

(Translation)

Minutes of the 11th Meeting of the District Facilities Committee of  
Sham Shui Po District Council (5th Term)

Date : 14 September 2017 (Thursday)  
Time : 9:30 a.m.  
Venue : Conference Room, Sham Shui Po District Council

Present

Chairman

Mr LAM Ka-fai, Aaron, BBS, JP

Members

Mr CHAN Kwok-wai

Ms CHAN Wing-yan, Joephy

Mr CHENG Wing-shun, Vincent, MH

Mr CHEUNG Wing-sum, Ambrose, BBS, MH, JP

Ms CHOW Wing-heng, Zoé (Arrived at 10:47 a.m.)

Mr HO Kai-ming, Calvin (Arrived at 9:40 a.m.)

Mr KONG Kwai-sang (Arrived at 10:20 a.m.)

Mr LEUNG Man-kwong

Ms NG Mei, Carman

Ms NG Yuet-lan (Arrived at 9:52 a.m.)

Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, MH, JP (Arrived at 9:50 a.m.)

Mr WAI Woon-nam

Mr WONG Tat-tung, Dennis, MH, JP (Arrived at 10:10 a.m.)

Mr YAN Kai-wing

Mr YEUNG Yuk

Mr YUEN Hoi-man

Co-opted Members

Mr WAN Kam-chuen (Arrived at 9:35 a.m.)

Ms WONG Kwai-wan

In Attendance

Miss CHEUNG Yun-chee, Freda

Assistant District Officer (2), Sham Shui Po District

Ms SO Kit-ye, Phyllis

Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Sham  
Shui Po District Office

Mr SHE Yat-chun, Ryan	Executive Officer I (District Management), Sham Shui Po District Office
Ms CHAN Suk-fan, Janet	Liaison Officer In-charge (District Facilities Management Committee and Lai Chi Kok), Sham Shui Po District Office
Mr LUK Chi-kwong	Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong East), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms LEE Shuk-ling, Agnes	Leisure Manager (Sham Shui Po), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms WONG Sau-ling, Vicky	Deputy District Leisure Manager (Sham Shui Po), District Support, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr HONG Chi-keung	Assistant District Leisure Manager (Sham Shui Po) District Support, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr KO Man-fung, Ivan	Assistant District Leisure Manager II (Sham Shui Po) District Support, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr LAW Lok-fai, Edwin	Architect (Works) 4, Home Affairs Department
Mr LI Wai-hei	Inspector of Works (Kowloon) 1, Home Affairs Department
Mr LUI Man-kit	Assistant Inspector of Works (Sham Shui Po), Home Affairs Department
Mr TANG Hon-yin	Senior Engineer/Kowloon 1, Water Supplies Department
Mr YUEN Tik-hong	Engineer/Kowloon (Headworks 1), Water Supplies Department
Ms LING Fung-kwan	Principal Estate Officer/Kowloon West (North) (District Lands Office, Kowloon West), Lands Department
Mr LEE Chun-man, John	Architect, Andrew Lee King Fun & Associates Architects Ltd.

Secretary

Miss TSE Ka-man, Clemence	Executive Assistant (District Council) 1, Sham Shui Po District Office
---------------------------	--

Absent with Apologies

Members

Mr CHAN Wai-ming, MH, JP
Ms LAU Pui-yuk

Absent

Members

Mr CHUM Tak-shing

Mr LEE Tsz-king, Dominic

Mr LEE Wing-man

Mr LEUNG Yau-fong

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed members and public officers to the meeting. He also welcomed Ms Phyllis SO to attend the meetings from now on in place of Ms FUNG See-wan, Melissa, who had been transferred out. He also took this opportunity to thank Ms Melissa FUNG, who had left her post, for her contribution to the Committee during her years in office.

2. The Committee noted the leave applications from Mr CHAN Wai-ming and Ms LAU Pui-yuk.

Agenda Item 1: Confirmation of minutes of the 10th meeting held on 29 June 2017

3. The Committee confirmed the above minutes without amendment.

Agenda Item 2: Matters for discussion

(a) Improvement works for the open space outside Tung Chau Street Jade Market – demolition, restoration and enclosure works (DC Paper 48/17)

4. Mr Ryan SHE introduced Paper 48/17 with the aid of PowerPoint.

5. The Chairman added that the Working Group on District Works (“WGDW”) had discussed the works in details.

6. Mr WAI Woon-nam raised the following views and enquiries: (i) upon installation of chain link fences, the situation inside the enclosed area could still be seen from the outside. Therefore, he supported enclosing the area with chain link fences; (ii) he enquired who term consultants were and how they would follow up on the re-beautification of the open space outside the Jade Market.

7. Mr Ryan SHE responded that term consultants were appointed by the Home Affairs Department (“HAD”) and they worked under the lead of Architects of the Works Section of the Department. The Sham Shui Po District Office (“SSPDO”) would hand over the works, which were more complicated and involved mechanical, electrical and design elements, to term consultants for follow-up. These works included the provision of walkway cover at Sham Shing Road which was being implemented.

