

**Minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Focus Group on Southern District Signature Projects (SDSP)  
Southern District Council (2012-2015) (SDC)**

Date : 11 September 2014  
Time : 2:30 p.m.  
Venue : SDC Conference Room

**Present:**

Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP (Chairman of SDC and Focus Group on SDSP)  
Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH (Vice-Chairman of SDC)  
Mr AU Lap-sing, MH  
Mr AU Nok-hin  
Mr CHAI Man-hon  
Ms CHAN Judy Kapui  
Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying  
Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung  
Mr CHU Lap-wai  
Mr FUNG Se-goun, Fergus  
Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH  
Mr LO Kin-hei  
Mrs MAK TSE How-ling, Ada  
Mr TSUI Yuen-wa  
Mr WONG Ling-sun, Vincent  
Mr YEUNG Wai-foon, MH, JP  
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN  
Ir CHAN Lee-shing, William, JP  
Ir Dr CHAN Yuk-kit, James

**Absent with Apologies:**

Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH  
Dr LIU Hong-fai, JP  
Dr YANG Mo, PhD



## **Opening Remarks:**

The Chairman welcomed professional members Ir Dr CHAN Yuk-kit and Ir CHAN Lee-shing, JP, as well as Members to the meeting.

2. The Chairman advised the meeting that Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Dr LIU Hong-fai, JP and Dr YANG Mo, PhD were unable to attend the meeting because of other engagements. The Chairman invited Members to note the aforesaid leave applications.

### **Agenda Item 1: Confirmation of the Minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting held on 23 May 2014**

---

3. The Chairman said that prior to the meeting, the draft minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Focus Group on SDSP (the Focus Group) had been circulated to Members for comments, and the Secretariat had not received any amendment proposals so far.

4. The minutes were confirmed by the Focus Group.

### **Agenda Item 2: Progress Report on Southern District Signature Project (as at 31 August 2014) (SDSP Paper No. 3/2014)**

---

(Ir CHAN Lee-shing, JP, Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH, Mr AU Lap-sing, MH, Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying, Mr YEUNG Wai-foon, MH, JP, Mr FUNG Se-goun, Ir Dr CHAN Yuk-kit and Mr AU Nok-hin joined the meeting at 2:42 p.m., 2:46 p.m., 2:47 p.m., 2:56 p.m., 2:59 p.m., 3:02 p.m., 3:03 p.m. and 3:41 p.m. respectively.)

5. The Chairman welcomed the following government departmental representatives to the meeting:

- Mr LI Ho-kin, Senior Project Co-ordination Manager, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)
- Mr LAU Tat-ying, Senior Project Co-ordination Manager, ArchSD
- Mr Raymond LAU, Senior Project Manager, ArchSD
- Mr TSANG Wai-lun, Architect, ArchSD
- Miss WONG Chung-ye, Project Manager, ArchSD

- Mr CHAN Sai-ho, Contract Architectural Assistant, ArchSD
- Mr CHAN Wai-kiu, District Leisure Manager (Southern), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
- Mr LEUNG Ka-yin, PS1/UAP, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

6. The Chairman invited Miss NG Kai-ting, Assistant District Officer (Southern) (ADO(S)), to brief Members on the latest progress of the Southern District Signature Project (the Project).

7. Miss NG Kai-ting, with the aid of PowerPoint presentation, reported the latest progress of the Project to the meeting. Owing to the availability of venues during the summer holidays, eventually the Hall of Caritas Community Centre – Aberdeen was chosen as the venue of the Residents’ Meeting. At that night, the District Officer (Southern) first briefly introduced the background of the Signature Project Scheme (SPS), followed by the presentation by SDC representatives on the details and progress of the Project, and then three rounds of views from the floor for members of the public and organisations took place. Lastly, the Chairman of SDC made the closing remarks. The Southern District Office (SDO) had invited the chairpersons of the four Area Committees, chairpersons of the owners’ corporations (OCs) and mutual aid committees (MACs) in Aberdeen and Tin Wan, as well as chairpersons of social services organisations and local organisations to join the meeting. Due to venue constraints, invitation could not be made to all OCs and MACs in the Southern District. Over 80 participants had attended the meeting at that night.

8. Miss NG Kai-ting continued that residents had given many views on the Project in the open-floor session. All in all, some residents supported the objectives of the Project and held that the aspiration merited respect; nevertheless, a majority of residents were concerned about the proposed location of the Project, worrying that the Project might lead to a reduction in the area of the existing open space at Aberdeen Promenade, as well as problems relating to the environmental, hygiene, traffic and public order. SDO had compiled a summary of the residents’ views, and details were given in Appendix 1. Besides, after the Residents’ Meeting, SDO had also received letters and emails from OCs of nearby residential estates and SDC Members of local constituencies, expressing concerns similar to the comments made by the attendees at the Residents’ Meeting.

