

Southern District Council (2020-2023) (SDC)
Minutes of the 1st Meeting of the
Recreation and District Facilities Committee (RDFC)

Date : 19 May 2020 (Tuesday)

Time : 2:00 p.m.

Venue : SDC Conference Room

Present:

Mr LO Kin-hei	(Chairman of SDC)
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	(Vice-Chairman of SDC)
Mr TSUI Yuen-wa	(Chairman of RDFC)
Mr CHAN Ping-yeung	(Vice-Chairman of RDFC)
Mr CHAN Hin-chung	
Ms CHAN Yan-yi	
Mr LAM Andrew Tak-wo	
Mr LAM Ho-por, Kelvin	
Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH	
Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun	
Ms LI Shee-lin	
Mr PANG Cheuk-kei, Michael	
Mr POON Ping-hong	
Mr WONG Yui-hei, Angus	
Mr YIM Chun-ho	
Mr YU Chun-hei, James	
Miss YUEN Ka-wai, Tiffany	

Secretary:

Mr CHEUNG Wai-chun, William	Executive Officer I (District Management), Home Affairs Department
-----------------------------	---

In Attendance:

Mr CHENG Kong-chung, Francis, JP	District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department
Miss CHENG Wai-sum, Sum	Assistant District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department
Ms CHOW Ka-yan, Chowee	Architect (Works) 3, Home Affairs Department
Ms WAN Chi-ying, Jenny	Architect (Works) 6, Home Affairs Department
Mr PANG Kam-ping	Senior Inspector of Works (Hong Kong), Home Affairs Department
Mr WONG Bun	Inspector of Works (Hong Kong) 1, Home Affairs Department
Ms MAN Chi-nga, Flora	District Leisure Manager (Southern), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr AU YEUNG Wai-ming, Arthur	Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Southern, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms CHOI Suk-kuen, Shirley	Senior Manager (Cultural Services) (Hong Kong West), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms ZHAO Yee, Emily	Manager (Hong Kong West) Marketing, Programme and District Activities, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms CHEE Suk-mei, Tammy	Senior Librarian (Southern), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms CHAN Siu-kuen, Catalina	Librarian (Aberdeen Public Library), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms CHENG Siu-ping, Jessica	Principal Estate Officer / Hong Kong West & South (1), District Lands Office / Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department
Mr NG Tsz-wing, Ricky	Principal Estate Officer / Hong Kong West & South (2), District Lands Office / Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department

For agenda item 5:

Ms CHAN Ching-han, Angela	Country Parks Ranger Services Officer (Education), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Dr KWONG Kim-hung, Ric	Country Parks Officer (Hong Kong), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Ms LI Lai-ha, Liz	Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing & Pest Control) (Southern), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

For agenda item 7:

Mr Freeman CHAN	Associate, Andrew Lee King Fun & Associates Architects Limited
Mr Paul MIU	Chief Architect, Andrew Lee King Fun & Associates Architects Limited
Mr MO Pak-yin	Assistant Building Surveyor, Andrew Lee King Fun & Associates Architects Limited
Mr WONG Yat-cheung	Assistant Quantity Surveyor, C. S. Toh & Sons & Associates Limited
Mr Kevin CHAO	Senior Architect, Leigh and Orange Limited
Ms Grace KUNG	Assistant Project Designer, Leigh and Orange Limited

For agenda item 8:

Ms YIP Wai-see, Priscilla	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department
Ms CHOW Suk-yee, Jessica	Senior Liaison Officer (2), Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department

Opening Remarks:

The Chairman said that in view of the latest situation of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19), this meeting was not open to the public in order to reduce the risk of crowd gathering.

2. Members and media were advised to bring their own masks and water. Before entering the venue, all persons were subject to checking of body temperature with the assistance of the staff of Southern District Office (SDO), and were required to complete a health declaration form and declare whether he/she was under the 14-day compulsory quarantine.

3. The Chairman welcomed members and the following government representatives to the meeting:

- (a) Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
 - (i) Ms MAN Chi-nga, Flora, District Leisure Manager (Southern);
 - (ii) Mr AU YEUNG Wai-ming, Arthur, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Southern;
 - (iii) Ms CHOI Suk-kuen, Shirley, Senior Manager (Cultural Services) (Hong Kong West);
 - (iv) Ms ZHAO Yee, Emily, Manager (Hong Kong West) Marketing, Programme and District Activities;
 - (v) Ms CHEE Suk-mei, Tammy, Senior Librarian (Southern);
 - (vi) Ms CHAN Siu-kuen, Catalina, Librarian (Aberdeen Public Library);
- (b) Lands Department (LandsD)
 - (i) Ms CHENG Siu-ping, Jessica, Principal Estate Officer / Hong Kong West & South (1) (District Lands Office / Hong Kong West & South);
 - (ii) Mr NG Tsz-wing, Ricky, Principal Estate Officer / Hong Kong West & South (2) (District Lands Office / Hong Kong West & South);
- (c) Home Affairs Department (HAD)
 - (i) Ms CHOW Ka-yan, Chowee, Architect (Works) 3;
 - (ii) Ms WAN Chi-ying, Jenny, Architect (Works) 6;
 - (iii) Mr PANG Kam-ping, Senior Inspector of Works (Hong Kong); and
 - (iv) Mr WONG Bun, Inspector of Works (Hong Kong) 1.

4. The Chairman said that to avoid suspending the meeting in the absence of a quorum, members should, as far as practicable, advise the Secretary of their early withdrawal before the meeting, and inform the Secretariat staff when they left the meeting.

5. The Chairman advised that to enhance the efficiency of the meeting, each member was allotted a maximum of two 3-minute slots to speak in respect of each agenda item.

Agenda Item 1: Confirmation of the Minutes of the 1st Special Meeting held on 12 March 2020

6. The Chairman said that the draft minutes of the above meeting had been circulated to members for comments before the meeting. The Secretariat had not received any amendment proposals so far.

7. The minutes of the 1st special meeting were confirmed by the Committee.

Agenda Item 2: Reports by the LCSD in the Southern District:

(A) Report on the District Free Entertainment Programmes in 2019-20, Community Arts Scheme 2020-21 and Other Arts and Cultural Activities in the Southern District organised by the LCSD;

(B) Report on the Usage and Extension Activities of Public Libraries in the Southern District by the LCSD; and

(C) Report on the Organisation of Recreation and Sports Programmes and Management of Facilities in the Southern District by the LCSD

(RDFC Paper No. 4/2020)

(Include agenda items on “Discussion on Annex 3 to RDFC Paper No. 1/2020” by Mr PANG Cheuk-kei, Michael and “Progress of Recovery Works and “Progress of Recovery Works and Redevelopment Plan for Aberdeen Sports Ground” by Mr LO Kin-hei and Ms CHAN Yan-vi)

Annex 1: Report on the District Free Entertainment Programmes in 2019-20, Community Arts Scheme 2020-21 and Other Arts and Cultural Activities in the Southern District organised by the LCSD

8. Ms Shirley CHOI briefed members on the district free entertainment programmes organised by LCSD in the Southern District for the period from December 2019 to March 2020, as detailed in Appendix I. Moreover, she said that the programmes in February and March 2020 had been cancelled due to the epidemic.

9. Ms Shirley CHOI said that LCSD would launch the Community Arts Scheme in the Southern District this year, and thanked SDC for its support. Details of the activities and district cultural programmes of the said Scheme were set out in Appendix II. In view of the epidemic situation, the opening performance of the musical *Our Days Down South* would be rescheduled for 19 July 2020, while the venue would remain at Ap Lei Chau Community Hall. Arrangement for the remaining programmes would be adjusted subject to the epidemic situation, and further report would be given to the meeting pending the updated information.

10. Ms Shirley CHOI briefly introduced the district cultural programmes to be organised by LCSD in the Southern District for the period from July to September 2020, including two applications for joint presentation of programmes with district organisations. Details were set out in Appendix II (II).

11. Ms Shirley CHOI briefly introduced the outline of other arts and cultural activities to be organised by LCSD in the Southern District 2020-21 and the other arts and cultural activities organised in the Southern District by LCSD from December 2019 to July 2020, as detailed in Appendices IV and V. While some of the activities had been affected by the epidemic, LCSD would review whether the activities scheduled to be organised for the period from June to July 2020 could resume normal with regard to the actual circumstances. Following the resumption of schools, some of the school programmes had started their enrollment work.

12. The Committee noted the above paper, and approved the two applications for joint presentation of programmes as mentioned in paragraph 5 of Annex 1.

Annex 2: Report on the Usage and Extension Activities of Public Libraries in the Southern District by the LCSD

13. Ms Tammy CHEE briefed members on the attendance of extension activities and the usage of the public libraries of LCSD in the Southern District from January to April 2020, as detailed in Annex 2.

14. Ms Tammy CHEE added that in view of the epidemic situation, the public libraries in the Southern District had been temporarily closed from 29 January 2020 onwards. The Aberdeen Public Library would be partially reopened on 21 May 2020, while the other three small libraries in the Southern District would remain closed until further notice. In light of the latest situation, all activities scheduled up to June 2020 would be cancelled with effect from 29 January 2020.

15. The Committee noted the relevant report.

16. The Chairman said that since the libraries had been temporarily closed during the epidemic, some of the elderly might not be able to renew their books online and end up having books overdue. He asked whether LCSD would exempt the elderly from the overdue fines.

17. Ms Tammy CHEE said that starting from 29 January 2020, LCSD had not counted the overdue fines of the books on loan. Even after partial reopening of certain libraries, no fines would be charged until the service of all the libraries had resumed normal.

Annex 3: Report on the Organisation of Recreation and Sports Programmes and Management of Facilities in the Southern District by the LCSD

18. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG briefed members on the recreation and sports (R&S) programmes organised by LCSD in January 2020 and those to be organised from June to July 2020 in the Southern District, the usage of the R&S facilities, a summary of opinions by users of leisure services, assessment of the LCSD's contractors' service levels and greening work in the Southern District from January to April 2020, refurbishment/improvement project, proposals of funding application for District Minor Works in 2020-2021, recovery works for LCSD's facilities damaged by the Super Typhoon Mangkhut in the Southern District, the construction of a footbridge with lifts to connect the Ap Lei Chau Wind Tower Park and Ap Lei Chau Estate, as well as the provision of heated pool at the Pao Yue Kong Swimming Pool Complex in the Southern District, as detailed in Annex 3 to the RDFC Paper No. 4/2020.

19. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG added that in view of the epidemic, LCSD had closed the leisure venues and suspended the recreational and sports programmes since 29 January 2020, and would resume organisation of some recreation and sports programmes from June 2020 onwards. However, giving consideration to factors such as prohibition on group gathering, the quota of the activities would be adjusted as appropriate under the actual circumstances. The actual quota would be provided in the report at the next meeting.

20. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN pointed out that the progress of recovery works for the LCSD's facilities damaged by the Super Typhoon "Mangkhut" in Deep Water Bay Beach was not shown in Appendix V of the paper. He said that the progress of the recovery works for Deep Water Bay Beach was not satisfactory, as it was only reinstated to its original status before the typhoon attack without any enhancement or improvement. He said that the old "Lovers' Bridge" was not beautiful, and opined that the recovery works should not just aim at reinstating the bridge but also grasp the opportunity to carry out beautification and enhancement works. He also requested that LCSD provide the layout plan for the recovery works of the "Lovers' Bridge". He pointed out that Hairpin Beach had the same problem too. He would like to make improvement and acquire the relevant layout plan of the beach. He was disappointed about the recovery of Deep Water Bay Beach, and requested to suspend the works and have a review of the relevant design before proceeding with the works.

21. Ms Flora MAN responded that as the footpath of Deep Water Bay Beach was severely damaged by the Super Typhoon "Mangkhut". After studying the condition of the said road section with the Highways Department (HyD) and the Transport Department (TD), it was considered that there was a risk of deterioration and the repair works had to be completed with priority. LCSD would proactively study the feasibility of various footpath improvement proposals, such as road widening. For the works of the "Lovers' Bridge" to connect Tai Tau Chau, it was the public aspiration to have the bridge reinstated to its original appearance as soon as possible in order to facilitate their access to Tai Tau Chau from Shek O Headland. The Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) had been trying their best to design so that the "Lovers' Bridge" could be reinstated to its original appearance and meeting the prevailing construction standards. Relevant works would comprise of two parts. The first part was to reinstate the footpaths at both ends of the bridge. The works had already commenced since the end of April 2020. LCSD had communicated with the local SDC member and residents of the constituency concerned regarding the traffic and transport conditions as well as the relevant arrangement. On the other hand, the works of the "Lovers' Bridge" reinstatement had proceeded to the detailed design stage. The reinstatement works would gradually commence after completion of the gazettal exercise. Regarding Hairpin Beach, the path connecting it to Stanley Main Beach was damaged in the passage of typhoon "Mangkhut". In this consideration, the recovery works had to be carried out to provide access for the public to use the nearby facilities before study on making further improvement.

22. The Chairman asked LCSD if it could provide the relevant layout plan for members' reference, and when the layout plan would be provided.

23. Ms Flora MAN responded that the detailed design of the “Lovers’ Bridge” was still under preparation. She would liaise with ArchSD after the meeting and enquire about the progress.

24. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN enquired of LCSD whether the “Lovers’ Bridge” would be improved or reinstated to its original status. He said that the whole “Lovers’ Bridge” had been completely destroyed and could not be repaired. The reconstruction works for the bridge should not just aim at restoring the shabby appearance of the old bridge but should redesign and improve it. There should be no haste for the works while re-planning might be needed. As regards Deep Water Bay Beach, he said that wheelchair users were not provided with direct access to such place as the beach from the car park. They had to go to their destinations via the carriageway. He proposed that LCSD should redesign a feasible plan and take this opportunity to tackle other problems all together even if a longer time was required.

25. Ms Flora MAN responded that LCSD had accorded higher priority to restore the “Lovers’ Bridge” at the present stage, so as to ensure that the public could use the “Lovers’ Bridge” connecting between Shek O Headland and Tai Tau Chau as soon as possible. LCSD would also study various options with ArchSD to improve the appearance of the “Lovers’ Bridge”.