8. The Chairman added that term consultants were long-term contract staff, responsible for larger scale projects in the district. They would conduct design works for projects by drawing reference from views of District Councils and local communities. Since beautification works for the open space outside the Jade Market involved design

works as well as consultation and it would take time for implementation, it would be more appropriate to hand the works over to term consultants for follow-up.

9. The Committee noted the contents of the paper and endorsed the funding application of HK\$360,000 for the demolition, restoration and enclosure works, as well as the handover of the beautification works to term consultants for follow-up.

(b) Provision of rain shelter at Pratas Street outside St Thomas' Primary School (DFC Paper 49/17)

10. Mr Ryan SHE introduced Paper 49/17 with the aid of PowerPoint.

11. Ms Carman NG enquired about the progress of the new proposed location as mentioned in the paper.

12. The Chairman responded that relevant follow-up work would generally be handled by WGDW.

13. Mr Ryan SHE responded that the objectives of the paper were as follows: (i) to apply funding from the Committee for the provision of a shelter at a feasible location as assessed by findings of the ground investigation; (ii) to report to the Committee on the new proposed location as raised by the initiated member. The proposal concerned would be handed over to WGDW for discussion after relevant government departments and SKH St. Thomas' Primary School had been consulted. Subject to circumstances, it would decide whether the ground investigation works and relevant funding applications would proceed.

14. Ms Carman NG raised the following enquiries: (i) the number of proposed rain shelters in this funding application and whether this was supported by the school; (ii) whether the works on the proposed rain shelters would commence upon completion of the consultation on the new proposed location.

15. Mr Ryan SHE responded as follows: (i) the funding would be used to provide one rain shelter; (ii) SSPDO had sought views from the school on three proposed locations for the provision of rain shelters and gained its support. However, since only one of the three locations was assessed to be feasible by findings of the ground investigation, SSPDO could only submit a funding application for the provision of a rain shelter at the feasible location; (iii) SSPDO would first provide a rain shelter at a location, which was assessed to be feasible, and would concurrently conduct a consultation on the new proposed location.

16. Mr WAI Woon-nam said that illegal parking at Pratas Street was severe. He expressed concern that some of the railings at the said location might be removed due to the provision of the rain shelter, thereby causing the problem of illegal parking to get worse.

17. The Chairman responded that it was unnecessary to remove roadside railings for the provision of the rain shelter, and WGDW did not suggest the removal of roadside railings.

18. The Committee noted the contents of the paper and endorsed the funding application of HK\$170,000 for the provision of a rain shelter at Pratas Street outside St. Thomas' Primary School.

(c) Provision of rain shelter at Tonkin Street outside Heep Woh Primary School – feasibility study (DFC Paper 50/17)

19. Mr Ryan SHE introduced Paper 50/17 with the aid of PowerPoint.

20. The Chairman added that WGDW had discussed the works in details.

21. Ms WONG Kwai-wan supported the project and raised the following views: (i) many wild birds gathered in the vicinity of C.C.C. Heep Woh Primary School (Cheung Sha Wan) (“Heep Who Primary School”) from time to time. Also, she saw members of the public feeding wild birds at the said location. The problem of wild birds had been in existence in the district for years, and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (“FEHD”) and the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (“AFCD”) should follow up on the problem; (ii) the gathering of a large number of wild birds might cause avian influenza or other environmental hygiene problems. She suggested that the Committee should write to AFCD, requesting it to completely resolve the problem by driving wild birds away.

22. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) feeding wild birds was an unlawful act and law enforcement agencies would issue summons to the individuals concerned. However, some individuals continued feeding wild birds and it would be difficult to completely resolve the problem for the time being; (ii) this district had been affected by wild birds for a long time. In this connection, the District Council (“DC”) established the Non-Standing Working Group on Wild Bird and Poultry Market Problems (“WGWB”) to address the problem. This Committee was mainly responsible for dealing with matters relating to district facilities, and matters relating to environmental hygiene would be followed up by the Environment and Hygiene Committee. He would convey members’ opinions to WGWB via the Secretariat; (iii) according to observations by DC Member of the constituency concerned, wild birds hardly gathered on the roof panel of the rain shelter near Heep Woh Primary School.

23. Ms Joephy CHAN welcomed the Committee to convey the wild bird problem to WGWB for follow-up. She would request relevant government departments to take follow-up action and make regular reports on this.

24. Mr LEUNG Man-kwong raised the following views: (i) DC Member of the constituency concerned had pointed out that wild birds hardly gathered on the roof panel of the rain shelter near Heep Woh Primary School; (ii) he reckoned that appropriate follow-up action could be taken subject to circumstances upon completion of the rain shelter; and at that time, if wild birds were found to be gathering there, bird spikes could be installed.

