **The Chairman** proposed that more innovative elements should be incorporated into the Square and agreed that wireless broadband service was required. He also proposed the inclusion of green arts such as landscape trees and bonsai. He also enquired whether equipment of the control tower of the old airport would be placed at the runway park in the future.

27. **Mr Raymond LAU of ASD** replied that the equipment of the control tower of the old airport was then disassembled and stored by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The Department was following up on the relevant equipment with CEDD and it would study with LCSD whether the equipment was suitable for relocation at the runway park.

28. **Mr LO Chiu-kit** enquired about the ratio of children's recreational space in the square and relevant facilities. In addition, he objected to the construction of bowling greens in the square as they would take up too much space. It would be a waste of prime sites. He proposed that indoor bowling greens be constructed in other areas of Kai Tak or in Kai Tak Sports Park.

29. **Mr CHAN Tsz-fung of LCSD** replied that the demand for bowling greens was on the increase, and that a workshop and meetings held earlier also supported the provision of such facilities. In addition, there were a certain number of children's recreational facilities in the Square. The Square and park facilities were also open to members of the public without age limitations, and the lawn, water features and multi-purpose facilities were suitable for enjoyment of families.

30. **Mr Thomas WAN of ASD** replied that the square adopted a comprehensive landscape

design which complemented with the surrounding environment and was suitable for enjoyment of families and persons of all ages. The Department would suitably take into account Members' opinions.

31. **Mr Terrence SIU** said that users of Hong Kong parks were mostly residents of the district. The Department should not assume that there would be a large amount of tourists to shore up the usage rate of the Square. Therefore, it should not rely on the connection of railway to the Square alone to attract outsiders. It should rather connect with old districts.

32. **The Chairman** said that in the future, there would be underground city and pedestrian footbridge to connect old and new areas. Thus, there would be a certain number of people using the Square. The Committee did not object to the design and the agenda item was concluded.

**Call for Concern over the Environmental Hygiene and Noise Nuisance Problems at Sung On Street Sitting-out Area  
(Paper No. 67/16)**

33. Paper No. 67/16 was submitted by Mr Jimmy LAM. The Chairman requested Members to refer to the written replies on the table submitted by LCSD and Environmental Protection Department, i.e. documents no. 1 and 2 on the table.

34. **Ms Brenda YEUNG of LCSD** briefed the meeting on the document no.1 and supplemented that the Department had conducted joint actions with the Police and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) on 8, 22, 29 September and 27 October. The relevant problem had been improved. In addition, LCSD had deployed more staff to remove the publicity materials in the areas under its jurisdiction.

35. **Mr Jimmy LAM** enquired that if people concerned assembled and caused nuisance again after the joint actions, what members of the public affected could do. And if persuasion did not work, what the relevant departments would do. He also enquired whether tickets would be issued and summons action be taken against those concerned.

36. **The Chairman** said that people concerned placed a banner on seats and they moved it to occupy the streets after being warned. He enquired whether the Department had communicated with those concerned.

37. **Mr PONG Wing-ho, Assistant Police Community Relations Officer (Kowloon City District) of HKPF** replied that in September this year, the Police had conducted 4 and 6 joint law enforcement actions at Sung On Street with LCS D and FEHD respectively. People concerned were advised to keep their voice low. The departments had also conducted noise assessment at schools nearby. The Police would continue its law enforcement with the relevant departments.

38. **Ms Brenda YEUNG of LCS D** replied that while the publicity materials were hung inside the sitting-out area, they did not occupy seats. LCS D had contacted people concerned and they were rather co-operative. They removed the materials after being advised and therefore there was no prosecution.

39. **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** said that if Members hung publicity materials, they would be removed without warning and Members would be fined. He hoped that the departments concerned would be fair in law enforcement.

40. **The Chairman** proposed that Mr Jimmy LAM should contact the departments concerned and participate in and inspect the effectiveness of the joint actions.

#### **Request for Tree Replant Following the Removal of Trees in Ho Man Tin District (Paper No. 68/16)**

41. Paper No. 68/16 was jointly signed by Mr TING Kin-wa and Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming. Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming introduced the Paper. In addition, the Chairman requested Members to refer to the written reply from LCS D, i.e. document no. 3 on the table.

42. **Ms Brenda YEUNG of LCS D** briefed the meeting on document no. 3 on the table. She supplemented that as Brown Root Rot disease was infectious, replant could be conducted only some time after the infected tree was removed. In addition, before removing the tree, the Department would post notice to inform members of the public of the arrangement. If necessary, meeting would be held with residents and the Member concerned so as to explain the procedures of removal.

43. **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** expressed appreciation to LCS D for its immediate follow-up of the matter. Residents in the meantime accepted the method of dealing with the issue. However, they hoped that in the future the notice could be given as early as possible. In addition, the infected tree would give out a foul smell after its uprooting. Therefore, they hoped

that the Department would remove the tree as soon as possible in order to avoid adverse effect on residents.

44. **The Chairman** enquired LCSD how many days before the removal of the tree was the notice posted.