26. The Chairman agreed with the comments of Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, opining that LCSD should seize the opportunity to tackle the aforesaid problems in tandem with the recovery works. Otherwise, it would take a longer time to process the improvement works in future. Since the recovery works for LCSD’s facilities damaged by the Super Typhoon “Mangkhut” in the Southern District was not a discussion item raised by SDC and owing to the fact that there was election and later on the epidemic, LCSD had not communicated well enough with SDC before carrying out the works. He hoped that LCSD could make improvement if similar situation occurred in future, and listen to members’ comments before and during the works, which would be beneficial to the community and the works.

27. Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun proposed that LCSD should consider categorising recovery works into urgent and non-urgent types when similar cases arose in future. If the works was not urgent, LCSD could explore if there was room for further improvement.

28. Mr PANG Cheuk-kei, Michael said that he had previously inspected the condition of the “Lovers’ Bridge” in Shek O with the LCSD representative. He also agreed with Mr

Paul ZIMMERMAN's comments that when the layout plan for the recovery works of the "Lovers' Bridge" was still under discussion, members should take part in the process. Moreover, given that the road sections along Shek O Village Road were very narrow, LCSD had to take into account the opinions and concerns of residents in Shek O during implementation of the works. He had suggested to LCSD earlier on that it might consider adopting sea transport for the work, but he was not sure whether LCSD would accept this arrangement. He said that if land transport was adopted, it would cause inconvenience to residents and damage to the roads. He hoped that LCSD would study the feasibility of sea transport in order to minimise the impact of the works on residents as far as practicable.

29. Ms Flora MAN responded that LCSD noted members' comments on improving the recreational facilities under LCSD's purview. Regarding the proposal of adopting sea transport for the works of the "Lovers' Bridge" in Shek O, LCSD would study various options with ArchSD.

30. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH enquired about the progress on the construction of a footbridge with lifts to connect the Ap Lei Chau Wind Tower Park and Ap Lei Chau Estate, and when the relevant funding would be put up for discussion and approval in the relevant Committee of the Legislative Council (LegCo).

31. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG responded that the said works was expected to be submitted to the Public Works Subcommittee of LegCo for discussion in May 2020. However, as the works of other departments were also on the waiting list, the order of discussion for various works had yet to be confirmed by the LegCo.

32. The Chairman said that according to LCSD's response, the project had been put on the queuing list of the LegCo. It was expected to be tabled for discussion in May 2020.

Annex 4: Discussion on Annex 3 to RDFC Paper No. 1/2020

33. Mr Michael PANG briefed members on his agenda, as detailed in Annex 4 to the RDFC Paper No. 4/2020.

34. The Chairman enquired whether the representative of LCSD had anything to add apart from the information given in the written reply at Annex 6 to the RDFC Paper No. 4/2020.

35. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG said that he had nothing to add.

Annex 5: Progress of Recovery Works and Redevelopment Plan for Aberdeen Sports Ground

36. Ms CHAN Yan-yi briefed members on the agenda item, as detailed in Annex 5 to the RDFC Paper No. 4/2020. She added that a lot of comments were raised on enhancing the sports ground in the past, including those put forth by the last term SDC. She asked LCSD why the recovery works had not included all those improvement works, such as construction of an arena stage with cover, addition of seats and removal of the four pillars blocking the vision of spectator stand, as well as installation of additional lighting. She wished to hear explanation from the department the reason for being unable to address the above proposal and the future direction, and whether it would account to members for any study or progress of the proposed project. She said that as there were more newly elected members under the current term of SDC, she hoped that LCSD could listen to members' views first during the planning stage with a view to enhancing the quality of the Aberdeen Sports Ground.

37. Mr LO Kin-hei added that the sports ground had been reopened and some of the suggestions previously raised had been implemented. However, the progress report had not shown the updated situation and its presentation was loosely organised. Through discussion of this agenda, he hoped that it could be consolidated into a report consisting of the works already implemented, the outstanding works and those considered to be pending future redevelopment of Aberdeen Sports Ground, with a record of comments which had been discussed before to facilitate follow-up in future. Apart from discussing the recovery works, he hoped that LCSD would also give an account of the overall redevelopment programme and progress of Aberdeen Sports Ground and when the actual proposal on the redevelopment would be made available to the SDC or the public for discussion and comments. The sports ground was of great importance to the Southern District residents and was the home of the district football team, Kwoon Chung Southern District Football Club. It was also used by many schools. He hoped that LCSD could work with the SDC by providing more information so as to enable members to explain and have discussion with the residents and local organisations.

38. The Chairman said that the written replies of LCSD had been given at Annex 7 to the RDFC Paper No. 4/2020. He asked the LCSD representatives whether they had additional information to give apart from the written replies.

39. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG added that LCSD had incorporated most of members' comments on the proposed improvement into the renovation works. He said that members'

comments would be considered as far as practicable during its planning stage for the redevelopment project of Aberdeen Sports Ground. As mentioned in the paper, the scope under the latest study would be a holistic approach which included the adjacent Wong Chuk Hang Recreation Ground and Wong Chuk Hang Sports Centre. If it could be smooth, SDC would be consulted by the end of this year or early next year on LCSD's preliminary plan.

40. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN would like to see the relevant layout plan in order to make comments for improvement. In view of the current epidemic situation, he asked whether touch-free device could be provided with the facilities like wash rooms, wash basins, auto doors and bottle filling stations for public use.

41. The Chairman said that as the project was still at its initial stage, he suggested that members raise their comments as far as possible at this stage so that LCSD could take members' views into consideration during implementation of the redevelopment project.

42. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN enquired whether LCSD would consult the pitch users, such as the Rugby Union or other sports associations.

43. The Chairman asked about the extent of area of expansion for the sports ground and whether new facilities would be added, for example, whether the half basketball court would be turned into a standard basketball court; whether facilities like table tennis tables could be added if more space could be vacated from the adjacent area. Since it was the preliminary design stage, he hoped that LCSD could consider comments in this regard.

44. Mr LO Kin-hei enquired whether a plan for expansion had been confirmed for the redevelopment of Aberdeen Sports Ground and was put under its overall planning accordingly. He hoped that a clearer blue print could be provided by LCSD, such as the facilities and ancillary facilities to be provided, and whether the venue could meet the international competition standards, so that members could explain the plan to residents and collect their opinions. He would like to know whether LCSD would consult members at this stage for consideration and planning purpose.

45. Ms Flora MAN gave a consolidated response that the latest scope of study on the redevelopment of Aberdeen Sports Ground would be in a holistic approach to include Wong Chuk Hang Recreation Ground and Wong Chuk Hang Sports Centre in order to use the land resources more efficiently. After the redevelopment, Aberdeen Sports Ground could be used for organising high level football events. As regards the comments or proposals raised by members previously, LCSD had already relayed to ArchSD for study and deliberation.

Since the project was at its initial stage of development, LCSD would continue to collect information and views and would discuss with other departments for timely consultation with the members.

46. The Chairman enquired whether the consultation plan mentioned by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN before was being conducted at this stage.

47. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG responded that LCSD would consult the relevant users of Aberdeen Sports Ground, such as Hong Kong Rugby Union and the Hong Kong Football Association. For the indoor facilities of the sports centre with badminton court, basketball court and volleyball court, LCSD would also consult the relevant sports associations in the hope that the venues would suit the need of different users after redevelopment.

48. The Chairman enquired of LCSD whether Wong Chuk Hang Sports Centre would need to be demolished for redevelopment under the redevelopment programme. If it was the case, there would be greater room for design. He proposed members to follow up and express their views to LCSD via various platforms. In addition, he asked LCSD to provide latest information on its grant to sports coaches scheme during the epidemic.

49. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG replied that under the prevailing redevelopment programme, Wong Chuk Hang Sports Centre would be demolished for redevelopment. As regards the arrangement on the release of grant to the part-time staff of R&S activities, the amount of grant had been increased from 50% as earlier reported to 100% of the grantee's salary.

50. The Chairman thanked LCSD for its arrangement on behalf of all coaches.

(Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Mr Michael PANG, Mr CHAN Hin-chung, Mr LO Kin-hei joined the meeting at 2:14 p.m., 2:20 p.m., 2:22 p.m. and 2:32 p.m. respectively.)

(Ms Shirley CHOI, Ms Emily ZHAO, Ms Tammy CHEE and Ms Catalina CHAN left the meeting at 2:52 p.m.)

Agenda Item 3: Setting up of Working Groups under RDFC
(RDFC Paper No. 5/2020)

51. The Chairman said that in accordance with the terms of reference (ToR) of RDFC as endorsed at the meeting of SDC on 7 January 2020, the Committee might set up working

groups to assist in discharging its duties as stated therein. Having regard to the ToR of the Committee, it was now proposed that the following three working groups be set up under the Committee, namely the “Working Group on District Minor Works Projects”, “Working Group on the Management of Community Halls / Community Centres and Libraries” and “Working Group on Animal Rights”.

52. The Chairman asked members to refer to the ToR, membership and tenure of office for each of the Working Groups as detailed in Annexes 1 to 3 of the RDFC Paper No. 5/2020 respectively.

53. The Committee agreed to set up three Working Groups, i.e. “Working Group on District Minor Works Projects”, “Working Group on the Management of Community Halls / Community Centres and Libraries” and “Working Group on Animal Rights”, and endorsed the ToR, membership and tenure of office as set out in Annexes 1 to 3 of the Paper.

54. The Chairman said that the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen would be elected at the first meeting of the respective Working Groups. The Secretariat would formally invite members to join the Working Groups later on.

Agenda Item 4: Improvement and Development of Open Space in the Southern District and Request for Provision of a Sitting-out Area in the Bays Area
(Include agenda items on “Request for Provision of a Sitting-out Area in the Bays Area” by Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun and “Improvement and Development of Open Space in the Southern District” by Mr CHAN Ping-yeung)
(RDFC Paper No. 6/2020)

55. When briefing members on the agenda item, Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun said that the details of the agenda item were given at Annex 1 to RDFC Paper No. 6/2020. He added that there were many small vacant sites in the Bays Area. Given the small areas of these sites, when the LCSD tried to use these sites for leisure purposes, its efforts would be constrained by various factors such as the gradient of the land and slopes. Some vacant sites under the purview of the LandsD were fenced off by wire fences and overgrown with weeds. Some passers-by even disposed of refuse in the site. He understood that it was difficult to request LandsD to carry out cleansing and weed-cutting for the sites frequently as these were not the main duties of LandsD. LandsD suggested adopting the mode of joint management

and maintenance (M&M) when converting these sites to open spaces. But he considered that the mode of joint M&M would give rise to a lot of problems. For example, LandsD could not ban smoking inside the site. Its cleansing and beautification work were also inferior to the venues managed by LCSD. He suggested that LandsD hand over the vacant sites to LCSD, which could convert them to simple open spaces. He reiterated that it would be a better management mode to convert these small sites to open spaces under LCSD.

56. The Chairman said that the written response from LCSD was given at Annex 3 to RDFC Paper No. 6/2020. He enquired whether there was any supplementary response and requested LCSD to briefly introduce the mode of joint M&M.

57. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG responded that the mode of joint M&M generally refers to the management of some unleased or unallocated Government land by different departments carrying out duties under their respective ambits. In general, LCSD would undertake the maintenance of vegetation and trees in the sites. On the other hand, LandsD had allocated some open space areas to LCSD under district minor works (DMW) projects in the past, the sites were then developed into recreational venues. This arrangement must take into account factors including the location of venue and availability of resources, which took a rather long time for completion of development. In order to open the vacant sites for public use as soon as possible, adopting the mode of joint M&M would be a relatively faster method which required less resources.

58. Miss YUEN Ka-wai, Tiffany said that adoption of the mode of joint M&M on sites with little development and smaller areas would give rise to problems. Citing the site next to Hing Wai Centre as an example, she pointed out that the division of labour between different departments was chaotic. While the site concerned was large enough for ordinary leisure activities, it was currently suffering from the problems of uneven tiles, improper trimming of decayed branches, overgrown weeds and serious mosquito breeding. When asked to handle the problems, the departments would say that the site was not under their purview. She hoped that the departments would consider providing a list of such sites and assigning a department to take over the sites. She said that although dogs were not allowed to enter leisure venues managed by LCSD according to the Pleasure Grounds Regulation, she hoped that the relevant provision could be amended to keep abreast of the times. She further said that nowadays many people kept dogs as pets which required leisure grounds. But since there were now a limited number of pet gardens, she hoped that the relevant department would follow up the issue with the relevant working group.

59. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG said that he noted members' concerns. LCSD would follow up the maintenance of vegetation in the aforesaid sites. As for the suggestion of allowing pets going to parks, LCSD would continue to review the situation of individual venues regarding to the demand.

60. Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun said that he considered the mode of joint M&M completely ineffective because it suffered from certain structural problems. He also wondered whether the various departments could carry out specialised management for the sites. Even if the relevant departments could arrange for co-management quickly, they could not prevent people from smoking or doing other things in the sites. He understood that it would take a rather long time for the site to be handed over to LCSD. But he would rather wait a long time to see the site be converted to a venue which was properly used and beneficial to the public, which was a better arrangement than the mode of joint M&M. He considered that the public would not like the mode of joint M&M. He called on fellow members to be aware of the problems of the mode of joint M&M and reiterated that this mode was a tumour of society.

61. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that there were numerous sites of this type in the Southern District and the crux of the problem was who to pay the expenses. It might take a long time to properly resolve all these land problems, but there were still some basic things that could be done at present. For example, using railings to replace the wire fences or carrying out minor repair and maintenance works. He pointed out that the maintenance responsibility of different sites had to be handled individually having regard to the specific situation and he believed that the site in Tin Wan was under HyD's purview. If the site was under the purview of HyD, then HyD would have resources to beautify the site. He added that fellow members could list the sites that required improvement. The appearance of many sites located near trunk roads or crossroads could be reshaped by planting or removing wire fences and a list of such sites must be available first before any follow-up actions could be discussed.