25. Mr YUEN Hoi-man raised the following views: (i) the funds allocated to WGWB this year were increased to HK\$60,000 from HK\$22,000 last year. New resources were mainly used for the purchase of liquid hand soap and organisation of parent-child orientation activities; (ii) if WGWB's application for DC funds was endorsed, he suggested that parent-child orientation activities should be organised at wild bird feeding blackspots in the district to enhance the effectiveness of activities.

26. The Chairman noted members' opinions and reiterated that this Committee was mainly responsible for dealing with matters relating to district facilities.

27. Ms Carman NG said that as the location of the proposed rain shelter was close to wild bird feeding blackspots, WGDW expressed concern that individuals who fed wild birds would throw feed up to the roof panel of the rain shelter, thereby leading to cleaning-related issues. Therefore, it finally adopted the "eagle shelter" design for the rain shelter.

28. The Chairman said that this agenda item aimed to discuss the provision of a rain shelter, and other issues should be discussed by other committees as appropriate.

29. Ms WONG Kwai-wan said that she was not a member of WGWB and could not convey her opinions to WGWB. Since the way residents made use of district facilities was a matter relating to district facilities and the location of the proposed rain shelter was close to wild bird feeding blackspots, she took this opportunity to give her opinions.

30. The Chairman expressed concern over the problem of wild birds. He concluded that the Committee noted the contents of the paper and endorsed the funding application of HK\$30,000 for the ground investigation works.

(d) The site on the top of Mission Hill where the Sham Shui Po Fresh Water Break Pressure Tank is located (DFC Paper 51/17)

(e) Request for the Government to provide fitness equipment on Mission Hill as soon as possible (DFC Paper 52/17)

(f) Improve the facilities on Mission Hill for the enjoyment of the public (DFC Paper 53/17)

31. The Chairman suggested that Papers 51/17, 52/17 and 53/17 should be combined for discussion as these three papers were similar in nature. Members did not raise any objection.

32. Mr YUEN Tik-hong introduced Paper 51/17.

33. Mr Kalvin HO introduced Paper 53/17.

34. Mr CHAN Kwok-wai introduced Paper 52/17.

35. Mr TANG Hon-yin responded as follows: (i) having considered the existing water supply facilities, the Water Supplies Department (“WSD”) reckoned that it was unnecessary to use the break pressure tank on the top of Mission Hill anymore. Currently, it was exploring whether the site concerned could be handed over to the Lands Department for suitable usage; (ii) the main responsibility of WSD was to provide water supply while responsibilities such as operating recreational facilities, managing venue opening hours, providing and repairing recreational facilities, etc. did not fall under the Department’s purview.

36. Ms LING Fung-kwan introduced the Response Paper 59/17 and added that: (i) having received a complaint from the public about the unlawful occupation of government land, the District Lands Office, Kowloon West (“DLO”) initiated land control action on 7 August this year. The location involved was an unleased government land at the foothill, instead of the top, of Mission Hill. Nevertheless, since opinions from other members of the public were received, DLO had suspended the action concerned; (ii) DLO would take follow-up action in accordance with applicable procedures in a timely manner.

37. Miss Freda CHEUNG introduced the Response Paper 60/17 and added that: (i) SSPDO understood and expressed concern about the request for the provision of additional recreational facilities by users of Mission Hill. Previously, SSPDO co-ordinated relevant government departments to explore how to make the best use of the site on the top of Mission Hill; (ii) SSPDO had learnt from WSD about the use of the site on the top of Mission Hill and requested the Department to review whether the site could be released for public use. After deliberation, WSD reckoned that the site on the top of



Mission Hill could be released subject to requirements of relevant government departments and the safety of the site. The Department was currently addressing related technical issues; (iii) after technical difficulties had been resolved by WSD, SSPDO would continue to proactively co-ordinate relevant government departments to respond to the public's expectations to provide additional recreational facilities.

38. Ms Agnes LEE responded as follows: (i) when providing a recreation venue, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD") had to take various factors into consideration, including whether the facilities were safe, whether the facilities would adversely affect the environment, whether there were similar facilities in the vicinity, etc.; (ii) according to observations, the site on the top of Mission Hill was not accessible by vehicles and the walkway on the hill also posed potential risks. The provision of facilities would induce safety issues and there would also be a certain degree of difficulties in terms of daily maintenance; (iii) the Department had provided recreational facilities at Tai Hang Tung Recreation Ground and Tong Yam Street Hillside Sitting-out Area in the vicinity of Mission Hill.

39. The Chairman enquired about the depth of the fresh water break pressure tank and reckoned that this would affect the future development of the site.

40. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views and enquires: (i) he hoped that the existing facilities at Mission Hill could be maintained at this stage for the public's continued use; (ii) LCSD had indicated its intention to follow up on matters relating to Mission Hill years ago; (iii) he enquired whether WSD had formulated any timetable on reinstatement of land and whether it had conducted any preliminary assessments; (iv) he enquired whether the site where the fresh water break pressure tank was located was the "Bright Peak" mentioned by the public. He also enquired whether the area under the management of WSD referred to the area enclosed by chain link fences; (v) there was fitness equipment both inside and outside the area enclosed by chain link fences. He enquired whether WSD's works on reinstatement of land would affect the facilities outside the area enclosed by chain link fences; (vi) he reckoned that members of the public who provided and used the fitness equipment attached importance to the safety of equipment, and therefore he disagreed to its demolition; (vii) there were structures, such as canvases etc., at Mission Hill near Tang Yam Street. Residents in the neighbourhood expressed concern that individuals dwelled or carried out other activities at the said location. He reckoned that DLO should follow up on structures other than fitness equipment.

41. Mr Kalvin HO raised the following views: (i) DC and SSPDO logos were found at many stairs and pavilions at Mission Hill, e.g. the stairs leading up to the hill from Shek Kip Mei Health Centre and the so-called "Dog Poop Lane" (the lane near Sai Yeung Choi Street North and the Police Sports and Recreation Club). He suggested that SSPDO

should consider providing relevant facilities continuously; (ii) some stairs at Mission Hill were paved by the public while some other locations were still muddy land and were not equipped with railings, e.g. the surrounding areas of “Bright Peak” (i.e. the hilltop area enclosed by WSD). Therefore, he hoped that SSPDO could consider addressing the issues together if it was technically feasible.

42. Mr CHAN Kwok-wai raised the following views: (i) matters relating to Mission Hill involved various government departments, and SSPDO had all along played a co-ordinating role. He hoped that relevant government departments could make a good plan to improve ancillary facilities at the said location, with a view to making the best use of land; (ii) the Council had discussed matters relating to Mission Hill in the past, but there was not much progress so far. He hoped that relevant government departments could proactively follow up on this.

43. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) an appropriate method should be adopted to demolish the fresh water break pressure tank according to the depth of the water tank, and it might be necessary to level the hillside area substantially; (ii) this opportunity should be used to re-plan the future development of the site. Members could discuss the future development of the site, for example, for the provision of parks or housing units.

44. Ms WONG Kwai-wan raised the following views: (i) the Council had been following up on issues relating to the facilities of Mission Hill as well as their repair and maintenance for years. Also, the Sham Shui Po East Area Committee under SSPDO wrote to relevant government departments on this years ago, with a view to examining how to make the best use of the “Bright Peak” site. Afterwards, DC allocated funds to provide district facilities, such as stairs and pavilions, at different locations of Mission Hill and carry out repairs as appropriate; (ii) a few locations in the neighbourhood were suitable for the public to do exercise, and therefore, Mission Hill was popular among residents and even residents of other districts would make target visits to it; (iii) WSD would hand over the site at Mission Hill to DLO, which should follow up on examining the development of the said location; (iv) DLO mentioned that there were activities relating to the unlawful occupation of government land. It was believed that it referred to individuals who set up canvases for dwelling and kept dogs near Fook Tak Temple. SSPDO had carried out inspections with members who expressed concern over this. She reckoned that these individuals had malicious intents and were involved in illegal acts, such as thefts, as mentioned by some residents; (v) she reckoned that if the authorities could have provided a fresh water break pressure tank on the hill, the provision of additional fitness equipment should not be a problem. She hoped that government departments could seriously consider this in line with the Government’s initiative to promote physical activities.

45. Mr TANG Hon-yin gave a consolidated response as follows: (i) according to WSD's information, the fresh water break pressure tank was approximately seven metres in depth and was believed to be built as early as 1930; (ii) WSD was responsible for managing as well as repairing and maintaining the area enclosed by fences on the top of Mission Hill. The area outside the fences was not within the Department's purview; (iii) the Department had reviewed the existing system in response to the public's request. Findings showed that the existing system was adequate to cope with the needs of water supply of Sham Shui Po District and there was no need to use the fresh water break pressure tank again. Therefore, it decided to hand over the site concerned; (iv) earlier, WSD had appointed a renowned reservoir expert to review the condition of Sham Shui Po Fresh Water Break Pressure Tank. The expert reckoned that the water tank had structural safety problems and the site was not suitable for opening to the public. Therefore, the Department decided to demolish the water tank. Considering public safety and law and order, the Department reckoned that it was necessary to continue enclosing the area where the water tank was situated and to erect signboards at the entrance to remind the public not to enter; (v) the Department and relevant government departments were currently examining a simple and efficient land restoration plan, with a view to handing the site over to DLO for other uses as early as possible.