9. The Chairman invited ArchSD representatives to report on the latest progress of works matters of the Project.

10. Mr LI Ho-kin said that at the invitation of the Chairman of SDC, ArchSD representatives had met with members of Aberdeen Promenade Concern Group in end July 2014. After the said meeting, ArchSD had attempted to modify the design direction of the Project, and presentation had been made to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of SDC, as well as the chairpersons of the respective committees. Eventually, it was opined that four alternative conceptual design schemes thereof were relatively desirable, and could be proposed at this meeting for Members' comments.

11. Mr TSANG Wai-lun, with the aid of PowerPoint presentation, briefed Members on the various alternative conceptual design schemes. Details were summarised as follows:

- (a) the initial design as provided in the "Technical Feasibility Statement" (TFS Scheme) had been preliminarily drawn up in response to SDC's views on the proposed location based on the concept of integration with the existing viewing deck. The scheme had the merits of keeping the existing ramp intact and that the lift installation project would not be affected. Moreover, the location concerned was near the bus stop, pier and fish market. Its shortcoming was that the relatively narrow section near the bus stop would make it quite crowded during the morning peak;
- (b) comparing with the TFS Scheme, under Scheme 1, the appearance of the new building could be better rationalised and the area of the existing open space to be occupied would be reduced. Furthermore, the number of trees to be cut down or transplanted could be reduced. Also, the designation of the dining areas near the staircase could alleviate the possible congestion occurred on the road section from the entrance of the Promenade to the bus stop;
- (c) under Scheme 2, the ramp was to be demolished, and then the lift installation project would be undertaken by CEDD. This scheme enabled adherence to the design principles of the TFS Scheme and re-arrangement of the layout of the new building at the same time. Its merits were: the open space on the first floor could be made available to the public for outdoor activities, and would facilitate public access to/from the footbridge; the courtyard on the ground floor could be open for public use during non-business hours of the dining facility; and the related planning concept

was close to the approved TFS Scheme, thus having less impact on the budget estimate and works progress;

- (d) the design concept of Scheme 3 was about the re-arrangement of the layout of the new building. The outdoor activities area cum outdoor dining area would be provided on the first floor. Despite that the area of the dining area was relatively small, it had the merit of facilitating public access from the footbridge to the open space or vice versa, while the outdoor dining area could be opened for public use during non-business hours. Under this scheme, the viewing platform on the first floor could be retained. Also, when comparing with the TFS Scheme, the area of the existing open space to be occupied was significantly reduced under this scheme. ArchSD also planned to install shading and noise mitigation facilities as well as carrying out greening work on the rooftop, with a view to optimising the visual amenity;
- (e) the design concept of Scheme 4 was about the elevation of the entire building in order to retain the existing open space on ground level as a covered activities area cum outdoor dining area. It had the merits of enhancing public accessibility and the availability of the outdoor dining area on the ground floor for public use during non-business hours. The indoor dining area was located on the first floor to facilitate restaurant operations. Under this scheme, the viewing platform on the first floor would be retained. As compared with the TFS Scheme, the area of the existing open space to be occupied would be significantly reduced. After the demolition of the ramp, it was wished that more space could be made available to passengers waiting at the bus stop for taking a brief rest. Furthermore, in response to the views of SDC and representatives of the concern group, ArchSD suggested that the dining facilities should be provided on the upper floor. ArchSD wished that an atrium or courtyard could be provided on the upper floor, and greening could be carried out at the central courtyard. Under this arrangement, not only could it enhance the daylight utilisation below the first floor but also air circulation for better ventilation; and
- (f) Scheme 5 was an additional design prepared by ArchSD in response to residents' views. The design concept of this scheme was about the designation of all dining facilities on the ground floor, and the upper floor would be open for public use. Moreover, seats would be provided for the

purpose of leisure or rest. This scheme had the merit of the availability of space on the upper floor for public use; nevertheless, the layout of the ground floor would become much cluttered.

12. Miss NG Kai-ting supplemented that after the Focus Group had finalised the design direction, ArchSD would proceed to refine the design. Besides, to date, progress had been made to the completion of the planned activities as at July 2014. As for the proposed dates in the TFS, the key milestones thereof included the submission of planning application to the Town Planning Board, consultation with the relevant Legislative Council panels and the vetting of the application by the Public Works Sub-committee and Finance Committee, etc. She drew Members' attention to the fact that as the preliminary direction was yet to confirm at present, some arrangements such as the progress of the detailed design, demolition of the existing ramp and temporary partial closure of some sites as mentioned in the paper might affect the proposed dates in the TFS.

