

(Translation)

Minutes of the Extended Meeting of the 12th Meeting of the Housing Affairs Committee of  
Sham Shui Po District Council (5th Term)

Date: 29 December 2017 (Friday)

Time: 10:30 a.m.

Venue: Conference Room, Sham Shui Po District Council

Present

Chairman

Mr YAN Kai-wing

Members

Mr CHAN Kwok-wai

Mr CHAN Wai-ming, MH, JP

Ms CHAN Wing-yan, Joephy

Mr CHENG Wing-shun, Vincent, MH (Left at 12:45 p.m.)

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

Ms CHOW Wing-heng, Zoé (Arrived at 11 a.m.)

Mr CHUM Tak-shing (Arrived at 11:20 a.m.)

Mr HO Kai-ming, Calvin

Ms LAU Pui-yuk (Arrived at 10:35 a.m.)

Mr LEE Wing-man (Left at 12:45 p.m.)

Mr LEUNG Man-kwong

Ms NG Mei, Carman (Left at 12:30 p.m.)

Ms NG Yuet-lan

Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, MH, JP (Arrived at 1 p.m.)

Mr WAI Woon-nam

Mr WONG Tat-tung, Dennis, MH, JP (Arrived at 11:10 a.m.)

Mr YEUNG Yuk (Arrived at 10:40 a.m.; left at 12:45 p.m.)

Co-opted Member

Mr CHEUNG Tak-wai (Arrived at 10:43 a.m.)

In Attendance

|                                |                                                                                               |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Miss CHEUNG Yun-chee, Freda    | Assistant District Officer (Sham Shui Po) 2                                                   |
| Mr WONG Leung-ping, Ben        | Senior Liaison Officer 2, Sham Shui Po District Office                                        |
| Ms CHAN Chor-kuen, Isabella    | Officer-in-Charge (Tai Hang Tung Integrated Family Service Centre), Social Welfare Department |
| Mrs CHENG IP Sau-fong, Susanna | Senior Housing Manager/Kowloon West & Sai Kung                                                |

|                                     |                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Miss AU Mei-lin, Rebecca            | Region 1, Housing Department<br>Senior Housing Manager/Kowloon West & Sai Kung                                    |
| Mr CHOI Man-yuen, Wilson            | Region 2, Housing Department<br>Acting Housing Manager (Redevelopment 2), Housing<br>Department                   |
| Ms LEE HO Mai-wah, Josephine        | Housing Manager/Kowloon West & Sai Kung 2,<br>Housing Department                                                  |
| Ms LING Kuk-yi                      | Senior Housing Manager/Non-domestic (Headquarters),<br>Housing Department                                         |
| Mr WONG Sin-on                      | Senior Architect 17, Housing Department                                                                           |
| Ms WONG Lai-fong                    | Housing Manager/Kowloon West & Sai Kung 8,<br>Housing Department                                                  |
| Mr CHEUNG Yau-wah                   | Assistant Housing Manager (Pak Tin) 3, Housing Department                                                         |
| Mr LO Sing-wun                      | Planning Officer 26, Housing Department                                                                           |
| Ms LEUNG Ka-wai, Charity            | Architect 111, Housing Department                                                                                 |
| Mr LAU Kin-hang, Kenneth            | Senior Inspector (Assistant Police Community Relations Officer,<br>Sham Shui Po District), Hong Kong Police Force |
| Mr TONG Po-keung                    | Sergeant (Neighbourhood Police Co-ordinator, Sham Shui<br>Po District), Hong Kong Police Force                    |
| Mr Alan YENG                        | Senior Manager (Property and Development), Hong Kong<br>Housing Society                                           |
| Mr Gary FU                          | Senior Manager (Corporate & Community Relations),<br>Hong Kong Housing Society                                    |
| <u>Secretary</u><br>Ms Carmen CHUNG | Executive Officer (District Council) 4, Sham Shui Po<br>District Office                                           |

Absent

Members

Mr KONG Kwai-sang  
Mr LAM Ka-fai, Aaron, BBS, JP  
Mr LEUNG Yau-fong

Co-opted Members

Mr FUNG Man-tao, Joshua  
Mr LI Kwing  
Ms TANG Mei-ching

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed members and representatives of government departments to the extended meeting of the twelfth meeting of the Housing Affairs Committee (“HAC”).