46. The Chairman enquired WSD about the timetable for follow-up action and the land restoration plan to be adopted.

47. Mr TANG Hon-yin responded as follows: (i) WSD hoped to minimise the works' impacts on the public; (ii) the Department had conducted a preliminary study. Since the location of fresh water break pressure tank was inaccessible by carriageways, transportation of works machinery and construction materials was expected to be difficult; (iii) currently, the project management division of the Department and relevant government departments were exploring feasible land restoration plans. Since the plan to be adopted and the time required would be interrelated, the Department could not provide a timetable for follow-up action for the time being.

48. The Chairman said that the provision of uphill carriageways could be explored to facilitate the future development of Mission Hill.

49. Ms LING Fung-kwan gave a consolidated response as follows: (i) if WSD finally handed the site of the fresh water break pressure tank over to DLO, the site would become an unleased government land and any government departments which intended to provide facilities at the site might submit an application for land allocation to DLO; (ii) the rain shelter on Mission Hill was also provided by SSPDO after a land allocation was approved by DLO; (iii) in respect of the handling of complaints about illegal structures or facilities on government land, DLO would initiate land control action in accordance with the Land

(Miscellaneous Provisions) Ordinance. Facilities would be kept only if these facilities were confirmed to be safe and their repair and maintenance would be followed up by government departments; (iv) DLO only suspended the land control action against the structures at the foothill of Mission Hill. It would take follow-up action in accordance with applicable procedures in a timely manner.

50. Miss Freda CHEUNG gave a consolidated response as follows: (i) the then Urban Council started to follow up on matters relating to Mission Hill in the 80s and provided district facilities, such as stairs, rain shelters, benches, etc. on the hill. SSPDO had all along followed up on the maintenance of these facilities. For example, a funding application was submitted to the Committee for the improvement works for the stairs of Mission Hill in Shek Kip Mei earlier this year; (ii) considering the Council's concern about the site of Mission Hill and the needs of the public, government departments were currently considering whether more areas of the site at the top of Mission Hill could be opened for use. However, there were a lot of technical difficulties in the follow-up process, such as loading of the slopes of Mission Hill, the area of developable land of the hilltop site in future, etc.; (iii) SSPDO had all along maintained communication with WSD and DLO, and had requested relevant government departments to report on this when technical difficulties were resolved; (iv) if the Committee hoped to provide fitness equipment on Mission Hill, SSPDO would be willing to communicate and follow up with relevant government departments.

51. Ms Agnes LEE responded that LCSD would proactively consider the feasibility of the views concerned with respective government departments.

52. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) he agreed that the development of Mission Hill had quite a number of technical difficulties and requested relevant government departments to continue addressing them; (ii) Mission Hill had all along been the "city lung" and open space of Sham Shui Po East. The authorities should continue developing and improving the facilities there, with SSPDO playing an important role in this respect; (iii) the slopes of Mission Hill posed potential risks and landslides occurred from time to time after heavy rainstorms. He hoped that while waiting for WSD to formulate land restoration plans, SSPDO could co-ordinate relevant government departments and request the Civil Engineering and Development Department to take follow-up action and repair slopes when necessary; (iv) he and members who expressed concern over matters relating to Mission Hill had collected opinions from morning walkers at the said location. After deliberation, members considered it more appropriate for the site to be handed over to LCSD and suggested that the Department should conduct relevant studies as early as possible; (v) if issues of Mission Hill, such as facilities, etc. were not appropriately addressed, they might lead to community conflicts. Therefore, he hoped that SSPDO could properly launch a consultation, especially seeking opinions from morning walkers;

(vi) after typhoons, it was often that hillside trees collapsed. Relevant government departments should expedite their cleaning efforts; (vii) Mission Hill was not a public place and FEHD would not regularly clean up waste there. As a result, some morning walkers burnt waste and polluted the environment, which was undesirable. He hoped that SSPDO could follow up the issue with the Department; (viii) the existing fitness equipment on Mission Hill was provided by a recovered SARS patient on his initiative and was well received by residents. Government departments, such as WSD, DLO, etc. did not forcefully ban facilities which did not involve safety issues. He hoped that LCSD would consider the issue about fitness equipment.

53. The Chairman enquired about the area of the fresh water break pressure tank and reckoned that reclaiming the water tank would involve a lot of resources.

54. Mr TANG Hon-yin responded that the area of the fresh water break pressure tank was approximately 1,700 m<sup>2</sup> and its depth was seven metres. WSD had considered different ways to carry out demolition works with a view to reducing cost.