45. **Ms Brenda YEUNG of LCSD** replied that unless the tree posed imminent risks and necessitated immediate removal, the Department would usually post a notice for the tree's removal two weeks before implementation.

**Request for Enhanced Cleansing Work at Man Fuk Road Garden  
(Paper No. 69/16)**

46. Paper No. 69/16 was submitted by Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming. The Chairman requested Members to refer to the written reply from LCSD, i.e. document no. 4 on the table.

47. **Ms Brenda YEUNG of LCSD** briefed the meeting on document no. 4 on the table and supplemented that apart from hiring professional pest control companies, LCSD would also step up anti-rodent work at the venue.

48. **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** was appreciative of LCSD's proactive response and hoped that rodent infestation could be resolved as early as possible.

**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. 70/16)**

49. **Ms Brenda YEUNG of LCSD** introduced the Paper. She hoped that Members would pay special attention to the progress report on the trial scheme of opening hours of all ball courts at Hoi Sham Park in the morning and the relevant part in the park regulations of Hoi Sham Park.

50. **Mr KWAN Ho-yeung** asked how many complaints about noise nuisance LCSD had received with all ball courts at Hoi Sham Park opening at 6:30 a.m. In addition, he enquired whether LCSD had conducted assessment on the impacts of the four options.

51. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** said that after many discussions at the four-party platform, the various stakeholders only stated their opinions without arriving at a consensus on the opening hours of the ball courts of the Park. Residents of Bayview said that they could just barely accept the opening hours of all ball courts at 6:30 a.m. After conducting on-site inspection, Members opined that the noise level after the opening of all ball courts in the Park was not acceptable. Park users said that they needed flat space to conduct activities like jogging to avoid injury. According to an assessment conducted earlier, only 22 people conducted activities on the football pitch between 6:00 to 6:30 a.m. As such, he inclined to select Option (2) to balance needs of various sides.

52. **The Hon Starry LEE** express appreciation to the Department, Members and stakeholders for their follow-up work. However, they all stood their ground and no consensus was arrived at in the end. As there was no single option that could meet the demands from all parties, she enquired LCSD which option it inclined to adopt. In addition, she concurred with the opinions of Mr PUN Kwok-wah that to balance the needs of various sides, Option (2) could be adopted as a short-term measure. She enquired what medium and long term solutions LCSD prepared to use in order to resolve the conflicts among stakeholders, such as the expansion of Hoi Sham Park.

53. **Mr NG Po-keung** said that similar noise nuisance issues also occurred at Kowloon Walled City Park, Ma Tau Wai Road Playground and Argyle Street Playground which were close to residences. He asked if these parks had a standard opening time, or they each had their own opening time depending on the situation.

54. **Mr Jimmy LAM** said that he understood the demand of residents of Bayview and those of Hoi Sham Park users. After conducting on-site inspection, he opined that residents were indeed easily affected by noise in early morning hours. At the same time, he concurred with park users that they needed flat and barrier-free places for jogging. To balance the needs of all parties, he agreed that Option (2) should be adopted and tried out for a month, followed by a review.

55. **Ms Brenda YEUNG of LCSD** gave a consolidated reply as follows:

- (a) the Department conducted a three-month trial scheme earlier on (i.e. opening hours at 6:30 a.m.) and had received no complaint;
- (b) as noises mainly came from basketball activities, if the original opening hours

were to be adopted again (i.e. Option (1)), residents nearby would be affected by the noise. Option (4) would not be able to meet the demand of park users, i.e. low noise activities such as walking backwards would not be able to be conducted on the football pitch starting from 6:00 a.m. To conclude the opinions of various stakeholders, LCSD opined that Options (2) or (3) was more likely to balance the demands from various stakeholders. In addition, the Department would deploy more staff to advise park users to keep their voices low when conducting activities;

- (c) Phase II Works of Hoi Sham Park would develop towards the seaside and there would be a school separating residences from the Park. Thus it was anticipated that the long standing issue of noise nuisance at Hoi Sham park in the morning could be resolved; and
- (d) ball courts were usually opened at 7:00 a.m. The Department would also make adjustment according to the condition of individual areas.

56. **Mr LO Chiu-kit** said that the noise level of basketball activities was high and people affected by the noise would out-number those conducting basketball activities. He thus agreed that basketball courts should be opened late. He opined that the crux of the issue was the source of noise, rather than the opening hours of the football pitch or basketball court. In addition, he enquired that if people were found playing basketball on football pitch in early morning and noise nuisance was created, what LCSD would do.

57. **Mr Admond YUE** said that discussion at the four-party platform would not be able to arrive at a consensus. If further meetings were held, participants would only express their opinions. Choices and sacrifices had to be made in order to arrive at a suitable opening time. As the number of people playing basketball was fewer, whereas the number of people affected by the noise could be many, he thus selected Option (2) for the trial scheme.

58. **Mr KWAN Ho-yeung** said that under the existing opening hours of ball courts, no complaints had been received. If the option selected by Members in the end caused many complaints, he proposed that LCSD could on its own revert the opening time to the original in order to avoid lengthy discussion on the agenda item.