Agenda Item 2: Matters for discussion

(b) Strongly request for allocating two flats for households with five persons at Blocks 9, 10, 11, 13 of Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment (HAC Paper 96/17)

(c) Request for relaxing allocation standard for households with more than five persons when Blocks 9, 10, 11 and 13 of Pak Tin Estate are redeveloped (HAC Paper 97/17) and Item 6 under Follow-up matters (HAC Paper 104/17)

2. The Chairman said that he had moved a provisional motion at the meeting on 14 December this year seconded by Ms Carman NG and the content of the motion was supplemented as follows:

“In 2012 the Housing Department (“HD”) announced at the same time the redevelopment of eight old public rental housing (“PRH”) blocks in Pak Tin Estate in two phases, and the households with five persons of the four blocks in the first phase had been allocated medium-sized units of about 40 square metres. However, the residents of the other four blocks in the latter phase (Blocks 9, 10, 11 and 13) would be allocated medium-sized units of about 35 square metres.

In the light of the above “special situation”, this Committee urges HD to endeavour to remedy the unfair allocation of units to Blocks 9, 10, 11 and 13 of Pak Tin Estate, including the relaxation of allocation standard for households with more than five persons and the allocation of two flats for households with five persons.”

3. The Committee voted on the motion by open ballot and the result was as follows:

For: Mr Ambrose CHEUNG, Mr Calvin HO, Ms Carman NG,  
Ms NG Yuet-lan, Mr WAI Woon-nam, Mr YAN Kai-wing (6)

Against: (0)

Abstain: Mr CHAN Wai-ming, Ms Joephy CHAN, Mr Vincent CHENG,  
Ms LAU Pui-yuk, Mr Dominic LEE, Mr LEUNG Man-kwong,  
Mr CHEUNG Tak-wai (7)

4. The Chairman announced that the provisional motion was carried and asked the

representatives of HD to reflect the views of members to the Department.

5. Miss Rebecca AU responded that she would reflect the views of members to the Department and take follow-up action.

[Post-meeting note of HD: In response to the views of members, HD said that the design of PRH estates had to be improved over time. In addition to complying with the latest regulations, consideration would be given to the characteristics of individual sites to optimise its development potential. The Department would adopt the latest design in project development, as a result, the design and size of units allocated to residents in different periods would not be completely identical. To cater for the difference in the number of persons in the households of the applicants, there were different types of design of PRH units, and different allocation ranges would be set for units of different types. As PRH units were scarce public resources, the deviation from prevailing policy in respect of a single redevelopment project would be unfair to existing or future PRH applicants. The prevailing allocation standard of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (“HA”) was no less than seven square metres of internal floor area per person, this allocation standard also applied to the PRH residents affected by redevelopment. Type D flats of Standard Modular Estates were suitable for allocation to households of four to five persons. On parity grounds, HD had to allocate PRH units according to the prevailing allocation standard.]

(d) Request HD to provide information on the facilities and building plans for the site of Pak Tin Estate Phase 9 Redevelopment (HAC Paper 98/17)

6. The Chairman introduced Paper 98/17.

7. Ms Carman NG enquired when the road works outside the site of Pak Tin Estate Phase 9 Redevelopment would be completed, and pointed out that passers-by had to walk on the road which was very dangerous. She asked HD to provide the details of the works.

8. The Chairman asked the Department to report the works progress of the site of Pak Tin Estate Phase 9 Redevelopment and explain how the safety issues outside the site would be addressed.

9. Miss Rebecca AU responded that Phase 9 Redevelopment was expected to complete in the second quarter of 2018. The works were underway on schedule without delay. As regards the safety issues outside the site, the Department would reflect the view of members to the Construction Division and would continue to follow up on this matter.

10. The Chairman concluded that the Committee had noted the report of HD and requested the Department to take note of the safety issues outside the site to avoid

accidents.

(e) Request for deferring the demolition of car park at Pak Tin Commercial Complex (HAC Paper 99/17)

11. The Chairman introduced Paper 99/17.

12. Miss Rebecca AU responded as follows:

- (i) In constructing PRH estates, HD designed the facilities of parking spaces in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and with reference to the needs of residents of the housing estates.
- (ii) To meet the demand of residents of Pak Tin Estate for parking spaces, parking spaces at neighbouring housing estates including Nam Shan Estate, Shek Kip Mei Estate and Chak On Estate would be available for application by residents of Pak Tin Estate when monthly parking spaces in Pak Tin Estate for 2018 were available for application.
- (iii) The Department noted the concern of members over the shortage of parking spaces, and would continue to identify suitable locations to provide parking spaces having regard to the parking conditions in the housing estate and the actual needs, and would co-ordinate with the departments concerned on the use of resources and the feasibility of providing other ancillary facilities.