55. The Chairman concluded as follows: (i) the Committee hoped that Mission Hill would be developed into a park and requested government departments to conduct a study on it by making reference to other hillside parks (e.g. Kowloon Tsai Park); (ii) it was hoped that WSD could provide details of the restoration works for the site on the top of Mission Hill as soon as possible, including the scale of the works and the method to be adopted; (iii) there were many slopes in Mission Hill. WSD should enhance the standards of the works in order not to affect the slopes and might carry out geotechnical engineering works (e.g. slope stabilisation works) if necessary; (iv) a lot of users were involved in the site of Mission Hill, and therefore a full consultation for matters relating to its development would be required. Targets of consultation included users of Mission Hill, residents in the district, relevant area committees, DC, etc. Since the area covered by the site of Mission Hill was not small, its development required the co-ordination of various government departments. Also, in view of its substantial management expenses in future, views from relevant government departments had to be sought; (v) when planning and conducted the works, government departments should take the needs of the public into consideration, for example, by providing adequate protection measures and paying attention to the management of dust, air and water quality during the works period, and should carry out assessments in advance; (vi) he hoped that DLO would take follow-up action as soon as possible upon receipt of WSD's land restoration plan and works timetable; (vii) it was suggested that relevant government departments should explore the feasibility of constructing carriageways on Mission Hill to facilitate the management and transportation works in future and the access of users; (viii) the development of the entire project would take a long time. It was suggested that government departments should continue with the repair and maintenance of the existing district facilities on the premise of reasonable

utilisation of resources and should continue to explore how to improve other hillside ancillary facilities (e.g. stairs, rain shelters etc.) upon implementation of the development plan; (ix) FEHD would be urged to follow up on matters relating to hillside waste via SSPDO.

[Post-meeting note: SSPDO had referred the issue of hillside waste disposal to FEHD for follow-up.]

56. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) he agreed to the development direction of Mission Hill but expressed concern that the development might take too long; (ii) Mission Hill covered a vast area of land and was adjacent to private land. SSPDO might not be able to address the issue on its own and the authorities might need to provide more support; (iii) many trees were planted on the top of Mission Hill. He reckoned that it was unnecessary to fell trees at the said location for the demolition of the fresh water break pressure tank; (iv) government departments should consider the long-term development of Mission Hill when conducting the works, and they would take care of safety issues to prevent users from being affected as far as possible; (v) he agreed that the implementation of district minor works on Mission Hill, such as re-paving damaged road surfaces, should continue. He also requested government departments to properly cleanse the existing district facilities, such as rain shelters etc.

57. The Chairman said that his earlier conclusions had covered members' views.

58. Mr WAN Kam-chuen said that WSD pointed out that the fresh water break pressure tank posed potential risks. He hoped that the Department would take appropriate measures to keep the public away from the fresh water break pressure tank.

59. The Chairman said that WSD stated that it had appointed a world-renowned reservoir expert to conduct an assessment on the water tank. The expert reckoned that the water tank had structural safety problems and the site was not suitable for opening to the public. Therefore, the Department had provided fences around the water tank. He hoped that WSD could provide a land restoration plan soon, with a view to achieving the vision of providing a park at Mission Hill as early as possible.

(g) Construction of rain shelter at Cheung Sha Wan Road outside Cheung Sha Wan Plaza (DFC Paper 54/17)

60. Mr YUEN Hoi-man introduced Paper 54/17 and said that in respect of removal of planters outside Cheung Sha Wan Plaza, he had made a few suggestions on the relocation of planters for SSPDO's consideration.

61. Mr Ryan SHE responded that SSPDO noted the member's opinion and would explore the feasibility of the works.

62. Mr Ambrose CHEUNG supported the suggestion and said that: (i) against the background that the space outside Cheung Sha Wan Plaza available for waiting buses and minibuses was inadequate and shops at the said location would carry out renovation works from time to time, it was difficult for passengers to get on and off; (ii) it was inappropriate to place large planters at the said location. He suggested that SSPDO should explore the feasibility of replacing the existing floor planters with railing planters, and it should consider relocating floor planters to the area in the vicinity of Butterfly Valley Road.

63. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) he agreed that a rain shelter should be provided at the said location; (ii) he agreed that the provision of planters in industrial areas could help improve environmental perceptions. However, the replacement of planters with railing planters might give rise to other problems. Therefore, he suggested that other options should be explored; (iii) given that the current demand for telephone booths had declined, he suggested that the telephone booths at the said location should be removed.

64. Ms Carman NG raised the following views: (i) the telephone booths occupied a lot of space and were provided in the vicinity of pedestrian crossing facilities, causing obstruction to pedestrian flow; (ii) as she remembered, the Council decided to place planters at the said location to improve air quality due to high vehicular flow and serious air pollution; (iii) members could discuss how to strike a balance between the needs of greening and the use of land.

65. Mr YUEN Hoi-man pointed out that: (i) the railing planters were provided in the vicinity of the above location while plastic flowers were placed at locations which were not suitable for planting. According to observations, many cigarette butts and waste were accumulated in both floor planters and railing planters. It was difficult to achieve the greening effect. He had arranged the relocation of railing planters to a more appropriate location via SSPDO; (ii) the floor planters at the said location were not only accumulated with a large quantity of waste, but also caused obstruction to pedestrians at the said location. Therefore, he supported the relocation of planters; (iii) he kept an open mind on the removal of telephone booths; (iv) as LCSD was responsible for the plants in planter, FEHD was responsible for the removal of waste in the planters and SSPDO was responsible for the related expenditure for the provision of planters, this did not yield a desirable effect; (v) he understood that government departments did not suggest the disposal of planters on the principle of proper use of public money. Nevertheless, having considered management-related issues, he reckoned that this was done the wrong way round.