62. Mr LO Kin-hei said that the problems generated after removal of wire fences had to be tackled. It would take a long time to remove the wire fences if it was done after LCSD have finished converting the land into a park. He pointed out that the mode of joint M&M was very common in Hong Kong, but it was not an effective mode. He advised the relevant department to expedite the construction of parks. He considered that it was not aesthetic to fence off sites with wire fences. Consideration could be given to using more aesthetic methods to fence off the sites in certain locations. He hoped that the various departments

would step up coordination beforehand instead of tackling the related problems only after removing the wire fences.

63. The Chairman enquired of the District Lands Office (DLO) about the required processing time if LCSD applied to DLO for allocating a site for future maintenance.

64. Ms Jessica CHENG responded that there were two kinds of applications for temporary land allocation. The first one is simplified temporary land allocation which did not require consultation of various departments, it took about two to three months to process the applications in general. The second one is temporary land allocation which required consultation of various departments, it took about nine months to process the applications in general.

65. The Chairman enquired of DLO about the required time for processing applications for permanent land allocation in general.

66. Ms Jessica CHENG responded that the consultation period of applications for permanent land allocation would be longer and each application had to be considered on its own merits.

67. The Chairman said that as there were quite a number of Government sites which could not be converted into parks immediately, the mode of joint M&M was adopted as an intermediate solution with a view to improving environmental hygiene and beautify the view of the sites concerned. He worried that the intermediate solution would become a permanent solution and opined that the mode of joint M&M would give rise to a number of intractable problems. He enquired whether LCSD failed to apply for land allocation owing to any consideration and hindrance. If LCSD intended to convert a site under mode of joint M&M in the district to a park, LCSD should put forth the relevant suggestions, but no progress had been seen yet.

68. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG responded that apart from available sites for recreational purposes, LCSD also required the necessary funds and to consider different factors according to the established rules and guidelines. Under the existing mechanism, members could apply for a DMW project under SDC to implement an improvement project for a proposed site. After securing the funds for carrying out a feasibility study and obtaining approval of the project funds, LCSD would follow up the relevant projects.

69. The Chairman said that new sites could be handled in this way. Regarding those sites that were currently managed under the mode of joint M&M, he enquired whether LCSD planned to convert them one by one to parks or sitting-out areas managed by LCSD.

70. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG said that the current sites under the mode of joint M&M were usually reserve lands without a clear long-term development plan. Therefore, the permanent use of a site must be confirmed, such as permanently allocated for recreational purposes, before LCSD taking follow up actions.

71. The Chairman urged LCSD and the Secretariat to provide a preliminary list of sites under the mode of joint M&M after the meeting so that members could express his/her comments for LCSD's reference and submit application to DLO with a view to replacing the intermediate solution with a permanent solution.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat sent the relevant information to members by email on 13 July 2020.)

72. The Chairman invited Mr CHAN Ping-yeung to briefly introduce the agenda item.

73. When briefing members on the agenda item, Mr CHAN Ping-yeung said that the details of the agenda item were given at Annex 2 to RDFC Paper No. 6/2020. He added that as the agenda item was proposed in January 2020, some questions had already been answered by the relevant departments. He said that after it was proposed in the Policy Address that facilities similar to those in the children's playground in Tuen Mun Park be extended to more than 170 public play spaces managed by LCSD, he had conducted a site visit to Tuen Mun Park and found that the facilities there had high entertainment values and popularity. He said that there were only two swings in Ap Lei Chau and they were provided inside the private housing estates in South Horizons. There were many pleasure grounds in the Southern District, but the play equipment was lacking. According to the consultancy report of the Planning and Development Study of the Waterfront Area of Ap Lei Chau and Other Related Areas conducted by the last term of SDC, the coastal land of the Eastern Waterfront Area in Ap Lei Chau was suggested to be converted to an open space, covering a long waterfront area from the white lighthouse to Sham Wan Towers. He enquired which types of play equipment would be provided in the open space by LCSD.

74. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG said that LCSD's written response had replied to the questions. He had also noted members' comment on the lack of play equipment in Ap Lei Chau. The proposal of converting the site into an open space at the Eastern Waterfront Area

in Ap Lei Chau was still under study. However, since a lot of public utility had been provided on that site, LCSD could not develop the site into a community garden.

75. The Chairman enquired of LCSD about the implementation progress and timetable of the proposal.

76. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG said that as the proposal was still in the stage of preliminary study, no timetable could be provided.

77. Mr LO Kin-hei said that the existing park facilities were not entertaining and exciting enough. It was hoped that LCSD would assess the possibility of improving the park facilities in the Southern District by borrowing ideas from the successful elements in Tuen Mun Park. He also requested LCSD to provide a timetable for refurbishing and improving the park facilities in the Southern District for reference and suggested reconstructing parks or play equipment with low utilisation rates to enhance their attractiveness. He urged LCSD to give a positive response to the above comments.

78. Mr WONG Yui-hei, Angus expressed regret about the situation that some residents in Aberdeen had to go playing in South Horizons owing to lack of recreational facilities in the area. He understood LCSD's difficulty in developing a large park in the Southern District, but he asked LCSD to note the residents' aspiration for recreational facilities and add the relevant elements when it refurbished the recreational facilities in future. Using Aberdeen Promenade as an example, he said that there was not a necessary correlation between the availability of proper facilities and high utilisation rate. He urged the relevant department to keep abreast of the times.

79. The Chairman said that as the children's playground next to Aberdeen Police Station had a low utilisation rate, the play equipment there remained intact and required no repair over the years, but the relevant department had not faced up to the problem of low utilisation rate. He thus advised the relevant department to review the situation.

80. Mr POON Ping-hong said that as it took time to conduct a study on the play equipment, it could not satisfy the immediate needs of the facility users, parents may have to look for other suitable play equipment for their children. He hoped that LCSD could provide a timetable for improving the play equipment so that the users had a rough idea and made their plans accordingly. He said that unattractive play equipment would have a low utilisation rate and so required improvement. He also pointed out that most parents and

children preferred to stay at home during the epidemic, but after the epidemic subsided, their demand for the play equipment would rise.

81. Concurring with the comments of other members, Mr YIM Chun-ho said that the parks under LCSD's management gave the public the impression that they were dull in that the play equipment was similar in type, colour and model. He hoped that LCSD could introduce diversified facilities when constructing and refurbishing the facilities. He also said that LCSD could consider adding play equipment of different types that could suit the needs of different age groups when improving the facilities in Wah Lam Path Sitting-out Area, Aberdeen Promenade and Waterfall Bay Park.

82. Mr CHAN Hin-chung advised LCSD to consult the views of SDC when re-planning parks or refurbishing the play equipment so as to choose play equipment that suited the residents. He further said that owing to low attractiveness of the play equipment, the children's playground in Shek Pai Wan Estate had now become a place for housewives and foreign domestic helpers to dry clothes. He was of the view that LCSD should not overemphasise the safety of facilities and make the play equipment unattractive and useless.

83. Mr WONG Yui-hei, Angus said that apart from play equipment, importance should also be attached to the planning of fitness facilities and rehabilitation facilities for the elderly on open spaces. He said that there were few such facilities in Aberdeen constituency. Many elders had to go a long way to the vicinity of Wong Chuk Hang constituency in order to use the facilities. He said some elderly residents told him that there was room in Aberdeen constituency for adding the facilities. He hoped that diversified facilities could be provided at open spaces to attract different users.

84. Mr CHAN Ping-yeung said that it was indicated in LCSD's written response that numerous facilities were provided in Ap Lei Chau Promenade and Ap Lei Chau Park and were highly welcomed by the nearby residents. In this consideration, it was not able to convert any existing facilities. He had reservation about the response and said that the venue would certainly become even more popular if swings could be provided there. He further said that there was a small slide near staircase No. 2 of Marina Habitat and advised LCSD to convert it to three swings because the same facility also appeared in Ap Lei Chau Park. He suggested inviting fellow members to conduct a site visit to the Wind Tower Park to examine the feasibility of adding the relevant facilities there after the epidemic subsided.

85. Miss YUEN Ka-wai, Tiffany believed that during class suspension, the children should have high demand for play equipment. However, there was insufficient play

equipment in Tin Wan Estate. Although residents could bring their children to the playground at Shek Pai Wan Road, the lack of attractiveness of the facilities and the problem of mosquito breeding had lowered the utilisation rate of that playground. She said that the situation was not unique to the Southern District but was a common problem in Hong Kong. She commented that LCSD emphasised safety so as to avert any legal liability and compensation rather than considering the children's physical and mental health. She advised LCSD to understand the genuine needs of children and make reference to the practice of other districts. She also said that more children had started to play skateboards recently and LCSD should strike a balance between facility safety and other factors.

86. Clarifying his comments raised just now, Mr CHAN Hin-chung said that what he meant was not that safety of play equipment need not be considered. He emphasised that safety was still important, but he hoped that LCSD would not overemphasise safety and ignore other factors. He hoped LCSD could strike a balance between entertainment and safety.

87. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG expressed thanks and had made notes to members' comments. LCSD was studying how to improve the existing play equipment, including adding innovative and inclusive elements, to enhance the attractiveness of the facilities. LCSD would pay more attention to the low utilisation rate of some play equipment as mentioned by members and would communicate with the SDC member of the constituency concerned in carrying out refurbishment works in the future.

88. The Chairman enquired of LCSD about the timetable for major refurbishment of parks or sitting-out areas in the Southern District.

89. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG said that he would provide the supplementary information in due course.

90. Mr PANG Cheuk-kei, Michael said that the children of many foreigners in Stanley and Shek O liked to play skateboards. He said that a dispute between a person and the security guards arose when a child played skateboard within the area of a shopping arcade managed by the Link. The incident showed that there was no suitable venue for children to play skateboards in the community. He also noticed that the area near a cafe beneath a flyover in Kowloon East waterfront would become a skateboard ground at night. He said that the youngsters' interest had changed and enquired whether LCSD had planned to go to the communities to collect the youngster's views on the play equipment and whether LCSD

had any policy to collect views from the communities. He also wished to know more about how LCSD determined the criteria for constructing facilities.

91. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG replied that various facilities would be provided for different age groups in parks under LCSD's purview depending on the available space. Since the venues in the district were generally small, the variety of facilities is relatively low. LCSD would collect the public's views from different channels, such as telephone hotline and the comments of National Sports Associations and SDC members, with a view to providing suitable recreational facilities for the public use.

92. The Chairman said as Mr Arthur AU YEUNG had said that he would provide a park refurbishment timetable after the meeting, he suggested that members provide LCSD with suggestions on the refurbishment of existing parks and facilities. Members could also try to identify a suitable venue in the district for constructing play equipment.

93. Ms LI Shee-lin said that a number of members had hoped for the provision of play equipment with higher entertainment value in the Southern District. She said that LCSD in fact did not lack such facilities, such as those in Jordan Valley Park and the bicycle park. She suggested that apart from swings and roundabouts, other options could also be introduced into parks, such as venues for playing remote control cars and boats. It was hoped that LCSD could give consideration to her suggestion if there were suitable places in future. She added that facilities for rock climbing and playing skateboards, fitness facilities, venues for cycling or lawns were also very popular among the public. Special themes or educational elements such as renewable energy sources or horticulture could also be added to the parks. She hoped that when refurbishing the parks in the Southern District in future, LCSD could provide other options and hold workshops for discussion with Committee members and members of the public so that the parks in the Southern District would have novel facilities.

94. Mr CHAN Ping-yeung said a number of members had said that the play equipment should balance safety and entertainment. Recalling what he saw in the children's playground in Tuen Mun earlier on, he said that many children did not get hurt when they fell while running in the playground, which showed that LCSD was capable of handling the issue of facility safety. He said that if LCSD did not improve its facilities promptly, the facilities would no longer be needed after the children had grown up. He said that as Ap Lei Chau was an area with the third highest population density in the world, he wished to convince LCSD to provide swings in the playgrounds in Ap Lei Chau.

95. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG said that he noted members' comments and would study the feasibility.

(Ms CHAN Ching-han, Angela, Dr KWONG Kim-hung, Ric, and Ms LI Lai-ha, Liz joined the meeting at 3:40 p.m.)

Agenda Item 5: Group Gatherings and Environmental Hygiene Problem on the Beaches, Hiking Trails and in the Country Parks in the Southern District

(Include agenda items on “Call for Stepping up Efforts to Deal with Group Gatherings on the Beaches, Hiking Trails and in the Country Parks” by Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun and “Environmental Hygiene Problem in Stanley and Shek O During Holidays” by Mr PANG Cheuk-kei, Michael)
(RDFC Paper No. 7/2020)

96. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives to the meeting for discussion of agenda item 5:

- (a) Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)
 - (i) Ms CHAN Ching-han, Angela, Country Parks Ranger Services Officer (Education);
 - (ii) Dr KWONG Kim-hung, Ric, Country Parks Officer (Hong Kong); and
- (b) Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD)
 - (i) Ms LI Lai-ha, Liz, Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing & Pest Control) (Southern).

97. Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun briefed members on the agenda item, with details at Annex 1. He added that during the peak of COVID-19, the number of people going to beaches or hiking surged. The hiking trails were bustling and the ground was covered with masks left by hikers. The beaches in the Southern District were also more crowded than on previous summer holidays. He believed that although the epidemic had so far been eased, he hoped to review how the Departments concerned should handle with similar situations in the future. He pointed out that LCSD closed the beaches during the outbreak of the epidemic and the fact that only red tapes surrounded outside the public toilets of beaches, which could not effectively prevent swimmers from entering and using the facilities. He

believed that it was lucky that no one had been infected by the virus during the group activities at beaches. He asked the Departments concerned how to properly handle the similar situation if the next wave of outbreaks occurred in the future. He urged LCSO to review the existing mechanism for handling crowd gatherings and refuse disposal.