13. The Chairman thanked ADO(S) and ArchSD representatives for reporting the project progress, and invited Members to give views on the related matters.

14. Mr WONG Ling-sun said that he would not support all schemes. He opined that the neighbourhood of Aberdeen Centre was not a suitable location for the restaurant premises because this was the only open space available for residents' use. In this connection, he urged SDC to reconsider the site selection. Also, he apologised for not being able to attend last year's meetings because of sickness. He held that public consultation was far from sufficient and there was a lack of communications with residents. He continued that a meeting had been convened for the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of SDC to meet with a number of concern group members as well as the chairpersons and vice-chairpersons of OCs. In the light of the fact that quite a lot of residents used to play *tai chi* and did exercise at the proposed location of the Project, he asked how the open space they were entitled to could be retained. He continued that the day-to-day operation of the restaurants in Aberdeen Centre had already created many problems. Given that the proposed location of the Project was not far away from the residential area, it was still probable that problems such as noise, public order, air quality, hygiene and traffic might arise. Furthermore, residents were concerned about which organisation would be designated for operating the restaurant concerned. If the building was left idle because of mismanagement, the daily lives of the residents would be affected.

15. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN enquired about the arrangements for delivery of food ingredients, storage of goods and waste disposal. He opined that ArchSD's design of the

waterfront at Sai Kung was undesirable because both food ingredients and waste were stored outside the restaurants, which had an adverse visual impact on the park as part of the open space. He said that the outdoor area was visible from the waterfront direction, so the park landscape was still acceptable; nevertheless, the back of house facilities of the restaurant could be seen from the other side. He opined that the leasing of such public premises at nominal rent was unfair to other restaurants in the district, which paid a market rent for the use of the commercial premises.

16. Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung asked about the area to be occupied by the restaurant building in respective schemes. Also, ArchSD was urged to provide solutions to hygienic issues, e.g. the removal of odours produced by oily fumes, measures to cope with environmental hygiene in the periphery, loading and unloading of goods, etc.

17. Mr CHU Lap-wai said that SDC and SDC Members had received a lot of comments from residents. This showed that they had grave concern over the reduction in open space under the Project. He held that the Project was dedicated to the whole Southern District, and the recent discussions aimed to implement some signature projects for the Southern District. He said that it was found that many residents worried about problems such as traffic, pollution, public order and availability of open space. According to his understanding, the Project was not about the provision of a restaurant that would provide catering services for package tours, but rather a SDC's on-going endeavour to promote the Southern District, which appealed to tourists who looked for in-depth experience of the fishing harbour culture of Aberdeen. He opined that SDC had to clearly explain the original intention of the Project to residents. He suggested that SDC should enhance communications with residents for mutual understanding in order to avoid misunderstanding. He inclined to support Scheme 3 or 4 which would occupy less open space.

18. Mr YEUNG Wai-foon, MH, JP said that it was SDC original intention that the Project could assist in promoting of the special features of the Southern District. He was aware of the fact that the construction works might affect the residents in the Aberdeen town centre. However, he opined that SDC should, wherever possible, address residents' concerns in terms of the hardware and operation by the future partner. For instance, it was believed that the problems of noise nuisance and oily fumes could be tackled with the advanced technology nowadays. As for the issue of public order, security patrol should be stepped up. He opined that as the Project was about the development of the Southern District as a whole, Members could put forward various solutions to tackle the problems accordingly. He commended ArchSD for being able to draw up different schemes within

a short time in response to residents' views. Also, he pointed out that Scheme 4 had taken the practical needs of the residents into account by providing a shelter against rain or sunlight, so that residents could still use the facility despite bad weather conditions.

19. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling commended ArchSD for being able to provide specific modifications to the design after consolidating Members' concerns within a short time. She said that as the bus stop was very crowded for the time being, she wished to take this opportunity to improve the conditions of holding area of the bus stop. In addition, she said that as Aberdeen Promenade had suffered from the problem of sunlight exposure of the setting sun, ArchSD was urged to come up with a design on a shelter against rain or sunlight in the interest of residents. She appreciated the overall design; nevertheless, more efforts should be made in hearing and considering residents' views. Also, she suggested that SDC Members of local constituencies should conduct consultation with the community.

