

(Translation)

**Minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the  
Housing Affairs Committee (2016) of  
Kwai Tsing District Council**

Date: 2 February 2016  
Time: 2:35 pm - 3:55 pm  
Venue: K&TDO Conference Room

<b><u>Attendee</u></b>	<b><u>Time of Arrival</u></b>	<b><u>Time of Departure</u></b>
Mr WONG Yiu-chung, MH (Chairman)	Start of meeting	End of meeting
Miss LO Yuen-ting (Vice-Chairman)	Start of meeting	End of meeting
Ms CHEUNG Wai-ching, Clarice	Start of meeting	End of meeting
Mr CHOW Wai-hung, Rayman	2:55pm	3:46pm
Miss CHU Lai-ling	Start of meeting	End of meeting
Mr HUI Kei-cheung	3:00pm	End of meeting
Ms KWOK Fu-yung	Start of meeting	3:46pm
Ms LAM Chui-ling, Nancy, MH	Start of meeting	End of meeting
Ms LAU Mei-lo	Start of meeting	End of meeting
Mr LAW King-shing, MH	2:46pm	3:50pm
Mr LEE Chi-keung, Alan, MH	Start of meeting	End of meeting
Mr LEUNG Chi-shing	2:46pm	3:46pm
Mr LEUNG Kam-wai	2:38pm	End of meeting
Mr LEUNG Tsz-wing, Dennis	Start of meeting	End of meeting
Mr LEUNG Wai-man, MH	Start of meeting	End of meeting
Mr LI Sai-lung	Start of meeting	3:46pm
Mr NG Ka-chiu	Start of meeting	End of meeting
Mr NG Kim-sing	2:38pm	End of meeting
Mr PAU Ming-hong	Start of meeting	End of meeting
Mr POON Chi-shing, MH	Start of meeting	End of meeting
Ms TAM Wai-chun, MH	Start of meeting	2:57pm
Mr TANG Shui-wah	Start of meeting	3:30pm
Mr WONG Bing-kuen	2:44pm	3:37pm
Mr WONG Yun-tat	2:41pm	End of meeting

**In Attendance**

Mr CHOW Yick-hay, BBS, JP	Vice-Chairman of Kwai Tsing District Council
Mr LAM King-chi	Senior Architect 43, Housing Department
Ms WONG Yuk-ling, Elaine	Senior Planning Officer 8, Housing Department
Mr WONG Wing-kit, Franz	Architect 129, Housing Department
Mrs CHEUNG LO Pik-yuk, Helen	Senior Housing Manager (KC), Housing Department
Mr MAK Yook-ming, Stephen	Senior Property Service Manager/KC, Housing Department
Mr WU Tin-yau, Gordon	Assistant District Officer (Kwai Tsing), Kwai Tsing District Office
Miss CHAN Hau-sin, Priscilla (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council) 1, Kwai Tsing District Office

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr LAM Siu-fai	(With prior notice)
Mr TSUI Hiu-kit	(With prior notice)
The Hon. LEUNG Yiu-chung	(Without prior notice)

## **Opening Remarks**

The Chairman welcomed Members and government representatives to the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Housing Affairs Committee (2016) of Kwai Tsing District Council (K&T DC).

2. The Committee unanimously endorsed applications of absence from Mr TSUI Hiu-kit and Mr LAM Siu-fai.

## **Consultation Paper**

### **Public Housing Development at the Former Site of the China Holiness College, Lai King Estate**

(Proposed by the Housing Department)

(HAC Paper No. 1/D/2016)

3. The Chairman welcomed Mr LAM King-chi, Senior Architect 43, Ms WONG Yuk-ling, Elaine, Senior Planning Officer 8, and Mr WONG Wing-kit, Franz, Architect 129 of the Housing Department (HD) to the meeting.
4. Mr LAM King-chi introduced the paper.
5. Mr CHOW Yick-hay opined as follows:
  - (i) Residents of Lai King Estate needed time to digest the development project proposed by HD before they could put forth opinions.
  - (ii) The site had never been used for housing development. Thus, there should be inherent constraints, making it not suitable for housing development.
  - (iii) The development of road system had made the area subject to much noise nuisances. The Environmental Protection Department (EPD) once recorded a noise level of up to 90 dB in Fung King House decades ago, and subsequently identified Kwai Chung Road as a location which required noise reduction. Although no noise barrier was built, some flat units of Fung King House were included under the Express Flat Allocation Scheme (EFAS) in view of the noise problem for allocation to the EFAS applicants. It showed that the site in the development project was unsuitable for housing development.