98. Mr PANG Cheuk-kei, Michael briefed members on the agenda item, with details at Annex 2. He added that the problems faced by Stanley and Shek O were the same as those described by Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun. He pointed out that although the epidemic had eased somewhat, we still could not relax. He stressed that the key problem was that with summer approaching, the number of people using country parks and beaches would continue to increase. He believed the discussion on the subject was indeed urgent, however, the written responses of the Departments concerned only reported the figures and publicity information and did not account for their effectiveness. He pointed out that the attached photos showed that measures taken by the Departments concerned were basically ineffective. He enquired whether there were practical ways to solve the above problems. He pointed out, for example, that during the closure of Shek O Beach, lifeguard service was not be provided and that red tapes were placed in front of public toilets to indicate that the public toilets were not allowed to enter. However, due to the continuous flow of visitors to the beach, many swimmers also used the shower facilities of nearby businesses after swimming, which affected the businesses. He believed that the above problems were also due to insufficient publicity and education. He pointed out that although the electronic screens at beaches displayed the words “Together, We Fight the Virus To Stay Safe”, no one paid any attention to them. Similar posters were also hung in the vicinity of the beaches at Stanley, however, the method of display, the content of the design, the inconspicuous appearance and so on, greatly reduced the publicity effect.

99. Ms Liz LI responded that FEHD had provided cleansing services in most of the areas of Southern District. As for remote locations such as Cape D’Aguilar Road, FEHD would not arrange regular street cleansing or washing work. In view of the COVID-19 epidemic, FEHD had already improved and enhanced the services, including specially arranged staff to the area near the bus stop of Cape D’Aguilar Road during the weekends to step up the cleansing work and provided additional refuse bins for public use at the pickup/drop off areas of some of the bus stops.

100. Dr Ric KWONG responded that in regard to the cleansing of country parks and hiking trails, AFCD had deployed staff and cleansing contractors to carry out daily cleansing at recreational sites and hiking trails inside the country parks. He pointed out that country parks were different from the recreational sites in general urban areas, thus the staff did not

station at a single location for cleansing at a specific time. They would inspect along the hiking trails and pre-planned routes. If litter was found, they would clean it up immediately. It would take about three to four hours for them to complete the inspection along some longer routes. If serious litter problem was found at individual locations, AFCD would also step up cleansing effort as appropriate.

101. Ms Angela CHAN supplemented that AFCD had already stepped up cleansing of hiking trails and concerned sites during the epidemic. During patrol, the staff would advise the public to maintain personal and environmental hygiene and dispose of masks properly, and take enforcement actions against littering. On education, AFCD had strengthened publicity efforts, which included the printing and display of posters and banners to remind the public of maintaining hygiene and social distancing. To enhance publicity to the general public, AFCD had recently promoted the message “Take Your Litter Home” on in train advertising panels and trackside panels in MTR stations. She added that AFCD had also cooperated with hiking groups and green groups to publicise and promote the above message on social media.

102. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG responded that in view of the slowing down of epidemic impact recently and due to factors such as weather conditions and holidays, more people went to the beaches in Southern District. In regard to this situation, LCSD had increased manpower to clean the area and maintain order so as to help reduce the risks caused by crowd gatherings. On the other hand, LCSD would step up publicity efforts to remind the public to observe the beach regulations and maintain appropriate social distancing.

103. Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun said that it was often difficult for the public to wear masks when hiking and swimming. He asked how LCSD would take effective measures to prevent the spread of the virus. He added that there were still a large number of people swimming and using beach facilities despite the beaches were closed and asked how LCSD could ensure the safety of the public. He agreed with LCSD on reviewing the relevant procedures.

104. Ms CHAN Yan-yi said that during her recent hike on Wong Ma Kok Road, she found that the intersections of the mountain trails were piled with rubbish and the situation was extremely bad. She asked whether FEHD would step up its anti-litter enforcement action. As for the hiking trails in country parks, there were no refuse bins along the trails. She asked AFCD if they would place refuse collection bins at the exits and entrances of mountain trails to facilitate the public to dispose rubbish.

105. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that some members of the public took the view that there had been no new COVID-19 cases in the community recently, and they went to beaches and hiking to enjoy fresh air and sunshine. In his opinion, LCSD had not responded to the public's demand for swimming as they did not provide lifeguard services or refuse collection services at beaches. He considered that if LCSD decided to close the beaches, they had to do it thoroughly via methods like police's enforcement. Or else, the beaches should be designed as being able to be operated under the epidemic. He opined that the current semi-open status of beaches would only cause more problems, the departments should not restrict the public from going to beaches and country parks for activities. In addition, he opined that clearly visible refuse collection points should be set up at both the starting point and end-point of hiking trails, the sites did not necessarily fall under the jurisdiction of AFCD. He opined that it had been a common problem for both AFCD and FEHD, and that the communication and coordination between the two departments should be strengthened.

106. Mr LAM Andrew Tak-wo agreed that during the epidemic, quite a number of people wished to enjoy fresh air and flocked to the hiking trails in the countryside (e.g. Lung Fu Shan near the University of Hong Kong, the Hong Kong Trail on the back hill of Chi Fu Fa Yuen, the morning walk trail on the Peak), and most hikers did not wear masks. He asked AFCD how to disseminate information to hikers in order to avoid the risk of crowd gathering. In response to the fact that quite a number of hikers were camping in country parks, he enquired AFCD about the number of inspections conducted for camping activities in country parks and the number of campers involved.

107. Mr PANG Cheuk-kei, Michael said that some residents in Shek O were disappointed about the waste management of beaches under LCSD's purview. He said the residents opined that there were too few refuse bins at beaches and the recycling bins were also contaminated. Few people noted that they were responsible for disposal of the litter they had brought and LCSD had not taken any enforcement action. He concluded that the Departments concerned "did their preparation work in a perfunctory manner and their follow-up work in a hasty manner" amid the epidemic. Regarding the latter, LCSD failed to effectively prevent swimmers from entering Shek O Beach after closing it. He asked for the reasons in the reduction in the number of refuse bins at Shek O Beach and urged LCSD to increase the number of refuse bins as soon as practicable. In addition, he pointed out that according to the routes and habits of hikers, they usually took buses to westbound, i.e. towards Aberdeen, after they had walked from the Wilson Trail Section No.1 to Stanley Gap Road. However, refuse bins were only placed next to the bus stops of the eastbound bus routes. Members of the public might leave their litter anywhere in order to catch the bus. He hoped that the Departments concerned could place more refuse bins at appropriate

locations and do publicity and education work beforehand, and step up the refuse collection work afterwards.

108. Mr YIM Chun-ho said that, after the Severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) outbreak in 2003, quite many members of the public had become keen on hiking, and many Hong Kong people had participated in trail running races thereafter. He opined that the current epidemic had prompted many people to participate in hiking activities, he suggested that AFCD should consider adjusting the planning and design of hiking trails. Although he agreed that hikers should take away their own litter for disposal in urban areas, the public generally still did not have such awareness. In this regard, he suggested AFCD should consider adding refuse collection facilities at locations in proximity to the roads along hiking trails, and at the same time, it should also consider stepping up publicity and educational efforts to tie in with its enforcement actions to improve the situation.

109. Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun agreed that if LCSD closed the beaches, it should ensure that no members of the public were allowed to enter the areas; if entries were still allowed for the public, the purpose of the closure would be defeated and the management of LCSD would also become difficult. In his opinion, it would be undesirable for the public to use beach facilities without lifeguard services. Moreover, he agreed that hikers had the responsibility to take away their own litter. However, educating the people who hiked occasionally on environmental hygiene awareness often could not be achieved overnight. As such, he believed that providing additional refuse bins along hiking trails would be one of the possible compromised measures.

110. Mr YU Chun-hei, James was opposed to placing a large number of refuse bins along hiking trails, as it was not easy to clear the refuse bins thereon, and would also increase the workload of the staff of the Departments concerned. He said that the Departments concerned should give due consideration on the locations of refuse bins, and pointed out that it would be more effective to provide refuse bins at proper locations than placing them arbitrarily. In this connection, he suggested the Department concerned should look into the waste disposal patterns of hikers.

111. Ms Liz LI gave a consolidated response that FEHD was planning to provide additional refuse bins in public areas concerned for the convenience of the public. The distance and quantity of refuse bins would be reviewed regularly. She continued that, in response to the provision of only one refuse bin for the bus stations in both directions, FEHD had carried out site inspection and found that one of the footpaths was too narrow, leaving inadequate space for placing a refuse bin. Members were welcomed to contact FEHD

directly if they identified individual locations suitable for placing additional refuse bins. After collecting views, FEHD would conduct site investigation to explore the feasibility of the provision of refuse bins.

112. The Chairman enquired of the number of additional refuse bins placed by FEHD in the Southern District during the epidemic.

113. Ms Liz LI responded that the major trend of FEHD was in fact the opposite. Before the onset of the epidemic, arrangements had been made to scale down the number of refuse bins. Currently, there were over 400 refuse bins placed in the Southern District. She pointed out that the direction of FEHD was to place refuse bins at right places so as to reduce the number of refuse bins accordingly. She stressed that without proper education and good awareness among the public, the practice of placing additional refuse bins would render ineffective. As such, FEHD would review the locations of refuse bins regularly.

114. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN considered that FEHD had put the cart before the horse on the issue of placing refuse bins and stated that FEHD should not request for members' comments. He thought that LCSD, AFCD and FEHD should communicate with each other and put effort into finding solutions to the waste problem of the Southern District instead of simply asking members for advice. He also opined that if the Departments concerned did not know how to solve the problem, it would show the Government did not understand public opinion and the situation in the district. If the Departments concerned had to collect views from the Committee on the location of refuse bins, it would reflect the lack of a sound communication mechanism among Departments. He enquired whether the Departments concerned had a relevant mechanism to identify the locations in the Southern District with problems such as overflowing refuse bins and littering on the ground. He emphasised that each Department should handle the refuse problem in the district according to the existing system but not relying on the opinions of members.

115. The Chairman agreed with the views of Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN but he also thought that the relevant issue should be resolved in a two-way mode. He pointed out that FEHD should make suggestions about placing refuse bins as well as set priority for the implementation of the plan, and report all the relevant information to the Committee. He continued that members were certainly familiar with the operation of the district and could therefore be able to reflect the situation to FEHD and request for improvement. He asked whether FEHD would list out the locations in the Southern District where the refuse problem was serious, and consider whether it was necessary to increase the number of refuse bins based on actual operational needs.

116. Ms Liz LI responded that refuse bins placed by FEHD in urban areas such as the Aberdeen Centre, Tin Wan and Ap Lei Chau could be easily located. However, FEHD found that there had been a significant increase in the amount of refuse at the junctions of hiking trails, entrances and exits of country parks and in the vicinity of Shek O Beach in recent months. Given limited resources, FEHD had also tried to allocate resources and stepped up enforcement actions.

117. The Chairman asked again whether FEHD had increased the quantity of refuse bins.

118. Ms Liz LI replied that FEHD had placed an additional large-sized pedal dust-bin at the bus stop of Cape D'Aguilar Road. She said that many places were not capable of placing additional refuse bins due to the geographical conditions of individual locations. She gave an example that entrances and exits of hiking trails were usually very narrow and crowded with people so there was insufficient space for adding large-sized refuse bins at these places. Therefore, the decision on the location of refuse bins could not be generalised. In this connection, she welcomed members to liaise with FEHD on individual locations where additional refuse bins were needed, and to conduct site inspections to jointly study the feasibility of placing additional refuse bins.

119. The Chairman believed that members concerned would be happy to communicate with and share their views with FEHD. However, he enquired whether FEHD had any plans to increase or reduce the number of refuse bins in the Southern District at this stage.

120. Ms Liz LI replied that FEHD recently received requests from members for the addition of refuse bins in areas such as Shek O and Stanley. She agreed that members were very familiar with the daily operation of the district and the residents. She therefore wished that members could contact FEHD at any time. She continued that FEHD had no information on increasing or reducing the number of refuse bins at the moment.

121. The Chairman thought that regarding the number and location of refuse bins, FEHD should first understand the root of problem before solving it. He believed that FEHD could not effectively proceed with its work if it did not gain a good understanding of the first step of work. He therefore urged FEHD to make improvement and asked the AFCD and LCSD to respond.

122. Ms Angela CHAN's consolidated response stated that she agreed that publicity and education were vital. Since 2015, AFCD had been collaborating with green groups and hiking groups to promote the good habit of "Take Your Litter Home" among hikers to improve the environmental hygiene of country parks. Refuse would affect the habits of wildlife, attracting wildlife to look for food in refuse bins. Lighter refuse might be blown to remote or steep slopes by wind, which was difficult to clear up. At the early stage of the launch of the "Take Your Litter Home" programme, some members of the public were not get used to it. However, with the continuous efforts of green groups, hiking groups, volunteer groups and AFCD in recent years, hikers generally became accustomed to the good hiking culture advocated by the programme. During the epidemic of COVID-19, AFCD did find that some people who seldom went hiking might not be familiar with the no-bin arrangement along hiking trails. In this connection, AFCD had adopted strategic measures, including advertising through panels in MTR stations, putting up banners with promotional messages in country parks and giving verbal advice to the public at hiking hotspots, etc.

123. Dr Ric KWONG added that in regard to the addition of refuse bins in country parks, AFCD should consider whether the facilities would have an impact on the natural environment and ecology (including wild pigs). He said that at the early stage of the epidemic and where feasible, AFCD had provided refuse bins with lids in the toilets of country parks to cater the need of hikers.

124. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG's consolidated response stated that LCSD had taken note of the opinions of members and would study improvement measures. LCSD would also review the number and location of refuse bins at Stanley Main Beach, and communicate and cooperate closely with FEHD to step up the beach cleaning work.

125. The Chairman said that quite a number of members had emphasised the importance of publicity and education, and hoped that the Departments concerned would strengthen enforcement actions. To this end, he required all Departments to report information on law enforcement.