20. Ir Dr CHAN Yuk-kit said that as a member of the design sector, he was very satisfied with ArchSD's designs. He opined that the design of a park should comprise dynamic and static components. The existing design was able to provide more space for residents' movements, and could attract visitors to carry out diversified activities as well. He opined that for the time being, state-of-the-art ionisers were available to filter odours and oily fumes, which were used by some temples. He pointed out that the existing carriageway next to the Aberdeen town centre was a main trunk road, and believed that the noise nuisance generated by vehicle movements would be greater than that of the restaurant.

21. Mr CHAI Man-hon felt very dissatisfied that under the SPS, assessment had not be carried out on areas such as the power of District Councils in district administration and availability of supporting departments, and regretted that the profession of public administration was neglected. He opined that SDC had to hear public's views, and pay due attention to the possible diminution of public space. He urged ArchSD to provide further information on the scheme before assessment could be made. Besides, he opined that issues such as effluent discharge, traffic movements, loading and unloading of goods had to be dealt with at a later stage. Also, thorough discussion on SDC's partnership of the Project could be made later on. He said that due to the insufficient information currently, the Democratic Party was unable to express a clear stance at this moment. It was wished that in future, further information could be provided and residents' participation be strengthened.

22. Ir CHAN Lee-shing, JP opined that it was no easy task for SDC to undertake a construction project at a cost of \$100 million. He held that the present location would become a landmark in the district in future. He appreciated ArchSD for their devotion and conscientiousness in coming up with designs, and expressed strong support to Schemes 3 and 4. He said that he did not worry about the problems such as oily fumes, noise nuisance and traffic arising from the operation of the restaurant. On the contrary, he supported the demolition of the existing ramp and the lift installation project, which could bring more convenience to residents in Aberdeen. He opined that Scheme 4 was in line with the philosophy of energy conservation for environmental protection.

23. Ms CHAN Judy Kapui considered that given that fishermen's culture was a signature feature of the Southern District, there was nothing wrong with the development of Project worth \$100 million in such a direction, and the location adjacent to the fish market was considered reasonable. However, other factors should be taken into account. She held that the consultation work on the Project should not just target the residents in Aberdeen and Tin Wan, but instead the views of residents of the whole Southern District should be taken into consideration. Besides, she said that the conceptual design of Scheme 4 was exceptional, and a rain shelter could be provided for the public without occupying the activities area on the ground floor. Regarding environmental protection, apart from considerations of treatment of oily fumes, effluent discharge and food waste disposal, she urged ArchSD to pay attention to the possible impact of light pollution on the nearby residents arising from the lighting of the restaurant.

24. Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying held that the restaurant and the Promenade could be connected under ArchSD's conceptual designs. She agreed that with the existing conceptual designs, not only could this provide a shelter against sunlight and rain, but also enhance the aesthetic value of the Promenade as a whole. At the same time, the Project could also be developed into a tourist attraction, which would play a rather vital role in upgrading Hong Kong's international status. She urged the Government to address the needs of both the restaurant and residents with the adoption of modern technology, in a bid to minimise the impact on the residents.

25. The Chairman invited representatives from LCSD and CEDD to advise on matters relating to the demolition of the existing ramp and temporary closure of the basketball court.

26. Mr CHAN Wai-kiu said that in the past, persons with disabilities (PWDs) could only access the viewing platform on the first floor via the existing ramp, and access to the

viewing platform on the second floor could only be made via the ramp of the footbridge outside. In view of this, PWDs were barred from direct access to the viewing platform on the second floor or Nam Ning Street from the viewing platform on the first floor. In case a lift facility was constructed adjacent to the footbridge outside, all floors of the viewing deck could be connected. Moreover, a new entrance would be provided at the ground floor of the Promenade for connecting the lift facility. Undoubtedly such arrangements could facilitate PWDs and the elderly to go to the viewing deck and Nam Ning Street via the Promenade, and the walking distance and journey time would be shortened correspondingly.

27. Mr LEUNG Ka-yin said that CEDD's lift installation project would provide an alternative access route to the proposed demolition of the existing ramp in order to facilitate PWDs to use the lift to go up/down the footbridge. In future, residents might use the existing ramp of the footbridge, the existing staircase and the new lift facility for access to the Promenade facilities and connectivity to the viewing deck, in order to achieve the objectives of barrier-free environment under the "Universal Accessibility Programme".

28. Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH commended ArchSD for preparing a number of schemes in response to residents' concerns within a short time, and being able to address residents' concerns on the problems of occupation of open space and noise nuisance at the same time. He appreciated and inclined to support Schemes 3 and 4. Also, he hoped that the future partnering organisation could enhance the management to address residents' concerns on the problems of environmental impact and public order arising from the Project.

29. Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH considered that the Project was a fruit of SDC's repeated discussions over a long time on how to highlight the special features of the Southern District in the long-term interest of the Southern District. The Project aimed to promote the fishing harbour culture of Aberdeen as well as seafood dining at Aberdeen. He maintained that consideration should be made from the perspective of the Southern District as a whole, and concurrently SDC should deal with the compatibility of the Project with the surrounding environment carefully, as well as addressing residents' concerns on the impact of the Project. He said that the recent views and proposals as put forward by SDC Members definitely reflected the concerns of the residents in Aberdeen Centre. He appreciated ArchSD for being able to optimise the original design in response to the aspirations and concerns of SDC and residents within a short time. He commended Scheme 4, in particular, for enabling residents to use the original public space for amenity and leisure activities, while at the same time consideration had been given to the use of the

facilities as a whole for the purpose of beautifying the waterfronts. He hoped that residents' views should receive more attention, and suggested that a public relations (PR) company could be engaged to collect public views.

30. The Chairman invited ArchSD representatives to respond.

31. Mr TSANG Wai-lun responded that after collecting public views on the preliminary design direction, ArchSD would proceed to refine the design having regard to issues such as effluent disposal, delivery food of ingredients and waste disposals. Regarding Member's enquiry on the respective area of the existing open space to be occupied under the proposed schemes, he responded that an area of around 750 m<sup>2</sup> would be occupied under the original proposal. Regarding Scheme 3, the opening of the rooftop on the first floor could compensate the area of the open space to be occupied on the ground floor, which was around 250 m<sup>2</sup>. An area of around 170 m<sup>2</sup> on the ground floor of the viewing deck would be occupied under Scheme 4. As regards Scheme 5 which had been drawn up in response to the concern group's comments, the indoor dining area would be located on the ground floor, while the rooftop would be made available for public use. An area of around 120 m<sup>2</sup> would be occupied under this scheme.

32. Mr WONG Ling-sun said that it had been suggested that an additional storey should be built on top of the existing fish market premises, but eventually the proposal was shelved because of objections from the fish merchants. He said that residents reflected that a building stretching out to the Promenade could be constructed adjacent to the fish market, in a bid to expand the public space. Also, the building could be used for the purpose of an exhibition hall. He reiterated that the residents had expressed objection to the proposal on the setting up of a restaurant.

33. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that at present, the Project involved the utilisation of Government land and public money of \$100 million for the development of a seafood restaurant. He opined that the handover of the site to a non-profit-making organisation (NPO) for management would create unfair and undue competition to the around 150 seafood restaurants operating in the Ap Lei Chau and Aberdeen areas. Regarding the design, he opined that issues such as traffic, delivery of food ingredients and waste disposal were the main concerns. He was disappointed about ArchSD stating that a response would only be made at the detailed design stage, and considered that such procedures were inappropriate.

34. Ir CHAN Lee-shing, JP opined that the development of a restaurant was a confirmed direction, and therefore, he objected that consideration should be given to other new proposals at this stage. He maintained that the current discussion on the four schemes was correct and appropriate.

35. The Chairman invited ArchSD representatives to respond.

36. Mr LI Ho-kin said that ArchSD noted Members' views and detailed information would be provided in the refined design for Members' reference. Besides, he hoped that the Chairman and the Focus Group could give a clear direction on the selection of scheme to facilitate ArchSD to take forward the related work.

37. In closing, the Chairman concluded that in summing up the views, most Members appreciated the alternative conceptual design schemes as provided by ArchSD, and agreed that under Schemes 3 and 4, adjustments had been made to address residents' concerns on noise nuisance and the occupation of open space. The Chairman suggested that as majority of Members inclined to support Schemes 3 and 4, Members were invited to conduct consultation with residents on these two schemes, and a decision would be made at the next meeting.

38. Mr CHAI Man-hon asked whether ArchSD could explore the feasibility of the proposal on the provision of the restaurant premises on the ground floor and the conversion of the upper floor to a new open space. Also, he urged LCSD to give a concrete response as to whether consideration would be made to the allocation of additional open space nearby as a compensation for the loss of open space arising from the occupation of land by the restaurant.

39. The Chairman urged LCSD to identify an alternative open space. As far as he was concerned, he opined that the design in relation to the provision of the restaurant facility on the ground floor and the conversion of the upper floor to an open space was not desirable, which might bring inconvenience to the operator or members of the public.

40. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN opined that the Focus Group should draw up clear-cut criteria for evaluating the cost-effectiveness of Schemes 3 and 4 in terms of delivery of food ingredients, waste disposal and traffic, etc.

41. The Chairman said that as the detailed guidelines on matters relating to oily fumes, noise nuisance, hygiene, light pollution, environmental protection and traffic had

been set out in the Guide to Application as Partnering Organisation, such issues could be discussed under the next agenda item. Meanwhile, Members were requested to give views on ArchSD's schemes, and consultation with residents should be made after the meeting, in a bid to facilitate the Focus Group's decision on the selection of scheme at the next meeting.

42. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN reiterated that the Focus Group should draw up clear-cut criteria for evaluating various schemes.

43. The Chairman responded that to enable Members to have a better understanding of the matters relating to the partnering organisation, discussion should be made under agenda item 3. Meanwhile, ArchSD had promised that after a scheme had been chosen, due attention would be paid to the issues such as environmental protection, noise nuisance, hygiene and light pollution at the detailed design stage.

44. Mr CHAN Wai-kiu said that previously, it was mentioned that after the completion of the construction of the restaurant, the Promenade would lose part of the open space. He clarified that under the SPS, the above site was still an "Open Space" from the land planning perspective; nevertheless, the use of the site concerned had changed. He said that consent should be sought with the submission of planning application for the construction of a restaurant on "Open Space". He held that deliberation should be made on the compensation for the change of land use, and said that consideration might be given to the covered area under Scheme 4.

45. Mr YEUNG Wai-foon, MH, JP maintained that both Schemes 3 and 4 as provided by ArchSD were conceptual designs. Based on their professional knowledge, ArchSD could come up with a more desirable design at the detailed design stage. He suggested that SDC Members of local constituencies should first conduct consultation in their own constituencies to avoid affecting the progress of the Project.

46. Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH said that if insufficient consultation or improper arrangements were made on the Project, this might lead to another outcome. To enable residents to have a better understanding of the objectives of the Project in the interest of the whole Southern District, and address to residents' aspirations having regard to their concerns on the possible impacts, he opined that SDC should spend more time in the consultation with residents in the Southern District. If the budget permitted, a PR company should be engaged to conduct a comprehensive consultation. In this connection, he suggested that a decision on the scheme to be selected should be made for ArchSD's

following up only after residents in the Southern District had reached consensus through the consultation work on the Project.

47. Mr WONG Ling-sun wished to have more time to conduct a comprehensive consultation with all residents.

48. The Chairman suggested that Members should consult residents in the next two weeks, and the decision on the scheme to be selected would be made at the next meeting.

**Agenda Item 3: Invitation of Proposals from Partnering Organisation**  
**(SDSP Paper No. 4/2014)**

---

49. The Chairman said that the Focus Group had made amendment proposals for the Guide to Application as Partnering Organisation in its 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting. The final revised version of the document was already emailed to Members.

50. Miss NG Kai-ting briefed Members on the progress of the invitation of partnering organisation. SDO uploaded the Guide to Application as Partnering Organisation onto the website of SDC on 28 July 2014 and open applications were invited. Meanwhile, advertisements were also published in Sing Tao Daily, The Standard and Southern District News, inviting interested NPOs to submit letter of intention. The closing date for application was 8 September 2014. SDO received two applications in total. The applicant organisations were Tao Heung Food Culture and Education Foundation Limited and HK Ample Love Society Limited respectively.

51. The Chairman asked whether the aforesaid two organisations were NPOs.

52. Miss NG Kai-ting replied that according to the application of Tao Heung Food Culture and Education Foundation Limited, it was making application for the status as an NPO, whereas HK Ample Love Society Limited claimed that it was already an NPO. As the application period had just expired, SDO had not examined in detail the information submitted by the application organisations.

53. The Chairman suggested that Members should read the contents of the applications before inviting the applicant organisations to give a briefing.

54. Ir CHAN Lee-shing, JP opined that applicant organisations which were making application for the status as an NPO should not be accepted for consideration. Since there was only an eligible applicant organisation, he suggested that an open invitation should be considered again in order to attract more application organisations.

55. Miss NG Kai-ting replied that it was already stipulated in the Guide to Application as Partnering Organisation that organisations making application for the status as an NPO were also allowed to submit applications. But the organisations concerned were required to obtain the said status within three months after the application period was closed, i.e., on or before 8 December 2014.