(iv) The problem of aging population was serious in Lai King Estate. However, there was insufficient public space, and as a result, there was lack of space for the elderly to do stretching exercises.

6. Mr WONG Yun-tat opined as follows:

(i) The site was near a highway and residential areas, the developments and construction of new public rental housing (PRH) would not only affect the landscape, but also create a sense of crowdedness in existing residents. Therefore, the District Council (DC) Member of the constituency concerned had to further discuss with the residents.

(ii) There was news that the government would redevelop PRH estates aged 40 years or above. As Lai King Estate had been completed for 40 years, he suggested HD deploying the new building of the development project to absorb some of the existing tenants, with a view to redeveloping Lai King Estate by phase.

(iii) As there was a major trunk road with a number of bus routes passing through below Lai King Estate, he suggested HD building more lift towers to facilitate residents' access to buses. HD should take into account planning, transport and other supporting facilities when devising project of housing development.

7. Mr POON Chi-shing said he did not object to public housing development. However, the papers submitted to DC by HD were not comprehensive, and relevant data were not provided for Members' reference, resulting in disagreements on the identification of site. HD should submit relevant information as soon as possible when consulting DC.

8. Mr LEUNG Tsz-wing, Dennis opined as follows:

(i) There was public housing in the vicinity of the site. Simply demolishing the old school building for housing development could not make the best use of the land, and it would be hard for the new building to fit in with the surroundings of the future redeveloped Lai King Estate. In order to increase supply of PRH units and to maintain the landscape of the Estate as a whole, HD should consider redeveloping Lai King Estate altogether.

- (ii) He doubted if the supporting facilities could meet the need of population of the new housing estate. HD should reconsider and devise a viable proposal.

9. Ms WONG Yuk-ling, Elaine gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The site was zoned as “Residential (Group A)” intended for residential use. The Government had agreed to hand over the land of the vacant school to the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA) for public housing development.
- (ii) The site was located in the southernmost part of Lai King Estate, and the impact of the proposed building on the residents would be relatively limited.
- (iii) It was mentioned in the Long Term Housing Strategy Progress Report that redevelopment was only a supplementary measure. If flat units of the new building were allocated to existing tenants for redevelopment of Lai King Estate, the number of flat units available for applicants on the PRH Waiting List would be decreased. There was no plan and timetable for the redevelopment at this stage.
- (iv) HD would provide sufficient parking spaces and greening facilities in accordance with the “Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines” (HKPSG). In addition, in view of a higher proportion of elderly persons in Lai King Estate, HD had also discussed with the Social Welfare Department (SWD) on the provision of premises having size up to the prevailing standard for a neighbourhood elderly centre in the proposed project, so as to relocate the existing Lai King Bradbury Neighbourhood Elderly Centre, which was just over 160 square meters, and facilities in Lai King Estate would be improved as a result.

10. Mr LAM King-chi gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) In view of a higher proportion of elderly persons in Lai King Estate, HD would also install additional outdoor fitness facilities for the elderly as well as provision of children’s playground.
- (ii) HD would try to keep the residential development away from the source of noises by design as far as possible. There had been advancement in

noise insulation technology, and with facilities like acoustic windows proposed by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) plus feasible measures proposed by environmental consultant of the site, the noise problem could be alleviated.

(iii) As the site was small in size, traffic generated would also be relatively small. In addition, as it was located within 500 meters of a MTR Station, it was believed that additional traffic generated could be absorbed by existing transportation network and there would be minimal impact on the environment after assessment.

11. The Chairman asked the representative of HD if there was any detailed information on noise issues for the Committee's reference at this stage.