126. Ms Angela CHAN said that AFCD could submit relevant information to the Committee after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: From January to April 2020, AFCD conducted 3 890 patrols in all country parks in Hong Kong, and prosecuted a total of 60 offenders for littering.)

127. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG said that from the beginning of 2020 to 14 May 2020, LCSD had conducted 2 039 inspections at beaches in which 406 verbal advices had been issued and no prosecution action was taken.

128. Ms Liz LI said that FEHD would report relevant information after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: From January to June 2020, FEHD instituted a total of 251 prosecutions against littering.)

129. The Chairman invited members to raise enquiries regarding this agenda item again.

130. Mr PANG Kam-ping considered that the performance of the Departments concerned in publicity work was not as good as that of other countries. He said that the number of visits to the publicity video clip produced and published on the Internet by the Singapore Government had exceeded 1 million. He criticised the Government's publicity work as being backward. In addition to the lack of creativity of the Announcements in the Public Interest launched by the Government, the click-through rate of the website concerned was also rather low. He noticed that information related to recommendations on local tourism and "check-in spots", etc. had been uploaded to many websites recently, so he expected that there would be even more visitors in Stanley and Shek O. In this connection, he enquired the Departments concerned about their strategies and advised them to act out of the bureaucratic framework to carry out publicity work in a forward-looking and more creative way.

131. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH considered that experienced hikers would take away their litter on their own, and recently more hikers had moved to country parks for hiking due to the epidemic. To this end, she believed that the Departments concerned should pay attention to the actual situation, and expressed disagreement with placing too many refuse bins at hiking trails. She pointed out that in the early years, in order to facilitate the legislative process of the Waste Disposal (Charging for Municipal Solid Waste) (Amendment) Bill 2018, the Departments concerned had proposed to reduce the number of refuse bins in the community. Increasing the number of refuse bins would run counter to the policy at a time when the public was gradually adapting or becoming slightly more environmentally conscious. She considered that, where feasible, it would be more effective to set up more green collection points than refuse bins. She stressed that the Departments concerned should adopt a two pronged approach. Apart from placing refuse bins according to actual needs, publicity efforts should also be strengthened to raise public awareness of environmental protection.

132. Miss YUEN Ka-wai, Tiffany pointed out that it was not important how many refuse bins there were, but how to educate the public. She believed that the Government should encourage the public to take their own litter away through different means. She also expressed her appreciation for FEHD’s recent promotional video featuring young singers and “Keep Clean Ambassador Ah Tak”.

133. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN agreed with the principle that the public should take away their own litter, but he believed that the Departments concerned should place refuse bins at the entrances and exits of hiking trails for the public to dispose of their litter. He believed that it was inappropriate to require the public to take their litter home before dumping it, because the litter carried might contaminate public facilities such as bus compartments. He suggested that refuse bins should be located at the junctions instead of hiking trails in country parks, and that communication between FEHD and AFCD should be strengthened to plan the best location of refuse bins. He said that the above-mentioned suggestions could also facilitate hikers to anticipate where to dispose the waste before entering the hiking trails. He hoped that the above Departments would consider them.

134. The Chairman concluded that as the COVID-19 outbreak subsided, many people went out to beaches or country parks, creating problems such as crowd gathering and waste accumulation. The Committee urged the Departments concerned to step up publicity and education work and law enforcement actions, and to collect more data after the meeting. Members generally disagreed with the addition of a large number of refuse bins, but believed that the Departments concerned should consider adding refuse bins to meet the needs of the public at the entrances and exits of the hiking trails and junctions. The Committee also considered that the Departments concerned should adopt a more innovative method to carry out publicity and education work, especially for groups of people who would go hiking intermittently in the future.

(Ms CHAN Ching-han, Angela, Dr KWONG Kim-hung, Ric, and Ms LI Lai-ha, Liz left the meeting at 4:33 p.m.)

**Agenda Item 6: Funding Applications for District Minor Works (DMW)
Projects
(RDFC Paper No. 8/2020)**

Annex 1: Projects with Home Affairs Department (HAD) Works Section as Works Agent

135. The Secretary briefed members on the following funding applications as detailed in Annex 1 to RDFC Paper No. 8/2020:

- (a) Desilting programme in the Southern District 2020;
- (b) Grass cutting in the Southern District 2020;
- (c) Inspection, cleaning, minor improvement and repair works in the Southern District 2020; and
- (d) Funding for exploring preliminary feasibility of SDC DMW projects 2020.

Annex 2: Improvement works undertaken by the LCSD

136. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG briefed members on the following funding applications as detailed in Annex 2 to RDFC Paper No. 8/2020:

- (a) Greening work to be carried out at various locations in the district 2020;
- (b) Minor improvement works at the venues of the LCSD in the district 2020;
- (c) Improvement works to the sand quality on beaches in the district 2020; and
- (d) Replacement of hydro-vent type scrubbing system in restaurant of Pao Yue Kong Swimming Pool

137. The Committee endorsed an allocation in the amount of \$4,860,000 for the implementation of the projects listed in Annex 1 and Annex 2 to RDFC Paper No. 8/2020 (i.e. the projects listed in paras. 135 and 136 above).

(Mr Freeman CHAN, Mr Paul MIU, Mr MO Pak-yin, Mr WONG Yat-cheung, Mr Kevin CHAO and Ms Grace KUNG joined the meeting at 4:53 p.m.)

Agenda Item 7: Progress Report on DMW Projects in Southern District (as at 5 May 2020)

(Include agenda item on “Supervisory Arrangement on the DMW Projects under SDC” by Mr YIM Chun-ho)

(RDFC Paper No. 9/2020)

138. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives of the term consultants to the meeting for discussion of agenda item 7:

- (a) Andrew Lee King Fun & Associates Architects Limited
 - (i) Mr Freeman CHAN, Associate;
 - (ii) Mr Paul MIU, Chief Architect;
 - (iii) Mr MO Pak-yin, Assistant Building Surveyor;
- (b) C. S. Toh & Sons & Associates Limited
 - (i) Mr WONG Yat-cheung, Assistant Quantity Surveyor;
- (c) Leigh and Orange Limited
 - (i) Mr Kevin CHAO, Senior Architect; and
 - (ii) Ms Grace KUNG, Assistant Project Designer.

139. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH said that the “Improvement to steel staircase at Lee Chi Road, Ap Lei Chau” had been completed. She proposed that the said project should be deleted from the next progress report.

140. Mr LAM Andrew Tak-wo enquired about the exact location of the “Repair of the footpath behind Chi Fu Fa Yuen to Hong Kong Trail – minor repair improvement”.

141. Mr PANG Kam-ping responded that the works was carried out near the hill to the north of the rear Chi Fu Fa Yuen. As the works involved various locations, he suggested providing a detailed explanation to the member after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The representative of HAD Works Section conducted a site visit with Mr LAM Andrew Tak-wo at the aforesaid location on 3 June 2020 and gave a detailed explanation on the scope of project.)

142. The Chairman said that some newly elected members may not be familiar with the project items raised in the last term SDC.

143. Mr LO Kin-hei said that for the reason mentioned by the Chairman, he proposed that the departments concerned should send the basic information of outstanding projects in the progress report, such as maps, to all members by email for their reference before the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat sent the relevant information to members by email on 13 July 2020.)

144. Mr PANG Kam-ping said that he would follow up accordingly.

145. Regarding the “Construction of a staircase linking Yue Kwong Road, Shek Pai Wan Estate to Aberdeen Praya Road (Jing Hui Garden Block 1)”, Mr CHAN Hin-chung enquired whether barrier-free access facilities could be added to the project.

146. The Chairman said that the said project had been proposed by him in early years, which aimed to provide convenience for the residents of Shek Pai Wan Estate to travel between “Fifteen Houses” and MTR Wong Chuk Hang Station. When studying the feasibility of the project at that time, installation of barrier-free access facilities such as a lift had not been proposed under this project. The Chairman added that works agent would only follow up the project scope already endorsed by the Committee, i.e. the construction of a staircase. Regarding the construction of a barrier-free access or lift tower, members could still convey their proposal to TD despite a low feasibility.

147. Mr LO Kin-hei said that there was an established framework for DMW projects. For example, the funding for each project could not exceed \$30 million, while a project at a cost exceeding \$30 million had to be submitted to the Legislative Council (LegCo) for consideration. Regarding the priority and scope of project items, the Committee could propose relevant amendments. As the works contract had commenced, it would involve a very complicated process if the project in progress had to be revamped substantially. In this connection, he considered that the proposal for the addition of barrier-free access facilities should better be made through other channels.

148. The Chairman agreed with the comments of Mr LO Kin-hei. He added that apart from funding limit, project feasibility also had to be taken into account, especially for projects involving slope works, as it would entail a huge cost, while various issues such as slope safety and long-term slope maintenance would also need to be addressed. However, the Committee would soon set up the Working Group on District Minor Works Projects. He welcomed all members to actively participate in the Working Group, in order to propose project items and discuss the current projects. The Chairman said that while it was not advisable to add barrier-free access facilities under this project, the issue might be handled separately if necessary.

149. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN enquired about the progress of the “Beautification works near the Sandy Bay Drainage Services Department Sewage Screening Plant at Sha Wan Drive”.

150. Mr PANG Kam-ping responded that the Works Section had conducted a site visit with Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN and the departments concerned before 2020 Lunar New Year, and found out that some trees in the works site had to be removed. As such, the Works Section had requested the Secretariat to carry out a public consultation. Pending completion of the consultation, LandsD would remove the relevant plants in accordance with the “Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal”. Subsequently, the Works Section would conduct tendering exercise.

151. The Chairman commented that the papers had been substantially improved as compared with the past, but no such details as the expected date of completion of the works had been provided for the project.

152. The Secretary responded that the Secretariat had received a report from the Works Section on the relevant tree removal plan, and was preparing for the consultation work. It was expected that a two-week public consultation would be conducted. Upon completion of the consultation, the Secretariat would report to the Committee on the progress.

153. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN requested the Secretariat to provide the relevant details of the plan to him prior to the public consultation.

154. Mr LO Kin-hei said that the project on “Construction of a hiking trail along Yuk Kwai Shan” had been completed. However, as the project proponent, he regarded this project as the biggest failure in his eight-year term of office as a SDC member. He hoped to know whether the Committee had a mechanism to record the views from people who were dissatisfied with the said works. Moreover, he was willing to be held responsible for and accept the negative feedback from the public about the works. He continued to say that he had all along maintained liaison with the SDO and the Works Section during implementation of the project, and was satisfied with the simulated effect in the design stage. However, upon completion of the works, it was disappointing that the faux stone was largely different from what was expected. Hence, he hoped that a remark would be added to the project item as a reference for similar projects in future, so as to avoid making the same mistake. He pointed out that the materials used for the said faux stone failed to produce a satisfactory effect and should not be adopted again.

155. The Chairman said that the discussion of the Committee would be recorded in the minutes of meeting which would enable the departments to note members' comments. He opined that when imitated objects were produced again, consideration should be given to the difference between the product and the design. He asked the member whether he had reviewed the mock-up in the design stage.

156. Mr LO Kin-hei added that he had repeatedly criticised the said project, but it had not been recorded in the progress report. He hoped that the self-criticism made by the project proponent could be put on record for this project.

157. The Chairman asked the Secretariat and the Works Section to note members' comments.

158. Regarding the "Beautification to the rainshelters and flower pots of SDC - Southern District Literary Trail related theme", Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN asked members whether they would still intend to include the project in the progress report. He proposed that the Secretariat circulate the relevant information to members again, and then determine whether the said project should be retained in the progress report.

159. The Chairman said that the Secretariat could arrange circulation of the relevant information after the meeting.

160. Regarding the "Improvement works of the Promenade from Kennedy Town to Aberdeen" (Consultancy Study Report Scheme 1)", Mr YIM Chun-ho opined that there were drawbacks concerning the addition of signages and information panels as well as the communication with the member of the constituency concerned. He said that supplementary information would be provided in the next agenda item.

161. Regarding the "Beautification to the rainshelters and flower pots of SDC - Southern District Literary Trail related theme", Miss YUEN Ka-wai, Tiffany enquired about the relationship between the beautification project and the Southern District Literary Trail as well as the progress of the project. She hoped to know whether a briefing session would be arranged to introduce the said project.

162. The Chairman said that the Secretariat would arrange circulation of the relevant details about the project, and could arrange for a briefing session if necessary. He hoped that the progress report would provide more specific details of the project progress.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat sent the information regarding the “Beautification to the rainshelters and flower pots of SDC - Southern District Literary Trail related theme” to members by email on 13 July 2020.)

163. Regarding the “Construction of a rain shelter with seats at the area near the fire gate opposite to Pok Fu Lam Terrace at Wah Fu Road”, Mr POON Ping-hong pointed out that the rain shelter would be changed to seats and he had responded that the arrangement was fine with him. He would like to know the commencement and completion dates of the works.

164. The Secretary responded that the Secretariat had noted member’s response on the design of the seats, and would collaborate with the Works Section to take forward the work.

165. Mr PANG Kam-ping responded that the works contract document of the said project had been made ready. The tendering exercise would be conducted pending the notification of the Secretariat.

166. Regarding the “Improvement on ‘Welcome to Southern District Signs’”, Mr WONG Yui-hei, Angus enquired whether the fonts adopted on the design would be the same for all other locations, and whether the locations for installation remained unchanged.

167. Ms Chowee CHOW responded that the project scopes included three pole type signages and one floor - mounted type signage. According to the project requirements, all existing signages at four different locations required replacement, within which two of them had to be moved to new locations. She continued that the Works Section would brief the Secretariat and members on the locations of the signages after the meeting. For the project progress, she said that the contractor had fabricated a 1:1 mock-up signage, which was targeted to deliver in the end of May 2020 for an inspection by interested members. Details would be announced by the Secretariat.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat had sent an invitation to members by email after the meeting, inviting them to inspect the mock-up of the “Welcome to Southern District Signs” with the Works Section on 29 May 2020.)