13. Ms Carman NG said that some car owners owned more than one car. The vacant site at Pak Wan Street could accommodate a certain number of vehicles. She believed that if the site could be converted into parking spaces, the demand of some car owners could be met. She enquired when to know whether the site could be converted into parking spaces.

14. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) there were 12 temporary parking spaces in Pak Tin Estate, but only three temporary parking spaces were left as indicated in the Annex to Paper 116/17. He asked the Department to give explanation on the reduction of parking spaces; (ii) he opined that the deferred demolition of the car park at Pak Tin Commercial Complex would be effective in alleviating the shortage of parking spaces.

15. Miss Rebecca AU responded as follows:

- (i) The Department had studied converting the vacant site at Pak Wan Street into parking spaces. Preliminary results revealed that only about 10 parking spaces could be provided.

- (ii) Due to the redevelopment of Pak Tin Estate, there were changes to the locations of some cautionary crossings and traffic lights. In studying the conversion of the vacant site at Pak Wan Street into parking spaces, road safety issues must be carefully considered.
- (iii) The Department adopted an open attitude towards the conversion of the vacant site at Pak Wan Street into parking spaces, and would discuss and study the feasibility of the plan with the Transport Department (“TD”).

16. Mr CHEUNG Yau-wah responded as follows:

- (i) As indicated in the Annex to Paper 116/17, 97 car owners had failed in their application of parking spaces at Pak Tin Estate, and 162 parking spaces at Nam Shan Estate, Shek Kip Mei Estate and Chak On Estate were available for application which were sufficient to meet the demand of car owners in Pak Tin Estate.
- (ii) Car owners in Pak Tin Estate could still use the parking spaces at the car park of Pak Tin Commercial Complex before 31 March 2018. After that time they could apply for temporary parking spaces but the number of parking spaces was to be confirmed.

17. Miss Rebecca AU supplemented that the Department intended to increase the number of temporary parking spaces in the housing estate, but some locations under preliminary study had to be used for the drainage works for the redevelopment project. The Department would continue to study other feasible methods to increase the number of temporary parking spaces.

18. Ms Charity LEUNG responded as follows:

- (i) In planning for the phased demolition and redevelopment of Pak Tin Estate, HA had thoroughly considered the daily needs of residents and arranged the demolition of commercial complex and community hall at a later phase in the hope of minimising the impact on residents as far as possible and providing new housing facilities and PRH units to the residents as soon as possible.
- (ii) Pak Tin Estate Phase 10 Redevelopment would be located at the centre of Pak Tin Estate which was expected to complete in 2022/2023 with retail facilities, market stalls, access, greening and public open space on its podium. The deferred demolition of Pak Tin Commercial Complex would not only affect the supply of residential flats but also defer the completion of estate facilities.

19. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) the shortage of parking spaces resulted in serious illegal parking. The public had to weave in and out of vehicles in crossing the roads which would give rise to accidents easily; (ii) he opined that HD and TD had failed to take precautions, and HD did not submit a detailed redevelopment plan and information, consequently the Committee was unable to give advice early; (iii) the vacant site at Pak Wan Street had been used for parking purpose, it was hoped that the Department could listen to the views of members and consider adopting this arrangement.

20. Ms Carman NG said that there were quite a number of illegally parked vehicles on the two sides of Pak Wan Street. She opined that if the vacant site at Pak Wan Street could be used for parking purpose, it could improve the traffic management nearby and solve the illegal parking problem. She hoped that HD, TD and the Hong Kong Police Force (“HKPF”) could consider the suggestion.

21. The Chairman concluded that: (i) the Committee supported the deferred demolition of Pak Tin Commercial Complex; (ii) the Department was requested to discuss with TD about the problems of illegal parking and shortage of parking spaces; (iii) the Department was asked to take the initiative to provide more parking spaces within or outside the housing estate to meet the needs of residents; (iv) the Department was requested to consider converting the vacant site at Pak Wan Street for parking purpose.

(g) “Service can be outsourced but not the responsibilities” Dissatisfaction towards HD’s connivance of contractors exploiting workers’ rights (HAC Paper 101/17)

22. The Chairman suggested that the order of matters for discussion be changed and item (g) on service outsourcing be discussed first. Members had no objection.

23. Mr YEUNG Yuk introduced Paper No. 101/17.

24. Ms NG Yuet-lan supplemented as follows: (i) she strongly condemned HD for improperly assessing tenders as it was not reasonable for two cleansing contractors to use the same address; (ii) she queried that the Department’s act was suspected of encouraging “bid-rigging” and requested the Department to respond.

25. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded as follows:

- (i) When changing contractors, HD would remind the new contractor to comply with the terms of employment contracts between the employer and the employees and the current legislation in making employment arrangements.
- (ii) The dispute over the labour rights and severance payment between the former contractor of Hoi Lai Estate and its workers was purely a labour dispute. The

Labour Department (“LD”) was intervening to conciliate the dispute while the Department would endeavour to assist LD to resolve the matter.

- (iii) If the matter involved “bid-rigging”, it might contravene the Competition Ordinance. The parties concerned could report to the Competition Commission (“CC”).

26. The Chairman asked whether the Department had made response to the five questions set out in Paper 101/17 in the Response Paper.

27. Mrs Susanna CHENG said that response was made in Response Paper 119/17 and asked members to refer to it.

28. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) the Department should not refer this dispute solely to LD, and remarked that the voluntary resignation agreement signed by cleansing workers should be null and void if they were misled into doing so; (ii) other than reporting to CC, he enquired whether there were other direct approaches to deal with bid-rigging; (iii) if the service level of a contractor failed to meet the standard, the Department should give warning or punishment immediately.

29. Mr Dennis WONG raised the following views and suggestions: (i) he understood that government departments would deal with the labour dispute at Hoi Lai Estate according to the established approach; (ii) in view of the “lowest bid wins” principle adopted in the current tendering system, bidders would try every means to keep prices down. Despite mechanisms of mark deduction, name removal and early termination of contract were put in place by the Department, these remedies could not prevent workers’ rights from being exploited; (iii) he opined that the pressing issue was to prevent workers’ rights from being further exploited. He suggested the Department consider establishing a deposit system. If a contractor violated contractual requirements, the Department could deduct the deposit; which was believed to be more effective than name removal.

30. Ms NG Yuet-lan raised the following views: (i) the Department had the responsibility to follow up on this labour dispute at Hoi Lai Estate with LD; (ii) she reckoned that the use of same address by two cleansing contractors was unreasonable; (iii) she asked the representative of the Department to reflect the views of the Council to the Department.

31. Mr CHUM Tak-shing raised the following views: (i) by adopting this approach in handling the dispute, HD connived the contractor to exploit the rights of workers by unreasonable means. He remarked that the labour strike had affected the cleansing services in the housing estate, the Department should assist in handling the dispute to avoid the recurrence of similar problem in other housing estates; (ii) the Department should

investigate whether similar incidents occurred in other housing estates served by the relevant contractor. He asked whether the Department would freeze or even terminate the contract unilaterally.

32. Mr YEUNG Yuk raised the following views: (i) cleansing workers risked being laid off in their strive for basic rights by means of strike, however, the Department did not show understanding and failed to provide any assistance all along; which was disappointing; (ii) the contractor in question provided cleansing services to a number of PRH estates in Hong Kong, he asked whether the Department would take action to prevent the occurrence of similar incident in other housing estates; (iii) he opined that the Department being the chief employer should understand the hardship of workers and take the responsibility to conciliate the labour dispute.

33. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded as follows:

- (i) When changing contractors, HD would remind the new contractors to comply with labour laws.
- (ii) The Department would put up notice in housing estates and issue letters to the affected workers to remind them to safeguard their own interests and have an early discussion with the employer about the arrangement after contract expiry without signing any documents in a haste. If there were any doubts, they could make enquiry to LD.
- (iii) The Department was very concerned about the labour dispute at Hoi Lai Estate and referred the matter to LD for follow up. If the contractor was confirmed to have breached the contract or committed any illegal act, the Department would take regulatory action as appropriate, such as mark deduction and termination of contract, etc.

34. Ms Josephine LEE responded as follows:

- (i) After the outbreak of the labour dispute at Hoi Lai Estate, HD had immediately request the existing contractor to deploy more manpower to handle the cleansing issues in the housing estate.
- (ii) The labour strike resulted in shortage of labour, “floor cleansing” might be postponed.
- (iii) The Department would take immediate follow-up action to minimise the impact on the residents as far as practicable.

35. Mrs Susanna CHENG added that HD had put in place the deposit system to deduct the deposit of contractors with poor performance, and said that the views of members would be reflected to the Department.

36. Mr Dennis WONG raised the following views: (i) under what circumstances would the Department deduct the deposit; (ii) despite the measure adopted by the Department to safeguard the interests of workers, workers were still being exploited. He hoped that the Department could discuss with LD about how to improve the situation and introduce other effective measures to safeguard the interests of workers; (iii) the existing tendering approach had been in use for years, the Department should review the tendering procedure to meet the need of the society today.