12. Mr LAM King-chi responded that with regard to the alleviation measures proposed by EPD and the environmental consultancy company, the use of acoustic windows and noise shielding wall could reduce noise level by 7-11 dB. Preliminary assessment revealed that noise level at a number of flat units would be above 70 dB. After installation of acoustic windows, the noise level of these units should be below 70 dB.

13. The Chairman requested the representative of HD to provide detailed information for Members' reference after the meeting.

14. Mr CHOW Yick-hay opined as follows:

(i) Residents of Lai King Estate were allocated with flat units based on the criteria 40 years ago when the Estate was completed, and they were obviously over-crowded nowadays. Therefore, they hoped that redevelopment could be carried out as soon as possible, so as to ease the crowded situation. In addition, Lai King Estate was facing a number of problems, such as stinky smell from aged dung channels of Yeung King House, On King House and Lok King House. Residents of Lai King Estate hoped that the environment could be improved and optimised to make it more elderly friendly. The Policy Address this year also mentioned that facilities would be enhanced in 100 PRH estates.

(ii) The meeting should only note the development project so as to allow more time for DC to discuss on it. He suggested HD explaining details

of the project to residents of Lai King Estate and listening to their opinions.

15. Mr POON Chi-shing was dissatisfied with the response from HD and stressed that HD should submit sufficient information, e.g. orientation and design, etc., before consultation with Members, so that Members could explain to residents HD's development project.

16. Mr HUI Kei-cheung opined as follows:

(i) HD only submitted documents two days before the meeting and seemed to take K&T DC and Member of the constituency concerned lightly. HD had submitted development projects to DC in the absence of assessments and consultation with local people for several times, resulting in opposition from DC. HD should provide more supplementary documents for DC's consideration.

(ii) As mentioned in the paper, applications to the Town Planning Board (TPB) on relaxing of plot ratio and proposals like cutting of slope were required, it was doubtful whether the land was suitable for housing development.

(iii) HD should not ignore communication with DC like in the Texaco Road development project when a development project was to be carried out.

17. Mr LEUNG Tsz-wing, Dennis opined as follows:

(i) HD, as always, did not address doubts on the development project upon its completion. Took Kwai Luen Estate and the 9H development project as examples, HD indicated by reports that increase in population would not create extra pressure on existing traffic load, transportation facilities had not been enhanced since flat in-take.

(ii) In the current development project, HD only moved existing facilities to a new location, which was not an improvement to community facilities. HD should consider improving facilities in the area when increasing the supply of PRH units.

18. Mr CHOW Wai-hung, Rayman opined as follows:

- (i) Existing facilities of Lai King Estate could barely satisfy the need of residents. In the case of no improvement in transportation, parking, shopping, clinical and other facilities, he could not support the above development project.
- (ii) He felt puzzled about HD's response of there being no redevelopment plan on Lai King Estate, as HA had declared that Lai King Estate was on the redevelopment list. He opined that the Estate together with other feasible locations in the district (such as the car park opposite to Fung King House) should be considered as a whole for redevelopment as far as the residents were not affected.
- (iii) He hoped HD could submit more information as soon as possible for Members' consideration.

19. Ms WONG Yuk-ling, Elaine gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) There was improvement to the environment of the estate in the development project. Apart from housing development, HD would enhance greening facilities as far as possible and provide parking spaces to meet demand from new flat units built. The architects of the Department would take care of landscaping and greening works and she hoped Members could have confidence in them.
- (ii) As for supporting facilities, the development project would provide about 400 square meters of space for the Bradbury Centre which was in short of space at present. Additional outdoor fitness facilities would also be installed. Therefore, upon the completion of the project, the environment of Lai King Estate and services for the elderly would be improved.
- (iii) HD would provide as many parking spaces as it could in accordance with the HKPSG with regard to new flat units built.
- (iv) There were only one vacant school premises and one basketball court on the site. Upon completion of the project, there would be improvement in space and facilities, and Members were requested to give support to the above development project.