168. The Chairman asked whether the Works Section has confirmed the ordering of the mock-up.

169. Ms Chowee CHOW further responded that the foundation works for the four locations had been completed. The 1:1 mock-up would be produced in line with the design previously adopted by the Committee. The purpose of the mock-up was intended for the Consultant and the Lead Department to carry out verification of the signage size, materials used and workmanship.

170. The Chairman opined that since the fabrication works had entered the final stage, it was rather difficult to change the fonts now.

171. Regarding the “Improvement works of the Promenade from Kennedy Town to Aberdeen (Consultancy Study Report Scheme 1)” and the “Installation of signages along the existing promenades, pavements and trails connecting Aberdeen and Stanley”, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that since the works had been completed last year, the public could use the existing pavements and trails to travel between Kennedy Town and Stanley according to the signage erected along the way. He suggested that the public and the local community have celebration together, such as organising a hiking activity which lasted for about five hours while inviting members to participate. He said that some organisation had already planned to organise a jogging activity on 31 May 2020.

172. The Chairman agreed with the suggestion of Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN but arrangement could not be made until the end of gathering prohibition after the epidemic.

173. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN enquired about the progress of the “Construction of a trail along the rocky shore at Sandy Bay”.

174. The Secretary responded that funding approval for the project had been endorsed at the last meeting. The Secretariat would arrange for implementation of the project subject to the cash flow status.

175. The Chairman enquired whether there was an implementation schedule for the project.

176. The Secretary responded that the next stage of the project would commence in the second year of 2020.

177. Concerning the “Beautification of South Bay Road (near Petrol Station)”, Mr Jonathan LEUNG said that LandsD had made available the site to a government department

for storage of materials. He asked whether the department had returned the piece of land to LandsD in the second quarter of 2020.

178. Mr Ricky NG responded that according to records, the site had been allocated to the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) up to March 2020 but LandsD had not taken over the site yet.

(Post-meeting note: The site was returned by CEDD to LandsD on 11 June 2020.)

179. The Chairman requested the Secretariat to follow up.

180. Ms CHAN Yan-yi enquired about the timetable for the design of the “Construction of rainshelters near Larvotto in Ap Lei Chau Praya Road”. She wished to put forth the views of residents about the design of rainshelter that it should avoid using the conventional style of green rainshelters.

181. Ms Chowee CHOW responded that the design of the rainshelter would be in line with the proposal endorsed in 2017. She suggested that members could make reference to the design of the rainshelter currently completed near No. 127 Repulse Bay Road. She further said that the rainshelter would be re-designed by the consultant and the main body would be made of stainless steel. The same design would also apply to other feasible locations later on. As for the design rendering, she said that the Works Section would submit it together with the options of the rainshelter’s ancillary facilities to the Secretariat. Subject to the comments received from members, they would proceed to work on the detailed design.

182. The Chairman asked members to refer to Appendix 1 of the reference paper for information on the rainshelters.

183. Mr LO Kin-hei said that since the current SDC had a lot of newly elected members, they might not have a clear picture of the basic design, including the style of rainshelters, previously adopted under the DMW projects. He suggested that the Chairman consider making arrangement for a briefing on the design of the standard plan adopted by the Committee.

184. The Chairman proposed that arrangement should be made for organising a workshop later on to brief members on the DMW projects, such as the relatively technical problems, the problems that had frequently come across, the work models and restrictions.

He believed that the arrangement would help members to familiarise themselves with the DMW projects, while this would also enable members to fully understand the procedures of submitting their proposed projects in future.

(Post-meeting note: The above workshop arranged by the Secretariat to be held in the morning on 14 July 2020 has been postponed until further notice.)

185. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN maintained that during discussion of the DMW projects, information should be provided in text and pictures, by displaying the relevant location plan and photos with the aid of PowerPoint presentation in order to facilitate clear explanation of the proposed projects to members. Furthermore, he said that the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the 18 District Councils (DCs) would meet with the Secretary for Home Affairs on 22 May 2020. He thus suggested that the Chairman ask the SDC Chairman to propose an increase of DMW fund on the day of the meeting.

186. The Chairman shared the view of Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN.

187. Regarding the “Installation of flower pots on pavement railings at Repulse Bay Road”, Mr Jonathan LEUNG expressed regret that the flower pots with an unattractive design shrank the narrow pavement and carriageways still further. He considered that there should be self-criticism over the experience of the project which was also a lesson to learn.

188. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN proposed that the flower pots be relocated to Pok Fu Lam.

189. The Chairman said that relocating the roadside flower pots was easy but given the fact that the works had just been completed, the relocation might also invite criticism.

190. Mr Jonathan LEUNG said that in case there were other places requiring installation of flower pots, the relevant arrangement could be discussed after the meeting.

191. Regarding the “Improvement works to the ex-Harbour Mission School site in Ap Lei Chau (to provide additional drainage covers first)”, Mr CHAN Ping-yeung was shocked that the wire fence was suddenly removed. He said that the site had insufficient lighting. He opined that if similar situation occurred next time, the relevant departments should coordinate the matter among themselves. The issue of determining which department to take up the responsibility should be resolved before opening up the venue.

192. The Chairman asked the member to give his proposal specifically.

193. Mr CHAN Ping-yeung responded that he wished to provide a lighting system for the site. However, after discussion with the HyD, it was found that the site was not a public road managed by the TD. Therefore, HyD would not arrange provision of lighting system for the site. All stakeholders had no idea how this problem could be solved. He stressed that all government departments should learn from the lesson and ensure that all the problems, including lighting, cleansing and mosquito control should be addressed by departments upon completion of the project and before opening up the site to the public.

194. Miss YUEN Ka-wai, Tiffany said that the flower pots on the railings of the pavements on Tin Wan Street near Tin Wan Estate had always been used for throwing away rubbish. While education of the public was important, she opined that the maintenance of the flower pots and planters provided by the departments was inadequate. There was also suggestion from the residents in the district that the flower pots installed on the railings should be removed because the potted plant withered easily. She proposed that the departments should first consult members of the Committee and the members should in turn collect various views from the public. Besides, she also suggested that the existing flower pots should be eliminated naturally, flower pots that were worn out could be disposed of directly without any need of maintenance or replacement.

195. Ms CHAN Yan-yi said that the Phase 1 work of the “Beautification of the area next to Marina South on Ap Lei Chau Drive” had been completed for a period of time but it was found that the colour tone of the flower pots was not as desired. She had talked to the previous project proponent, Mr AU Nok-hin, and learned that perhaps some discrepancy might have arisen in the decoding of colour during his communication with the department concerned. Moreover, she pointed out that the site also had uneven surface. She enquired whether the department concerned would make improvement before opening up the site and when the site would be open to the public.

196. Mr PANG Kam-ping responded that in the recent site investigation conducted by the Works Section, it was confirmed that the land of the project site was terraced, which is prone to water pooling and breeding of mosquitoes, etc. As such, the Works Section would conduct trial trench to ascertain if underground drains and sewers were available for carrying the pooled water from the ground level to the storm water drain underground, and would attempt to carry out further foundation works for the site. He opined that the viability of levelling the uneven surface to the same ground level was rather low. Pending completion of the latest design, the Works Section would seek members’ comments accordingly.

197. Ms CHAN Yan-yi enquired whether the site would be open for public use.
198. Mr PANG Kam-ping further responded that on account of public safety, the Works Section did not recommend opening up the site for public use at its status quo.
199. The Chairman enquired whether opening up the site or not was related to the removal of wire fence by LandsD.
200. Mr Ricky NG said that some government land sites were still having DMW projects in progress. Subject to completion of the works, LandsD would consider opening up the relevant sites for public use and would adopt joint M&M matrix for the sites according to the duties and roles of the concerned government departments. However, the joint M&M matrix might not provide effectively in management of the sites. Taking an example of the case of the ex-Harbour Mission School site, upon repeatedly request by the SDC and completion of drain cover work conducted by SDO, LandsD removed the chain link fence on 7 May 2020. After removed the chain link fence and the area reverted to public place, some issues such as inadequate lighting, which had not been raised out in meeting are to be resolved. He opined that a land allocation allocated to a single department to manage the site would be more effectively than that under joint M&M matrix. As regards the beautification of the area next to Marina South, LandsD would arrange for removal of the chain link fence after completion of the works upon request.
201. Regarding the “Improvement to the footpath of Lan Nai Wan Five Villages near Tai Tam Harbour, Southern District”, Mr Michael PANG said that he had a site visit at the beginning of his term of office and found that some of the defective footpaths had not yet been fixed. He asked whether the contractor would provide a maintenance period upon completion of the works. In addition, he proposed that the Works Section should take photos for each of the projects “before commencement” and “after completion” for members to follow up and for information.
202. The Chairman supported the proposal of Mr Michael PANG that there should be photos taken on the works.
203. The Secretary said that the remaining improvement works of a relevant project “Improvement to the footpath of Lan Nai Wan Five Villages” in the progress report was being followed up. Details on the location would be provided by the Secretariat to members after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat sent the relevant information to member concerned by email on 13 July 2020.)

204. Regarding the “Improvement works to the ex-Harbour Mission School site in Ap Lei Chau”, Mr LO Kin-hei said that apart from the addition of drain cover, previous discussions on the project also involved the mode of joint M&M and requesting individual departments to provide additional facilities. In this regard, he wished to know about the course of action of the departments now, say whether all improvement works would still be handled collectively. Furthermore, he would like to raise his concern about the geographical terrain of the site which was generally in a dim setting and the end part of the footpath was a steep slope. Therefore, he maintained that it was necessary for the department concerned to provide railings in order to avoid danger. As regards provision of lighting system, he opined that the Committee could consider provision of solar lighting through a DMW project. He requested the department to study the feasibility of the proposal.

205. Mr PANG Kam-ping responded that the Works Section was willing to discuss with members the feasibility of adding other facilities. As for the proposal of adding railings to the end part of the footpath, he said that the Works Section had noted the situation and was planning to provide a section of Type II railings 10 metres in length at the said location. Concerning the lighting system, the Works Section agreed that there was room for exploration. He further said that although solar lighting technique had been adopted by HAD for use in other districts, whether or not it was suitable for this site had yet to be studied.

206. The Chairman requested that the Works Section should liaise with the relevant members to follow up the feasibility of installing solar lights.

207. Concerning the “Provision of lighting at the pedestrian footpath in Ap Lei Chau Praya”, Mr CHAN Ping-yeung suggested that the project should be conducted in tandem with the replacement of street lamps carried out by LCSO along Ap Lei Chau Waterfront Promenade and that the same model of lights should be selected to cover these areas.

208. Ms Chowee CHOW invited the term consultant to brief members on the feasibility presentation of “Provision of lighting at the pedestrian footpath in Ap Lei Chau Praya”.

209. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kevin CHAO briefed members on the feasibility study of the project as detailed in Reference Information 1.

210. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that from the viewpoint of the waterfront environment, he did not support the provision of lighting in the waterfront edge. He said that the light reflected by the surface of the sea would be glaring and affect the sea viewers. He further said that the public could observe the adverse effects of lighting at the waterfront in Kennedy Town. He emphasised that the Harbourfront Commission had never suggested provision of lighting along the harbourfront. Besides, despite a width of 13 m between the lamp posts, the process of transporting dragon boats to the sea involved the use of trucks with cranes, which might cause damages to the facilities.

211. Sharing Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's views, Mr CHAN Ping-yeung said that if the distance between lamp posts was not large enough, the transportation of the dragon boats would cause damages to the dragon boats and lamp posts. Besides, he pointed out that locations B and C were opposite to the "Fifteen Houses" and Ocean Court, where some residents had complained to him that the light sources had caused nuisance to them. He requested the Consultant to consider this and make improvement. He also requested provision of independent light switch for each light to facilitate future repair and maintenance.

212. Following up on the light pollution problem mentioned by Mr CHAN Ping-yeung, the Chairman enquired whether the Consultant had considered using bollard lights or underground lights, which not only enhanced safety by providing illumination but also reduced the nuisance of light caused to local residents as well as avoid causing obstruction to the dragon boats.

213. Ms Chowee CHOW responded that the lighting design was not finalised at the present stage. The Works Section also understood members' concern over the problem of light pollution. She continued that when the project was implemented, the Consultant would go to the site to test the illumination level in the evening and at midnight. If the public considered that the illumination level of the existing lighting inside Ap Lei Chau Park suited the residents' needs, the Consultant would use the existing illumination level of the waterfront as a benchmark so that the illumination level of the entire waterfront area would be consistent. The choice of the heights of lights was subject to the available room in the lamp post foundation, the structure of concrete at the bottom of the waterfront and the approval of the relevant department.

214. Mr LO Kin-hei was of the view that lamp posts placed on pedestrian links would narrow down the usable space of the existing promenade. He enquired whether the

Consultant had considered installing the lamp posts at other locations or considered distributing the locations of lamp posts in a non-linear pattern.

215. Ms Chowee CHOW responded that the mutual distance and distribution of the lamp posts had to take into account factors such as the room required for the transportation of dragon boats and the illumination effect. The design also had to pass a number of tests. She suggested that the Committee give comments on the preliminary feasibility study to the Works Section, but she stressed that lamp posts with different heights would affect the range and level of illumination.

216. The Chairman said that members in general suggested reducing the heights of lamp posts or even using underground lights which would not affect the usable space while providing illumination.

217. Ms CHAN Yan-yi said that stage 1 of the footpath widening works for the “Covered Walkway along Lei Tung Estate Road near Yue On Court” had been completed. She enquired about the progress of providing a cover for the bus stop of CTB route nos. 97 and 99 and enquired whether the works would be carried out in parallel with stage 2 of the footpath widening works so as to minimise the impacts on the residents.

218. The Chairman said that the study on the project could be conducted only after the TD and the HyD had completed stage 2 of the footpath widening works.

219. Regarding “Provision of flower pots on the railings at San Shi Street and Shan Ming Street” and “Installation of flower pots on the railings at the junction of Main Street and Wah Ting Street in Ap Lei Chau (Exit A of Lei Tung MTR Station)”, Mr CHAN Ping-yeung said that the relevant department had to take into account the care and maintenance of the plants in the flower pots. He had seen that some plants planted in the flower pots started to wither just one week after planting and the flower pots then became a place for disposal of cigarette butts and refuse.