56. Mr AU Nok-hin said that the public was concerned about whether potential transfer of interest was involved between the organisations and SDC. He held that due attention should be paid as to whether the applicant organisations were able to obtain the status of an NPO before the deadline. Also, consideration should be given as to whether the contents of the proposals were consistent with the theme. He opined that Tao Heung Food Culture and Education Foundation Limited was basically a catering business, the applicant should clarify the relationship between its education foundation and Tao Heung Holdings Ltd.

57. The Chairman requested the Secretary to follow up whether Tao Heung Food Culture and Education Foundation Limited was able to obtain the said status before 8 December 2014, and that relevant proof should be provided. Regarding Mr AU Nok-hin's concern, enquiries could be made during the briefing by the applicant organisations.

58. Miss NG Kai-ting added that as one of the proposals contained much information, and Members might have to take longer time to scrutinise its contents correspondingly. Meanwhile, Members could preliminarily scrutinise whether the contents of the proposals could fulfil the requirements of the Project.

59. Mr YEUNG Wai-foon, MH, JP said that before meeting with the applicant organisations, Members also had to study the contents of the proposals and raised enquiries accordingly. He suggested that the selection of partnering organisation should be conducted only after the completion of the aforesaid procedures.

60. The Chairman asked whether arrangements should be made for Members to read the proposals first.

61. Miss NG Kai-ting said that the above arrangements could be made. Also, she asked whether Members would preliminarily read the proposals at the meeting on 16 September 2014. After the exercise, requests could be made to the organisations via the Secretariat to obtain the relevant information.

62. Mr CHAI Man-hon said that as the proposals were long, he hoped that Members could be given the opportunity to read the contents of the proposals and discussion be made first, and then enquiries could be raised to the applicant organisations by email or telephone via the Secretariat, or invitation be made for a meeting with these applicant organisations. Such arrangements could avoid misunderstanding and chaos during the meeting because the Focus Group was not well informed of the contents. He considered that such partnership mode was not as simple as the normal vetting procedures in the past. He suggested that a session should be arranged for Members to familiarise themselves with the contents of the proposals.

63. Mr LO Kin-hei opined that consideration should be given to a briefing by the organisations before proceeding to study the contents or vice versa. He wished to know the purpose of the next meeting as to whether it was intended for a briefing of the proposals by the organisations, evaluation of the proposals by the Focus Group, or just for Members to understand the contents of the proposals.

64. The Chairman said that according to his understanding, Mr CHAI Man-hon intended to let Members inform themselves with the contents of the proposals first, and the Secretariat would be tasked to follow up enquiries, if any.

65. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling agreed to Mr CHAI Man-hon's suggestion. She said that the Chairman should chair the reading session about the contents of the proposals. She opined that when the organisations attended the meeting, as Members were well informed of the contents of the proposals, it would enhance the efficiency of the questions and answers session. She suggested that Members could read the proposals in the morning, while the meeting with the organisations could be held in the afternoon.

66. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN opined that the contents of the proposals received could be uploaded to the internet for Members' reference.

67. The Chairman considered that Members could get together for exchange of views on the contents of the proposals.

68. Mr YEUNG Wai-foon, MH, JP said that under the established practice of SDC in the vetting of funding applications, the Secretariat would also verify the related contents in advance. He asked whether the Secretariat could highlight the main points in the proposals, and the contents and main points could be explained by the Secretariat at the meeting later on.

69. The Chairman said that Mr YEUNG Wai-foon, MH, JP's suggestion was similar to the prevailing practice of the Vetting Sub-committee (VSC).

70. Mr LO Kin-hei pointed out that the views as put forward by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN was also the established practice of VSC. SDC Members would study the information on the funding applications concerned before the meeting, and study on their own before attending the meeting. He opined that Members should first decide whether the prevailing practice of VSC should be adopted, i.e. the contents should be scrutinised and vetting be completed at the same meeting; or else the procedures would be split apart for processing at different meetings.

71. Ir Dr CHAN Yuk-kit supported the organisation of a "self-study session" to give Members the opportunity to study the contents of the documents. Besides, he opined that SDO was more familiar with the whole tender procedures, and wished to invite SDO to draft the contents on issues to be noted during the evaluation of proposals, in a bid to facilitate Members' deliberation during the group discussion session, with a view to enhancing efficiency of the meeting.

72. The Chairman suggested that ADO(S) could assist in the drafting of the contents on issues to be noted in the evaluation of proposals. Members could propose a date for holding the "self-study session", and the organisations would be invited to present their proposals later on. Afterwards, a closed-door session would be held for evaluating the proposals. Moreover, it was suggested that the documents could be passed on to Members for study at this stage.