(v) HD planned to demolish the former site of the China Holiness College within 2017 and expected to complete the development project before 2021. In order to solicit Members' views earlier and to seek support, HD chose to collect views from the Committee in early 2016. She said that HD would carry out further research and design on the development project after getting preliminary consent from Members, whose views would also be taken into account as well.

20. Mr LAM King-chi gave a consolidated response as follows:

(i) As the consultancy report identified the source of noise as from Tsing Kwai Highway at the southwest, most of the flat units of the new building would avoid facing directly to Tsing Kwai Highway.

(ii) There would be architectural fin (noise shielding end wall) at part of the external wall as proposed by the consultancy company for reducing noise effectively.

(iii) The new building would install acoustic windows, and the consultancy company pointed out that installation of acoustic windows could help reduce noise by about 7-11 dB.

(iv) The consultancy report said that the above three relief measures could reduce noise of the flat units to an acceptable level.

21. The Chairman suggested HD carrying out consultation in the community and explaining the development project to the residents.

22. Mr CHOW Yick-hay opined that Members should not show their support or opposition with regard to the development project at the moment. HD should provide more relevant information for Members' further discussion.

23. The Chairman said that HD had failed to address Members' concerns on an estate upon its completion in the past, the situation was worrying. He suggested giving HD two months' time to address Members' views and give official response as well.

24. Mr LAM King-chi gave a consolidated response as follows:

(i) The site of the development project was zoned "Residential (Group A)", and it was ready for immediate development to meet housing demand.

- (ii) The project was located at the remote side of Lai King Estate and would have little impact on the environment. The measures and technology previously mentioned could effectively alleviate the impact of noise on the buildings constructed. The 400 square meters area reserved for social welfare facilities and additional outdoor fitness facilities would also improve the existing environment.
- (iii) In view of huge demand for housing, HD urged Members to give support to the project, so that the development project could be completed on schedule to meet housing target.
- (iv) HD would optimise the development project based on Members' opinions and intended to report to Members of the situation in two months' time.

25. Mr CHOW Yick-hay opined as follows:

- (i) The premises of China Holiness College were vacant since 2010. If HD regarded the time frame for the development project as tight, why HD would have no communication with the Committee or local residents during the time when the school was vacant.
- (ii) As Lai King Estate involved a large area, even if the facilities as a whole were up to standard, it was in fact unevenly distributed. He pointed out that parking spaces at Yeung King House, On King House and Lok King House were inadequate, and there were insufficient refuse collection points (RCPs). While the number of households housed in the new building was more or less the total number of households in two of the buildings of Yeung King House, On King House and Lok King House, he doubted if existing facilities could cope with additional demand from the population increased.
- (iii) It was irresponsible for HD to request Members' endorsement of the above development project before the problem of dung channels of Yeung King House, On King House and Lok King House was properly dealt with. He reiterated that Members needed more information before response could be given. It is not appropriate to defer resolving the problems to after completion of the building.

26. The Chairman said that it would be undesirable to oppose to the development project under the situation of insufficient information. Given limited time of this meeting, the Committee had not discussed on the height of the building and area of the flat units and issues so on, he suggested HD using two months' time for communication with Members and the local community to solicit their views and optimise the project.

27. Mr LEE Chi-keung, Alan opined as follows:

- (i) As residents might live in the new building for life, HD should not deal with the above development project hastily, the Committee needed time to study the project to see if it could tie in with the future development of Kwai Tsing District.
- (ii) The Committee held meeting once every two months and the time for each meeting was limited. Members might not be able to reach a consensus on the above development project in a short time. Therefore, he proposed establishing a non-standing working group which could meet once every two to three weeks to collect technical information relevant to the project and submit the project to the Committee for decision when it was ready.

28. Mr HUI Kei-cheung opined as follows:

- (i) As HD had not provided sufficient information, the meeting should not make a decision on the above development project
- (ii) It was unacceptable for HD to inform Members of the development project and related documents in a short period of time. HD should conduct extensive consultation and submit opinions collected to the Committee.
- (iii) As for the above-mentioned noise insulation facilities, he criticised HD for failing to keep the promise of inviting Members to visit new buildings in San Po Kong for the acoustic windows.