59. **The Hon Starry LEE** opined that there might be discrepancies between reality and the conclusion of LCSD that no complaints had been received in respect of the existing opening hours. As residents might think that government departments and Members would follow up



on the matter, therefore no written complaint was received by the Department. However, that did not mean that there was no complaint. She hoped that the Department would be concerned about this. In addition, basketball activities would create louder noises, she hoped that the Department would advise the people concerned to use the basketball court at King Wan Street. She also hoped that the Department would stop park users from using loud-speakers in the venue.

60. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** said that the opening time of ball courts in Hoi Sham Park was 6:30 a.m., which was earlier than 7:00 a.m. of most of the ball courts. The opening time of the one at King Wan Street was 5:30 a.m. He hoped that Members would be sympathetic to residents of Bayview. In addition, he enquired how many more staff members LCSD would deploy to advise park users to lower their voices. And if people ignored their advice, what the Department would do.

61. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** said that LCSD should prohibit the use of loud-speaker in Hoi Sham Park. In addition, the basketball court should be opened later than the football pitch in order to attract people to use the court at King Wan Street.

62. **Ms Brenda YEUNG of LCSD** supplemented as follows:

- (a) users of the basketball court in Hoi Sham Park had moved to play at the one at King Wan Street. Most of them had revealed to the Department that they had adapted to and accepted to play the activity at the basketball court in King Wan Street. In response to the enquiry of Mr LO Chiu-kit, she said that if people were found to be playing basketball at the football pitch, the departmental staff would advise them to stop or leave;
- (b) she asked that if the new option generated complaints from residents, the Department, as suggested by **Mr Roger KWAN**, would revert the opening time to 6:30 a.m. on its own or not. She hoped that the Committee could arrive at a decision;
- (c) she clarified that the zero complaint figure referred to complaints about noises, not that of park users about the opening time of the park;
- (d) according to investigation, dancers who used loud speakers had pledged that they would turn on the loud-speaker only after 6:30 a.m. and that they would use the

acoustic paper carton provided by the Department to lower the noise;

- (e) at present, there was one security guard of LCSD at Hoi Sham Park. To tie in with the new opening hours, the number would be increased to two. The number of inspections conducted by the venue manager and on-site staff would also be increased. The departmental security guards would contact with the management office of the owners' committee in respect of the noise issue in the morning; and
- (f) as users of the basketball court in King Wan Street opined that there was no need to install a mobile toilet, the Department would shelve the plan.

63. **The Chairman** said that he had attended the four-party platform and various parties agreed that basketball activities were the source of noise nuisance. Therefore the existing opening time (i.e. 6:30 a.m.) of the basketball court should be maintained. The purpose of the four-party platform was to let stakeholders conduct negotiation and enhance transparency, so that members of the public would not think that the Committee was dictatorial. In addition, based on the concept of "issues of district should be resolved by the district", he hoped that Members would assess of the effects of each option and select an option from the two proposed by the Department (Options (2) and (3)) in order to balance the needs of various stakeholders. He also requested members to decide whether LCSD should revert to the existing opening time on its own if the option selected caused complaints from residents.

64. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** said that he agreed with the Department's shelving the proposal of installing a mobile toilet at the basketball court in King Wan Street. He also hoped that the Department would be concerned about the deployment of staff under the new opening time, and to record relevant data such as the number of users, types of activities, number of complaints about noise nuisance and its nature, so that the Committee could conduct a review. He said that after repeated persuasions by Members, residents of Bayview had agreed to make a minor concession that under the condition of users not creating noise nuisance, a football pitch would be open at 6:00 a.m. In addition, he hoped that the Department would disseminate the message of be considerate to users of football pitch so that the impacts on residents of Bayview could be minimized.

65. After discussion, **the Committee** unanimously agreed to adopt Option (2) and put it into trial for one month, followed by a review. If Option (2) did cause complaints from residents, the Committee agreed that LCSD could, from the day of commencement of trial to the date of

next meeting, revert the opening time to the current one.

**The LCSD's Report on the Free Local Civic Programmes, District Arts and Cultural Activities Organised in Kowloon City District and the Use of the Cultural Facilities (Paper No. 71/16)**

66. Ms Marianna HO, Senior Manager (Kowloon West/Cultural Services) of LCSD introduced the paper.

67. The Committee noted the captioned paper.

**The LCSD's Report on Public Library Promotion Activities and Use of Library Facilities in Kowloon City District and Progress Report on District Minor Improvement Works (Paper No. 72/16)**

68. Mr LO Hing-kwan, Senior Librarian (Kowloon City) of LCSD introduced the paper.

69. The Committee noted the captioned paper.

**Date of Next Meeting**

70. There being no other business, the Chairman announced at 5:45 p.m. that the meeting was adjourned. The Secretariat would make an announcement in due course on the date of next meeting to be held in 2017 and the deadline for submission of papers.

71. The minutes of this meeting were confirmed on 19 January 2017.

---

The Chairman

---

The Secretary

Kowloon City District Council Secretariat  
December 2016