66. Ms NG Yuet-lan gave opinions as follows: (i) the provision of planters at locations with high pedestrian and vehicular flows would only lead to the accumulation of waste for a prolonged period and increase the management workload of government departments such that it would be difficult to achieve the greening effect. Therefore, planters should no longer be placed at locations with high pedestrian flow, e.g. in the vicinity of bus stops, pedestrian crossing facilities; (ii) it was inappropriate for various government departments to share responsibilities in managing planters.

67. The Chairman said that: (i) it was noted that telephone booths also provided Wi-Fi service, but he reckoned that the provision of two telephone booths might not be necessary; (ii) there were minibus stops in the vicinity of Cheung Sha Wan Plaza. The air quality at the said location was poor, which had a direct impact on nearby shops. SSPDO had used publicity signboards to block vehicle emission, but the result was not satisfactory. At last, it decided to place planters as roadside barriers to improve air quality; (iii) he expressed concern about the recurrence of air quality problems upon removal of planters. Therefore, he suggested that DC Member of the constituency concerned should collect more opinions from the public and the issue should first be discussed by WGDW.

68. The Chairman concluded that the Committee endorsed the suggestion of requesting SSPDO to explore the feasibility of the relocation of planters at the said location and the proposal of installing a rain shelter.

(h) Report by LCSD on facilities management in Sham Shui Po District (DFC Paper 55/17)

69. Ms Vicky WONG introduced Paper 55/17 and added that: (i) installation of covered walkway along the pavement of emergency vehicular access in Lai Chi Kok Park (Project No. SSP-DMW355) and installation of drainage and irrigation system at the rugby pitch in Tai Hang Tung Recreation Ground (Project No. SSP-DMW513) had been completed; (ii) the works at Hing Wah Street West Playground was originally scheduled to be completed in the third quarter of 2017. However, due to typhoons and rainstorms in the past three months, the works could not be completed as scheduled. The Architectural Services Department (“ArchSD”) expected that the completion of the works would be delayed to November this year.

70. Mr YEUNG Yuk raised the following views in respect to the works of Hing Wah Street West Playground: (i) he and other members who expressed concern about the works, together with LCSD staff, carried out a site inspection early this year. The Department said that the works could be completed in the third quarter of 2017. He enquired whether the Department would consider the possible effects of inclement weather in projecting the anticipated date of completion; however, the Department said that it would not consider the effects of inclement weather in its projection; (ii) in order to provide the public with a more



accurate anticipated date of completion, the Department should proactively consider taking the effects of inclement weather into account when the projection was being made.

71. Mr WAI Woon-nam raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the children's play room in Pei Ho Street Sports Centre was situated on the 5th floor, where people lingered around from time to time and odour emitted from the nearby toilet frequently. He enquired whether the improvement works on the fresh air system in the children's play room, the dance room and activity rooms in Pei Ho Street Sports Centre (Project No. SSP-DMW522) could improve the odour issue; (ii) similar situation occurred in the vicinity of the toilet of Tung Chau Street Park Squash Centre. He requested LCSD to follow up on and pay more attention to the improvement works on the fresh air system in the indoor sports centre as well as the odour issue.

72. Mr YUEN Hoi-man raised the following views: (i) LCSD did not consider the factor of inclement weather when projecting the anticipated date of completion, causing the date of completion to delay repeatedly. This practice was undesirable. He hoped that the Department would proactively consider taking the possible effects of inclement weather into account when the projection was being made; (ii) the Department pointed out that the completion of the works of Hing Wah Street West Playground would be delayed until November this year due to typhoons and rainstorms. He did not reckon that the works would be delayed by two months due to typhoons and rainstorms, and he requested the Department to give an explanation; (iii) it was noted that the Department was aware of the delay of the works only when the anticipated date of completion was approaching. He reckoned that its communication and monitoring mechanism might have defects and hoped that the Department would review in this respect.

73. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) a contractor had to pay a substantial amount of penalty if a project was delayed. If the delay was too long, it would even affect its bidding for government projects in future; (ii) based on rainfall data of the Hong Kong Observatory, the works staff would decide whether a particular day was suitable for outdoor works or not. If rainfall reached a certain level, the day would be designated as a "rainy day" such that outdoor works would be suspended. By making reference to the data concerned, people in the trade would report on the number of days the works were affected by the rain.