29. Mr LEUNG Chi-shing opined that that the information HD submitted to the meeting was a bit rough and brief, and no decision should be made in the meanwhile. He hoped that HD could consult opinions of residents in the following two months and submit more comprehensive information at the next meeting.

30. Mr LEUNG Wai-man opined as follows:
- (i) On behalf of people on the waiting list of PRH (especially people lived in subdivided units), he requested the Government to develop PRH estates as soon as possible.
  - (ii) Housing was a pressing need of the public, noise and transportation issues could be left for solution after flat in-take.
31. Mr CHOW Wai-hung, Rayman opined as follows:
- (i) The Neighbourhood and Worker's Service Centre had always been supportive to the construction of more public housing as soon as possible. However, the impact of the project on the entire community should also be considered during the housing development. Took Kwai Shing Estate as an example, HD did not handle traffic arrangements properly after the completion of the Estate, resulting in shortage of parking spaces. He pointed out that HD always presented the housing development projects as well planned when submitting the projects, but there was never any improvement after flat in-take.
  - (ii) Deliberation on the above development project should be deferred for the meantime and wait until HD submitted more detailed information at the next meeting. Delaying the decision for two months would not affect the progress of the housing development. Making uninformed decision with insufficient information would affect residents who would live in the area for decades.
32. Ms KWOK Fu-yung agreed that HD should develop public housing. However, HD should carry out study on supporting facilities and impact on local residents first.
33. Ms CHEUNG Wai-ching, Clarice opined as follows:
- (i) Given that PRH applicants might not have a flat unit allocated after five years' waiting, she supported public housing development.
  - (ii) Documents submitted by HD failed to provide sufficient justifications for her to give support to the above development project. She would abstain if voting was to be conducted with regard to the project.

34. The Chairman suggested giving HD two months' time to optimise the project based on Members' views and conduct consultation in the community, and the development project could be put to vote at the next meeting.

35. Mr LEE Chi-keung, Alan said that a non-standing working group as mentioned before could be set up to focus on handling the above development project.

36. The Chairman responded that this could be decided after HD had finished the follow-ups.

### **Discussion Item**

#### **Arrangement of Regular Meeting Schedule of the Housing Affairs Committee in 2016**

(Proposed by the Kwai Tsing District Council Secretariat)

(HAC Paper No. 2/D/2016)

37. The Chairman introduced paper no. 2/D/2016.

38. Members noted and endorsed the above paper.

#### **Endorsement of the Working Groups Established under the Committee in 2016 and 2017 and Election of Respective Chairmen**

(Proposed by the Kwai Tsing District Council Secretariat)

(HAC Paper No. 3/D/2016)

39. The Chairman introduced paper no. 3/D/2016.

40. Members endorsed the working groups listed on paper no. 3/D/2016.

41. The Chairman drew Members' attention to the Standing Orders of K&TDC for the provisions on election of Chairman of working group, including paragraph 2 under Guidelines on the Mechanism of Working Group, i.e. "each District Council Member should not concurrently hold the post of Chairman for more than three working groups funded by the District Council", and paragraph 4(b), i.e. "District Council Members or Co-opted Members should nominate candidate at the meeting, and if the candidate is absent, he/she must give authorisation in writing for acceptance of the nomination."

42. The Chairman invited nominations for Chairman of the Public Housing

Affairs Working Group.

43. Ms LAU Mei-lo nominated Mr POON Chi-shing, which was seconded by Ms LAM Chui-ling, Nancy, Mr LEE Chi-keung, Alan, Mr PAU Ming-hong, Mr LI Sai-lung and Miss LO Yuen-ting. Mr POON Chi-shing accepted the nomination.

44. Mr CHOW Wai-hung, Rayman nominated Mr WONG Yun-tat, which was seconded by Mr LEUNG Kam-wai, Mr LEUNG Chi-shing and Mr HUI Kei-cheung. Mr WONG Yun-tat accepted the nomination.

45. The Chairman declared that voting for the Chairman of the Public Housing Affairs Working Group would be conducted by show of hands. There were 14 votes for Mr POON Chi-shing and 6 votes for Mr WONG Yun-tat. Mr POON Chi-shing was elected the Chairman of the Public Housing Affairs Working Group.