220. The Chairman enquired whether members still suggested providing flower pots. He commented that the relevant departments must take care of issues including the routine management, repair and maintenance of the flower pots.

221. Mr CHAN Ping-yeung supported the provision of flower pots. But the departments concerned must maintain the conditions of the plants in the flower pots. He

said that although cigarette butt receptacles were provided near the railings at Main Street and Wah Ting Street in Ap Lei Chau, the flower pots would easily become a place for smokers to dispose of cigarette butts if the withered plants in the flower pots were not replaced instantly.

222. Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun said that it was the smokers' practice of disposing cigarette butts in the flower pots that had caused withering of the plants. He was of the view that the provision of flower pots on railings should be considered prudently.

223. The Chairman said that the completed project of "Installation of flower pots and benches in the pedestrian link between Wong Chuk Hang MTR Station and Ocean Court" was a successful example. The flower pots provided on the railings had achieved some beautification effect without the problem of cigarette butt disposal. He was of the view that people in different places might behave differently. He said that members who had reservation about provision of flower pots at individual locations could suggest deleting the project when the project was still in the stage of in-principle consent and had not started implementation.

224. Regarding "Improvement works to the site at Ap Lei Chau Praya Road near Larvotto", Ms CHAN Yan-yi said that Mr AU Nok-hin, a former SDC member, had suggested construction of a pet garden at the site and provision of dog excreta receptacles and seats in the garden. However, the site had been included in the land sale programme by the Government in early 2019. She enquired whether the LandsD had conducted any district consultation on the land sale programme and whether the SDO had reflected to LandsD that the Committee had endorsed the DMW in principle.

225. The Chairman said it was indicated on the paper that the District Development and Housing Committee (DDHC) under the last term of SDC had passed the motion on the objection to the inclusion of the site into that year's land sale programme.

226. The Secretary responded that SDO had reflected to the District Lands Office (DLO) after the Committee endorsed the DMW in principle.

227. Ms Jessica CHENG said that she would report the update of the issue to the relevant members after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: Regarding the objection to the inclusion of the site for the improvement works to Ap Lei Chau Praya Road near Larvotto into the land sale programme, DLO has

referred the comment to the Land Supply Section for follow-up. The Land Supply Section responded to DLO that the site, i.e. Ap Lei Chau Inland Lot No. 137, was mainly zoned “Residential (Group A)” on the Approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H15/33 and was suitable for housing development. With a view to meet the keen housing demand of public, the Government had included the site in the 2020/2021 Land Sale Programme for private housing use. The Government had consulted the relevant departments on the land sale proposal. Moreover, the representatives of LandsD had also attended the 20th meeting of DDHC under SDC on 25 March 2019 for discussion of the second agenda item, namely “Motion on the Objection to the Inclusion of Ap Lei Chau Inland Lot No. 137 into this Year’s Land Sale Programme”.)

228. The Chairman said he found it most regrettable that DCs only served as consultative bodies and Government departments would ignore the issues or project proposals raised by DCs once they had their own plans.

229. Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun enquired about the progress of “Installation of water pipes from Deep Water Bay to Seaview Promenade for the greening works”.

230. The Chairman said that the projects listed in this part of the paper had been endorsed by the Committee. They were all in the pending stage without any progress. The work such as design and consultation was pending arrangement.

231. Mentioning projects with priority numbers 43, 45, 46, 47 and 53, namely “Construction of rainshelter with seats near light post no. 35284 connecting the exit of Lei Tung MTR Station at Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road”, “Replacement of existing railings at Ap Lei Chau Praya with Type II railings”, “Installation of Type II railings at a side of footpath and staircase near Manly House in Ap Lei Chau and removal of chain-link fencing”, “Improvement works to staircase near the bus terminus at Ap Lei Chau Main Street” and “Beautification to the railings at Ap Lei Chau Praya linking Ap Lei Chau Waterfront Promenade and the roundabout near Sham Wan Towers”, Mr CHAN Ping-yeung said that while all these projects were located within his constituency, he did not have a clear picture about the specific details of these projects. He further said that projects nos. 45 and 53 should be at the same location. But they had different designs. He enquired about the design that would be adopted finally.

232. The Secretary responded that projects nos. 45 and 53 were at the same location where some railings of cylindrical shape were damaged. Different members of the last term

of SDC had put forth proposed projects for repair and beautification. Members were welcome to raise comments on these two projects.

233. The Chairman said that consideration could be given to implementing the two projects together in view of their similar nature.

234. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that similar to “Repair of the footpath and railings connecting Hairpin Beach and Stanley Main Beach”, rust-proofing materials should be used for this project.

235. The Chairman asked the Secretariat and the Works Section to note members’ comments.

236. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH enquired about the tendering and implementation time table for the “Construction of public toilet at Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road Playground”.

237. The Chairman requested the inclusion of project timetables in future progress reports wherever possible.

238. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG responded that the tendering exercise for the project undertaken by the ArchSD was at its the final stage. However, owing to the development of Novel Coronavirus Disease, the tendering exercise was yet to commence. Besides, in view of the potential impacts of the project on the nearby trees, ArchSD was required to conduct a tree risk assessment for the project site and the vicinity, and submit a report for approval which would include the suggestions of tree protection into the tendering document before the commencement. It was expected that the project would commence in the 3rd or 4th quarter of 2020 and complete in the 4th quarter of 2021.

239. Mr LAM Andrew Tak-wo requested the relevant department to provide a route map for the “Construction of a Sitting-out Area at the roof of Pok Fu Lam No.3 Water Service Reservoir behind Chi Fu Fa Yuen”. He hoped that the department could arrange for a site inspection with him if possible.

240. The Chairman asked the department concerned to provide the relevant information or arrange for a site inspection with the member concerned after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: LCSD conducted a site visit with Mr LAM Andrew Tak-wo on 5 June 2020.)

241. Ms Jenny WAN invited the consultant to brief members on the feasibility studies for the “Extension of the Waterfall Bay Park (for Connecting to the Cyberport)” (S-DMW452) at the present stage, including the preliminary design and estimated cost of the project.

242. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Paul MIU briefed members on the feasibility studies of the “Extension of the Waterfall Bay Park (for Connecting to the Cyberport)”.

243. The Chairman said that LCSD was discussing the future management and maintenance responsibility with the relevant departments. As such, he requested LCSD to give an update of the progress.

244. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG responded that LCSD had received the design drawing from the consultant. He said that LCSD had no comment on the design but the future management and maintenance arrangement were still under negotiation. He said that under the current design, only a small portion of the proposed footbridge was situated within the boundary of LCSD’s Waterfall Bay Park while a major portion of the structure stretching across the natural stream course had fallen outside the purview of LCSD. Hence, it was necessary to discuss with other departments in order to delineate the management and maintenance responsibility effectively. He further said that LCSD had received replies from the CEDD and HyD. CEDD replied that the maintenance of a footbridge did not fall within the ambit of the department. HyD said in its initial reply that if HyD takes up the maintenance responsibility, the footbridge must fulfill the condition of compliance with its internal standards in terms of the design, materials and structural specification and that the routine management of the footbridge had to be undertaken by the TD. TD’s reply was being awaited.

245. The Chairman enquired of LCSD about the date of contact with TD.

246. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG responded that TD was consulted in early May 2020.

247. The Chairman asked whether LCSD would have any contingency plan if TD did not agree to take up the management of the footbridge.

248. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG explained that LCSD was mainly responsible for managing recreation and sports facilities with a view to providing recreational services to the public. A majority of the maintenance work for the facilities under LCSD's purview was conducted by works department, such as the ArchSD. Under the established framework of the service provided by ArchSD, the scope of its maintenance service would be carried out for buildings, and structures situated within the government land allocated to LCSD. Despite the fact that LCSD was the Lead Department of this project, the maintenance of the footbridge fell beyond the professional aspects of ArchSD. In this connection, LCSD was still negotiating the issue of management and maintenance responsibility at this stage.

249. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that after a lapse of 10 years' time, he finally witnessed the project being taken forward. He pointed out that during the 10-year period, at least one person lost his valuable life when crossing the said location from Cyberport to Wah Fu Estate. He maintained that the project should be taken forward without delay. He was shocked that LCSD intended to shift the maintenance responsibility to other departments, and pointed out that the proposed project was situated within the "open space" under the Approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan. It also provided a passageway for the public to visit the Waterfall Bay Park. So far as the future management and maintenance work was concerned, he opined that LCSD and ArchSD could not evade their responsibilities. He was shocked by LCSD seeking to have the maintenance responsibility taken up by other departments. He believed that TD and CEDD would have difficulty taking up the task. In this regard, he made a suggestion to the Chairman that the Committee should write to the senior officials in the Government, including the Secretary for Development and the Secretary for Home Affairs, saying that the Committee hoped to take forward the works project in a proper way as soon as possible. He opined that it was not appropriate for LCSD to express its unwillingness to take up the future management and maintenance for the works only at the last moment.

250. Mr YIM Chun-ho said that he shared the views of Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN that the above works should be completed as early as possible and that LCSD had the responsibility to take up the routine management work of the facilities on the grounds that LCSD staff had been stationing in the Park permanently for carrying out cleansing and security patrols. He opined that the shade of trees in front of the proposed footbridge had been blocking the view of Waterfall Bay from the pedestrians. Besides, he understood that the concrete part of the supporting bridge pier would be wider than the bridge floor area for structural safety. Nevertheless, he opined that the protruding edge from both sides of the upper part of the bridge pier would easily lead to accumulation of rubbish and fallen leaves, and hence an impact on the cleanliness management. In this connection, he suggested that consideration

should be given to adopting a sliding angle or hemispherical design for both sides of the bridge pier structure.

251. Mr Paul MIU responded that both sides of the bridge floor area had been designed with edge surface finish. He continued to inform the meeting that the consultant had met with the Drainage Services Department (DSD) to discuss the issues of stream flow and accumulation of refuse. In this regard, DSD had accepted the existing design option.

252. Mr YIM Chun-ho pointed at the relevant part on the PowerPoint presentation and said that the connection between the upper side of the bridge pier and the bottom of the bridge body constructed at a perpendicular angle beyond the railings would easily lead to accumulation of rubbish, which would be difficult to clear.

253. Mr Paul MIU responded again that amendment could be made to the design.

254. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH pointed out that during rainy days, there was greater stream flow while leaves and rubbish would also be piled up causing mosquito breeding. Amendment should be made to the design accordingly. Besides, the initial cost estimation of the proposed project was \$28 million. Given the funding ceiling of a project, the cost would reach its maximum limit of \$30 million by merely \$2 million. She would like to know how the departmental commitment could cater for the over-budget if the actual cost exceeded \$30 million in future and whether payment by instalment was required.

255. The Chairman said that according to his understanding, the department would make payment for the cost in phases. However, given the magnitude of this project, he requested the Secretariat to advise and respond whether there would be any financial implication on the cash flow.

256. The Secretary responded that according to the “Guidelines for Implementing District Minor Works Projects”, the cost of works projects should not exceed \$30 million each. The annual provision allocated to the SDC was about \$14.5 million in this financial year. He continued to advise that from the funding point of view, the cost of this works project was relatively large. It was anticipated that the project fee might need to be settled by spreading the payment over several financial years. Given the relatively large cost involved, it was likely to have impact on the spending for other projects and the cash flow of the relevant financial years. He said that the Committee might need to have further discussion on the cash flow consideration.

257. Mr LO Kin-hei understood the perception of Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH over the expenditure. He trusted that in case the project had an over-budget exceeding \$30 million during the implementation of works, it was not quite likely the project would be terminated. He was grateful that the works could come to an option costing lower than \$30 million in the end. As regards the cost ceiling of a project, he expected that the SDO would convey the message to the HAD or the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB). He believed that the maximum project cost of \$30 million would be subject to a further review in the near future. He said that in the past, the LegCo or the Government would make adjustment to the ceiling at certain intervals. He wished to learn more about the adjustment mechanism and the records of previous adjustment. Moreover, he considered that problem arising from the expenditure incurred on the projects of a larger scale would not affect the progress of other minor works projects. He pointed out that as there were more projects in the Southern District, there used to be occasion in the past that resources were transferred from other districts to cover the expenditure of the Southern District. He hoped that the department could provide more detailed information and advice.

(Post-meeting note: The Legislative Council (LegCo) Finance Committee approved on 2 November 2007 an increase in the financial ceiling on the delegation of authority for approving Category D items from \$15 million to \$21 million, and further to \$30 million with effect from 13 July 2012.)

258. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH was glad that the works project could manage to be taken forward with a budget proposal of \$28 million. That said, she worried that as it still took some time to commence the project, it was possible for the cost to exceed the estimate of \$28 million after the official launch of the project. She gave the case of “Improvement to steel staircase at Lee Chi Road, Ap Lei Chau” as an example, in which the project was initially estimated to cost about \$5 million, but there was a delay in the works period owing to such element as the slope issue and typhoon. The project ended up costing over \$10 million. She stressed that since the proposed project was extremely vulnerable to the impact of weather, not to mention all other uncertainty, the estimated cost of the project was getting very close to the ceiling of \$30 million. She hoped that the department could consider providing a special funding for the implementation of this works project.

259. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN welcomed the comments of Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH and appreciated the wisdom she had gained over the years of service in the District Council. He opined that the department should consider the consequential situation which might arise from the over-budget of the project and had a discussion with HAB in order to ensure smooth implementation of the project. He held the view that HAB was overseeing the policy

relating to LCSD and HAD, it was not difficult to solve the existing problem as long as the Bureau and the Departments were willing to sort it out and work closely together. He believed that the Government should take into account the importance of the project, including its historical element, the accident(s) that previously took place, the lapse of time on this project, the community support for the project and the location as one of the missing links in the coastal trail around Hong Kong Island. The construction of the proposed bridge could serve the purpose.