73. Mr Paul ZIMEMRMAN commented that the idea of "self-study session" was strange. He said that he preferred to read the proposals on his own, and would prepare questions for the response of the applicant organisations at the meeting.

74. Mrs MAK TSE How-ling was worried about the distribution of the proposals for Members' study in advance.

75. The Chairman said that the documents concerned were for Members' reference only instead of uploading to the internet.

76. Mr LO Kin-hei opined that the secrecy ethics of Members should be respected. In the past, documents not yet due for disclosure, such as papers on vetting fund applications, were emailed to Members for their own perusal before attending meetings. He said that SDC had already discuss whether to disclose briefing of proposals in a meeting held in May 2014 and it was decided that the prevailing arrangement should continue until further discussion was to be made on the Standing Order. He held that if the Focus Group required an open briefing of the proposals, adjustments should also be made for VSC accordingly. He maintained that the Council should adopt a set of standard rules.

77. The Chairman pointed that in the discussion of the Le Chateau des Arts (LCDA), briefing on its proposal was conducted in an open meeting. Only the vetting part was conducted in a private session.

78. Mr LO Kin-hei said that according to his understanding, SDC was not able to make approval for the application of the LCDA. The decision had to be made by Home Affairs Bureau. He opined that the Council should adopt a set of standard rules. If this meeting needed to conduct the briefing of proposals openly, the future meetings of Vetting Sub-Committee should have the same arrangement.

79. Mr CHAI Man-hon wished to know whether further meeting would be held after the evaluation before the selection of the partnership organisation.

80. The Chairman responded that the Focus Group should report on the evaluation results at its meeting, and recommendations be made to SDC afterwards.

81. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN refused to participate in the "self-study session". He urged the Chairman to provide the related information to Members, which should be marked confidential when necessary.

82. Miss NG Kai-ting suggested that drawing on the experience of the Traffic and Transport Committee, the Focus Group could study the proposals in the form of a workshop.

83. The Chairman proposed that a workshop would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 16 September 2014.

**Agenda Item 4: Public Engagement**  
**(SDSP Paper No. 5/2014)**

---

84. The Chairman said that to let residents and members of public well informed of the projects under SPS and enable them to have a better understanding of the related progress, each district in Hong Kong might apply for a one-off allocation capped at \$300,000 from the Home Affairs Department for organising public engagement programmes. However, applications were required to be made prior to the commencement of the projects concerned. Upon the commencement of the projects, the expenditure relating to public engagement programmes had to be deducted from the allocation of \$100 million approved for each district. Such public engagement programmes might include district consultation forums, roving exhibitions, production of promotional posters, publications and leaflets, as well as other promotional activities to be held in the community. Members were invited to give views on the utilisation of the funding concerned.

85. Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH said that as many residents were concerned about this project, he opined that more residents should be encouraged for participation. Regarding the allocation as just mentioned by the Chairman, he suggested that a PR company should be engaged to deal with the related matters. He believed that the Secretariat was already overburdened and unable to handle too many external activities such as consultation forums, talks, production of promotional leaflets, etc., so he held that the related affairs should be undertaken by a professional PR company for the smooth implementation of the Project.

86. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that if the setting up of a restaurant was the final choice, the Focus Group should reserve part of the funding for the production of models for public display, showing clear details of the restaurant such as its location, design, operation and connectivity with the paths in the Promenade. The number of display models to be produced should depend of the number of scheme options.

87. Mr LO Kin-hei said that he had proposed the outsourcing of PR affairs, regardless of public engagement, PR work or consultation work, to an external organisation because such an arrangement was viable. According to the established

tender procedures, the engagement of a PR company also required tender invitation and evaluation. In this connection, he enquired about the timetable to tie in with such arrangements, and whether a decision should be made on the amount of funding to be reserved.

88. The Chairman said that to date, the remaining balance of the said allocation was over \$200,000.

89. Miss NG Kai-ting supplemented that the funding was mainly utilised for the previous Residents' Meeting in payment of venue rental. In future, should it require placing advertisements in the Southern District News and organising other consultation forums as just mentioned by some Members, funding should be reserved for such purposes.

90. The Chairman asked whether Members agreed to engage a PR company to follow up the related matters. The Focus Group endorsed the above arrangements, and the Secretariat was asked to follow up the matters accordingly.

**Agenda Item 5: Any Other Business**

---

91. Members did not raise further items for discussion.

**Agenda Item 6: Date of Next Meeting**

---

92. The Chairman said that the SDC Secretariat would notify Members of the date of the next Focus Group meeting in due course.

93. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

Secretariat, Southern District Council  
October 2014