46. The Chairman invited nominations for Chairman of the Private Housing Affairs Working Group.

47. Ms LAM Chui-ling, Nancy nominated Mr LEE Chi-keung, Alan, which was seconded by Mr LEUNG Wai-man, Mr POON Chi-shing, Mr LAW King-shing and Mr LI Sai-lung. Mr LEE Chi-keung, Alan accepted the nomination.

48. As there was only one candidate, the Chairman declared that Mr LEE Chi-keung, Alan was elected the Chairman of the Private Housing Affairs Working Group.

### **Report Items**

#### **Housing Department's Statistical Returns and Progress Reports on Housing Affairs in the District (July to December 2015)**

(HAC Paper No. 4/R/2016, tabled at the meeting)

49. Mr NG Kim-sing and Mr LEUNG Kam-wai opined that HD should not submit the information of July to October at the meeting. He hoped that HD could submit these documents in advance in the future, so that Members could take a look in advance.

50. Mr LEUNG Kam-wai, Mr WONG Yun-tat and Mr HUI Kei-cheung suggested HD sending electronic version of the documents to Members and be

environmental friendly.

51. The Chairman asked HD to note Members' opinions.

52. Mr WONG Yun-tat enquired about the update on the Tai Wo Hau Road development project after a judicial review was incurred.

53. Mrs CHEUNG LO Pik-yuk, Helen said there was no news on the Tai Wo Hau Road development project of being jeopardised by the judicial review. She would clarify the situation with relevant colleagues and give a response afterwards.

54. The Chairman asked Mrs CHEUNG LO Pik-yuk, Helen to give a response as soon as possible.

55. Mr WONG Yun-tat hoped HD could respond after the meeting on reasons for delayed completion of the Tai Wo Hau Road development project for one to two years beyond the original schedule.

(Post-meeting note: The Tai Wo Hau Road public rental housing project is originally planned to commence construction in 2015 and to complete in Year 2019/20. During the public consultation period regarding the proposed rezoning of the site, 5 out of the 10 representations received stated that the proposal will not be supported if certain district facilities are not to be implemented. On the other hand, due to certain judicial review on the land use of other sites in the district, the draft Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan and the respective representations are unable to be submitted to the Chief Executive-in-Council for consideration. This eventually hindered HA from initiating the construction works. As the draft Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan judicial review cases are still to be scheduled for hearing, there will be no definite completion dates for the Tai Wo Hau Road public rental housing project.)

56. Mr HUI Kei-cheung said that Annex 4 of the document revealed that the problem of lift breakdowns in Tai Wo Hau Estate had not been alleviated, and situation in the three Harmony blocks was particularly serious, where 6-7 breakdowns were observed every two months and electronic switch board were needed to be replaced every month. He hoped HD could respond to the Motion endorsed by the Committee in 2014 as soon as possible and consider replacing the lifts with new ones.

57. Mr MAK Yook-ming, Stephen responded that HD was aware of the

situation of the lifts in the three blocks in Tai Wo Hau Estate, of which lift breakdowns in the past six months was not particularly serious. He said that HD would follow up immediately and carry out urgent repairs when lift was broken down. HD would follow up on the case mentioned by Mr HUI Kei-cheung after the meeting.

58. The Chairman hoped HD could deal with the lift problems proactively.

59. Mr HUI Kei-cheung added that although lift breakdowns in Tai Wo Hau Estate was not the most serious compared with other housing estates, but it was very often the lifts in the three blocks being broken down, of which lifts no. L5 and L6 of Fu Tai House being most serious. He hoped that HD could solve this problem which had been recurring over the past few years.

60. The Chairman urged HD to keep following up the problem.

**Hong Kong Housing Society's statistical returns and progress reports on housing affairs in the District (November to December 2015)**

(HAC Paper No. 5/R/2016, tabled at the meeting)

61. Members noted the above paper.

**Date of Next Meeting**

62. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 2:30p.m. on 5 April 2016 (Tuesday).

Kwai Tsing District Council Secretariat  
March 2016