260. Ms LI Shee-lin said that the proposed project was intended to protect pedestrian safety and prevent accidents. She continued that the project could also provide a direct linkage for connecting Cyberport with Wah Fu Estate, which was conducive to community development. She pointed out that a lot of residents needed to travel via the aforesaid location frequently. Pending completion of the works, the public would be able to enjoy the beautiful scenery of the coastal area while walking along the footbridge. She also agreed with Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN that the project could fill up a missing link of the coastal trail in Hong Kong Island enabling continuity of the trail. She hoped that the works could be implemented as soon as possible. Amidst the downturn of economy, it was possible that the cost of project might be adjusted downward as well.

261. In conclusion, the Chairman said it was hoped that the District Officer (Southern) could help contact the HAB and the relevant departments with a view to taking forward the works project. He supported the proposal of Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN. Since disputes among various departments over the maintenance responsibility of a project could lead to a delay in the works, the Secretariat was requested to draft a letter after the meeting and send it to the HAB and the Development Bureau, expressing the Committee's concern over the project and hoping that the issue of management and maintenance responsibility could be resolved.

(Post-meeting note: The Chairman sent a letter to the Secretary for Home Affairs and Secretary for Development on 16 June 2020.)

262. The Chairman said that this agenda item would include discussion of "Supervisory Arrangement on the DMW Projects under SDC" raised by Mr YIM Chun-ho, with details given at Annex 2 to RDFC Paper No. 9/2020. He invited Mr YIM Chun-ho to briefly introduce the agenda item.

263. Briefing members on an information panel at Waterfall Bay Park, Mr YIM Chun-ho said that the left side of the panel was facing the west but the words on that part

indicated the direction to Stanley, whereas the right side was facing the east but the words on that part indicated the direction to Kennedy Town. He commented that as the map did not show the route of the promenade clearly and neither were there any continuous directions shown on the ground, the information panel was misleading. He said that since the works were completed during the period when the last term of SDC suspended operation, the incumbent SDC member had no chance to see the final product. He commented that SDC members still needed to know the works progress during this period. He quoted a number of experienced members as saying that during the suspension period, the relevant departments would not consult and notify members of any local affairs, including works progress. Even if SDC members made enquiries, they could not receive satisfactory replies. He further said that earlier meetings of the Committee had been cancelled owing to the epidemic. He enquired how members could know the arrangements of the various projects and how they could monitor the works progress and give comments. He was of the view that proponents of DMW projects had the responsibility of monitoring the projects and ensuring proper use of the public money so as to avoid any unnecessary repair works in future. Finally, he called on fellow members of different constituencies to review whether the signage and information panels under the relevant projects also contained misleading information.

264. Ms Jenny WAN responded that the location, routing and design of the information panel concerned had been endorsed by the incumbent SDC members at the meeting held in March 2019. Before producing the signage and information panels, the Works Section erected a sample in 1:1 scale at Kwun Hoi Path and asked the Secretariat to inspect the design in June 2019. She considered that a consensus on the directions of arrowheads on the information panel had been reached during the design process. She thus invited the consultant to briefly introduce the design concept.

265. Mr Freeman CHAN said that the direction of arrowhead was mainly based on consideration of the direction of the walking trail. For instance, if a visitor headed towards Kennedy Town from Stanley, all signage that he/she walked past along the way would point at the direction of Kennedy Town. There would not be signage pointing at the opposite direction on the way. The directions of all signage should be based on a consistent principle. He said that the consultant understood members' concern. After discussing the issue with the member concerned before the meeting, it had come up with a preliminary improvement option and could readjust the direction of the arrowhead according to members' suggestions. At the present stage, the consultant would review the number of signage that required improvement and would report to members at the next meeting.

266. Ms Jenny WAN added that the Works Section had noted members' comments and would explore ways to improve the design with the consultant so as to suit the users' needs.

267. Mr POON Ping-hong said he found that the signage installed on the ground level of Wah Kwai Estate with faded colour on 11 December 2019. He advised the consultant to inspect whether the signage installed at other locations had the same problem.

268. Mr LO Kin-hei said that whether there was discrepancy between the final products and members' understanding of the products at the meeting or the Committee had not noticed the direction at that time, any misleading information found on the signage should be rectified. He believed that members could be consulted on the amended design by way of circulation of paper. Moreover, regarding the problems generated during the suspension period of SDC, he and Mr CHAI Man-hon, a former SDC member, had discussed with the HAD a couple of times last year how to follow up project items and local affairs during the period. He said that during the suspension period of the last term of SDC, the department concerned had conducted a tendering exercise for the ferry service between Aberdeen and Cheung Chau without notifying SDC. He expressed regret that HAD and SDO had ignored members' views, which had resulted in public criticism of SDC's operation. He hoped that the serious problems caused during the suspension period of SDC would be put on record by the Secretariat.

269. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN suggested that the relevant department provide members with mock-ups when producing signage in future.

270. The Chairman commented that the signage in Wong Chuk Hang also had similar problems. When the consultant designed the arrowheads, the design concept should be based on the users' point of view wherever possible, or else it would easily lead to misunderstanding. He believed that the department concerned could amend the directions of the arrowheads. Regarding the arrangements during the suspension period of SDC, he said that some members had constantly discussed the practicability and reasonableness of the arrangements with the relevant department. He was of the view that when the DC elections were drawing near, to ensure fairness of the elections to all candidates, Government departments would not meet with the incumbent DC members. Neither would they report the works progress to DC members. As a result, DC members could not closely monitor the local affairs and project items and could not perform their duties properly. He hoped that District Officer (Southern) would reflect the problem to HAD.

(Mr PANG Cheuk-kei, Michael left the meeting at 5:52 p.m. Mr Paul MIU, Mr WONG Yat-cheung, Mr Kevin CHAO and Ms Grace KUNG left the meeting at 6:36 p.m. Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun left the meeting at 6:47 p.m. Mr Freeman CHAN and Mr MO Pak-yin left the meeting at 6:55 p.m.)

(Ms YIP Wai-see, Priscilla and Ms CHOW Suk-ye, Jessica joined the meeting at 6:55 p.m.)

Agenda Item 8: Any Other Business

The 8th Hong Kong Games

271. The Chairman reported that the 8th Hong Kong Games (HKG), which was organised by the Sports Commission and co-ordinated by its Community Sports Committee, in collaboration with the 18 DCs, the LCSO, the Sports Federation & Olympic Committee of Hong Kong, China and the National Sports Associations of the relevant sports events, would be held soon. Moreover, the 8th HKG Organising Committee (OC) would soon be established. He added that the HKGOC had invited SDC to appoint a member to serve as an OC member, sought approval from SDC to authorise the HKGOC to display the emblem of SDC on the publicity materials of the 8th HKG, and to create a hyperlink to the 8th HKG website on the SDC website from June 2020 onwards.

272. The Chairman enquired whether members would accept the invitation to nominate a SDC member to serve as a member of the HKGOC and agree to display the emblem of SDC on the publicity materials concerned.

273. Mr LO Kin-hei opined that since the HKGOC had already been established and they essentially had in mind the candidates of most members, including the Chairman, the Vice-chairman and the Executive Adviser, etc., the operation of the HKG had no direct relevance to DCs, and it was debatable whether the sports events should be organised by districts. He pointed out that it was already the 8th HKG, but apart from giving more competition opportunities to athletes, the HKG did not serve any practical effect in connecting the residents with DCs. He expressed that the role played by DCs over the years was to nominally bring regional athletes to compete, but no relationship had ever been built. He was of the opinion that the form of the Game was outdated and DCs should not be bounded by conservative mentality. He continued that the budget passed by SDC of the current term had already allocated more resources to sports activities. He questioned the effectiveness of activities organised in the old manner and hoped that SDC would object to

the request of the HKGOC. As for sending athletic teams of the Southern District to compete in the HKG, he agreed strongly and was very supportive.

274. Miss YUEN Ka-wai, Tiffany agreed with Mr LO Kin-hei. She objected to the HKGOC's request that a member be delegated by each DC to serve in the Committee while its key members had already been preselected. Therefore, she opposed to delegating a member to the HKGOC and displaying the emblem of SDC on the HKG publicity materials. She continued that members could refer to the practice of the Central and Western DC and supported residents of the Southern District to form teams to participate in the HKG.

275. Mr CHENG Kong-chung, Francis, JP said that the Committee could certainly make the final decision on the HKGOC's request, but to his understanding, most DCs in the territory had already endorsed the above request and agreed to take part in the HKG. Despite varying extent of participation of different districts, the work and vision of the HKGOC were generally supported. As such, he hoped that members would give due consideration before making the decision.

276. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG supplemented that responses had been received from DCs of 17 districts, of which a majority had expressed support and intended to participate in HKG events. Given that DCs were important stakeholders of the HKG, the Government had attached great importance to the participation of DCs over the years, therefore the 18 DCs had been taken as the participating units of the HKG, and they had been the co-organisers and participating units since the first HKG. The above practice and arrangement had been operating effectively for the past seven terms of the HKG. He further stated that the participating athletes must be nominated by the DC of their residence for participating in the HKG, while participation as individual was not allowed. Moreover, despite noting that members would only consent to nominate athletes to take part in the competitions on behalf of the Southern District without any intention to appoint a representative as the member of the HKGOC, he still hoped that members would re-consider appointing a member for the HKGOC, so that the views from the local community could be reflected to the HKGOC.

277. The Chairman enquired whether it was obligatory for SDC to appoint a DC member to serve as a member of the HKGOC if it endorsed sending athletes of the Southern District to participate in the competitions.

278. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG responded that DCs must be the participating units of the HKG, and whether or not a DC member was appointed for the HKGOC would not affect DCs' nomination of athletes for the competitions of the HKG.

279. Miss YUEN Ka-wai, Tiffany enquired whether athletes of the Southern District would be forbidden to participate in the competitions if SDC disagreed to appoint a DC member to join the HKGOC. She also queried whether it was obligatory for SDC to follow the choices of other DCs. She pointed out that different types of work had gradually been politicised in the current DC term, and indeed it would be unacceptable if the Government bulldozed each DC into appointing a member for the HKGOC by prohibiting athletes from participating in the competitions of the HKG.

280. Mr LO Kin-hei said that he had all along disapproved of activities organised in the name of SDC by third parties, for instance, the competition named “18 Districts Cup” organised by the Hong Kong Jockey Club. He pointed out that the support of DCs had been requested for quite many activities at present, but those activities were in fact irrelevant to the matters of DCs’ concern. He stressed that sports should not be politicised, and that SDC of the current term had also increased the funding for sports. He opined that DC members would only become the “backdrop” of the HKGOC without any roles, given that they had never been given the opportunity to participate in the recruitment and selection of athletes in the previous terms of HKG. He reiterated that all competitions of the HKG in the past seven terms were entirely unrelated to DCs, except that LCSD had exploited DCs as a rubber stamp to support the sports events by arranging members to attend the opening ceremony, closing ceremony, celebration banquet, etc. In this connection, he expressed disinterest in attending the ceremonies and similar events.

281. Mr CHENG Kong-chung, Francis, JP said that, to his understanding, the proposals for requiring submission of nominations for the HKGOC members, authorising the use of the SDC emblem and authorising the creation of a website hyperlink were set out in three annexes respectively, implying that it was not obligatory to handle the three proposals as a “package deal” and they could be considered separately. He believed that the HKGOC certainly did want to receive full support for the said proposals. In his opinion, LCSD could provide further explanation, clarifying in detail whether the arrangement concerned could give the Committee flexibility in deciding their extent of participation, e.g. whether it was necessary to participate in the HKGOC, or whether they could support this sports event in other ways. He said that a member had already pointed out that it might not be appropriate to appoint SDC members to participate in the HKGOC by putting forward clear arguments and raising his/her concern. Another member pointed out he/she did not wish that district sports organisations could not participate in the game as district representatives for the reason that no SDC members had participated in the HKGOC. He hoped that LCSD could explain whether the arrangement concerned could fulfil the above two requirements. At last, he

pointed out that if the LCSD representatives were not able to make any concrete response immediately, they could report to SDC again after discussion with the management of their department.

282. The Chairman said that LCSD had just made a very clear response. To summarise, the Committee could encourage athletes to participate in the game on the one hand but could also allow SDC not to arrange their DC members to participate in the HKGOC on the other hand. They could also disapprove the use of the SDC emblem in the 8th HKG and the creation of a hyperlink to the HKG website on the SDC website.

283. Mr Arthur AU YEUNG reiterated that DCs were important stakeholders of the HKG, and the Government had highly valued the participation of DCs in the HKG over the past years. Athletes were nominated to participate in the HKG with the 18 DCs as participating units. In addition, if the HKGOC was not authorised to use the SDC emblem, the emblem would not be displayed on all publicity and informational materials of the HKG. When these materials were put together with the other SDC emblems which were authorised to use, an impression of inconsistency might be conveyed.

284. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH said that she respected the opinion of other members but she personally supported authorising the HKGOC to use the SDC emblem. She took the view that sports events should not be politicised. She said Mr LO Kin-hei had pointed out that the SDC had committed to supporting sports events and provided funding support in this respect. As such, SDC should support the use of its emblem in the HKG and become a supporting organisation of the event so as to promote sports events in the Southern District.

285. The Chairman concluded that the Committee strongly supported athletes of the Southern District to participate in the games of the HKG. Meanwhile, the Committee had decided not to appoint any representative to participate in the HKGOC. He said that appointing SDC members to participate in the HKGOC would not achieve much effect. They could only become the “backdrop” without any roles. In addition, the Committee also disapproved the use of the SDC emblem by the HKGOC and the creation of a hyperlink to the HKG website on the SDC website.

Agenda Item 9: Date of Next Meeting

286. The Chairman informed the meeting that the 2nd RDFC meeting would be held at the SDC Conference Room in the afternoon on Tuesday, 14 July 2020. The exact time would be advised by the Secretariat in due course.

287. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:13 p.m.

Secretariat, Southern District Council
July 2020