74. Mr Ambrose CHEUNG raised the following views: (i) LCSD had mentioned that it would explore the feasibility of implementing the Community Garden Programme ("CGP") at Sham Shui Po Park and Nam Cheong Park. He reckoned that CGP was also suitable for other parks in the district. He hoped that the Department would make regular reports on CGP; (ii) last year, DC suggested that LCSD should plant thematic flowers in major parks in the district, and therefore LCSD made a report in this respect in March this year. He

reckoned that the number of locations for flower planting was far from enough and the scale was also small, therefore the results were not satisfactory. Besides, in terms of the nature, the planting of thematic flowers was different from the horticultural beautification for major parks in Sham Shui Po District (Project No. SSP-DMW515) and the greening works mentioned in the Department's regular report. Therefore, he suggested that the Department should include information on the planting of thematic flowers in its regular report to facilitate members' follow-up.

75. Ms Zoé CHOW raised the following views in respect to the works of Hing Wah Street West Playground: (i) she reckoned that the Department's method for projecting the date of completion was not accurate and would only lead to repeated delays in the projected date of completion. She hoped that the Department would review this; (ii) residents hoped that Hing Wah Street West Playground would be completed as early as possible, and she hoped that government departments would expedite the works progress.

76. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu said that many old trees collapsed due to recent typhoons. He hoped that LCSD would provide information of old trees in the district as well as relevant maintenance works in future. This would facilitate residents to inform government departments of tree problems so that they could take follow-up action as early as possible, with a view to reducing the removal of trees due to inclement weather, insect pest, etc.

77. Ms Agnes LEE gave a consolidated response as follows: (i) LCSD had all along maintained close liaison with the planning sections of ArchSD on the works of Hing Wah Street West Playground. It noted that the completion of the works concerned would be delayed until November this year due to recent consecutive rainstorms. The Department and ArchSD were arranging a site inspection to explain the situation concerned to members who expressed concern over the works; (ii) in terms of the nature, the planting of thematic flowers was different from the horticultural beautification for major parks in Sham Shui Po District (Project No. SSP-DMW515); (iii) the Department noted members' opinions on the management of CGP, the planting of thematic flowers, the fresh air system in Tung Chau Street Park Squash Centre and the old trees in the district, and would follow up to address the issues.

78. The Chairman suggested that the Department should report on the planting of thematic flowers and CGP under two sub-items in future to facilitate members' follow-up. Based on his observations, it was true that there was odour in the toilet of Pei Ho Street Sports Centre. He requested the Department to follow up on this.

79. Ms Carman NG gave opinions as follows: (i) the renovated children's play room in Pei Ho Street Sport Centre was very popular, with a heavy flow of people; (ii) people

lingered around on the 5th and 6th floors of the centre from time to time, and this might be attributed to the hot weather; (iii) as the odour issue of the centre was serious, she requested the Department to pay attention to environmental hygiene of the venue and proactively resolve the issue from the perspective of management.

80. The Committee noted and endorsed the above report.

(i) Improvement works on recreation and sports facilities under LCSD in 2017-18 (Phase IV) (DFC Paper 56/17)

81. Ms Vicky WONG introduced Paper 56/17.

82. Ms Carman NG said that the fountain near the tennis courts of Shek Kip Mei Park had been closed earlier for repair and maintenance. She enquired why it was closed again to carry out the works.

83. Ms Vicky WONG responded that the works concerned aimed to install UV lamps for the water filtration system of the fountain and would not affect the operation of the fountain.

[Post-meeting note: LCSD said that the works concerned would be carried out without a need to close the fountain.]

84. The Chairman said that installation of UV lamps could improve water quality to enhance safety of the venue.

85. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu thanked the Department for its prompt installation of lighting at Tai Hang Tung Estate Playground No. 1 and enquired whether the new installation was LED lamps.

86. Ms Vicky WONG responded that the Department installed spotlights instead of LED lamps on the existing lamp posts in Tai Hang Tung Estate Playground No. 1, with a view to improving the lighting system in the venue as soon as possible.

87. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu suggested that the Department should replace the lighting of the venue with LED lamps in due course.

88. The Chairman suggested that the Department should use LED lamps as far as possible to reduce energy consumption when the lighting system of the venue was to be upgraded in future.

89. The Committee noted the contents of the paper and endorsed the funding application of HK\$895,513. It also agreed to make the payment in full in 2017-18.

Agenda Item 3: Reports from Working Groups under the Committee

(a) Report from the Working Group on District Works (DFC Paper 57/17)

90. The Committee noted and endorsed the above report.

(b) Report from the Working Group on District Facilities Management (DFC Paper 58/17)

91. The Committee noted and endorsed the above report.

Agenda Item 4: Any other business

92. The Committee did not raise any other business.

Agenda Item 5: Date of next meeting

93. The next meeting will be held at 9:30 a.m. on 16 November 2017 (Thursday).

94. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 11:56 a.m.

District Council Secretariat  
Sham Shui Po District Office  
November 2017