37. Mr YEUNG Yuk raised the following views: (i) the cleansing or security contracts for a number of PRH estates in Sham Shui Po District would expire soon, he opined that the Department should not simply distribute information leaflets to workers but explain one by one the labour laws and relevant rights to them, so that they would not be exploited and bullied by contractors; (ii) after workers signed the voluntary resignation agreement, they could not obtain any severance payment. He hoped that the Department could remind workers of this issue.

38. Mr CHAN Wai-ming raised the following views: (i) similar incidents of workers' exploitation also occurred in other housing estates of HD, which had revealed the inadequate supervision of the Department; (ii) the labour dispute had affected the cleansing services in the housing estate, the Department should give pressure to the contractor in the hope of ending the labour dispute early.

39. Ms NG Yuet-lan raised the following views and enquiries: (i) as the two contractors used the same address, she did not understand why the Department still considered that there was no evidence to prove that they were the same company; (ii) she asked whether the Department would review the criteria for awarding contracts; (iii) she opined that the Department should no longer connive improper profit making methods of the contractors and hoped that the representative of the Department could reflect members' views to the Department.

40. Mrs Susanna CHENG thanked members for raising their views and suggestions and undertook to reflect them to the Department.

41. The Chairman concluded that: (i) HD was the "major contractor" of security and cleansing services of housing estates, and had the responsibility to handle this labour dispute; (ii) the Department should take immediate action to eradicate the situation of bullying of workers by contractors and avoid the worsening of bid-rigging; (iii) he suggested studying other methods in addition to issuing warning letters to the contractors

with unsatisfactory performance to strengthen the monitoring of the service level of contractors.

(f) Harassment incident of “Impersonating Police Officer” at Pak Tin Estate (HAC Paper 100/17)

42. The Chairman introduced Paper 100/17.

43. Mr Kenneth LAU responded as follows:

- (i) He understood that residents and members were very concerned about this incident. The Police had taken action accordingly, including arranging the Police Tactical Unit to the scene and the neighbourhood for investigation, and reminded the security officers of HD to step up patrol at the above location.
- (ii) The Police would deploy frontline staff for patrol in response to the security situation in the district and the action required.
- (iii) The re-opening of Shek Kip Mei Police Station involved the resource deployment of the whole police force, Sham Shui Po Police District had not received such instruction for the time being.

44. Miss Rebecca AU asked members to refer to Paper 118/17 and added the following remarks:

- (i) HD was very concerned about the incident and would continue to work closely with the Police in terms of security, and would instruct security guards to pay attention to whether there were strangers and to patrol the hidden locations. In addition, the pins of the front doors of the buildings would be changed once every half a year for the sake of safety.
- (ii) If there was sufficient evidence to prove that the security guards had violated rules or performed poorly when they were on duty, the Department would certainly take stringent punishment.
- (iii) Residents would move out gradually as Pak Tin Estate was under redevelopment. The Department would closely monitor the law and order situation in the estate and deploy timely more manpower for patrol.

45. Ms Carman NG raised the following views: (i) she was aware that the Police had deployed more police officers to patrol at the housing estate and the security company also held meeting with the mutual aid committee (“MAC”) and the District Council Member of the constituency concerned immediately to discuss how to step up security measures in the

housing estate; (ii) some locations in the housing estate were gloomy, she hoped that the Department could provide more lighting and deploy more manpower for patrol, and arrange security guards to station at the security guard posts near Blocks 9, 10, 11 and 13.

46. The Chairman asked whether the Department had deployed more manpower for patrol and asked the Department to consider enhancing the security in the housing estate.

47. Miss Rebecca AU said that the Department had requested the security company to increase the number of patrols and pay special attention to security black spots and would request the security company to deploy extra manpower in the light of the relocation schedule of residents.

48. The Chairman asked the Department to consider increasing manpower as soon as possible to cater for the need of security services.

49. Ms Carman NG enquired whether the security guards of Pak Tin Commercial Complex would be deployed to the housing estate if the complex was demolished on schedule.

50. The Chairman said that: (i) many residents said that they had not seen any police officers patrolling in the housing estate; (ii) he understood that the case was still under investigation and there was no substantive progress, but he hoped that the Police could send staff to attend the meeting of MAC to rebuild residents' confidence and enhance communication; (iii) he hoped that the Police could listen to the views of the Committee and re-open Shek Kip Mei Police Station to step up patrol and safeguard the law and order in the district.

51. Mr Kenneth LAU responded as follows:

- (i) He would relay the request of members of increasing manpower to HKPF.
- (ii) Since the discussion of MAC meeting mostly focused on the security company, the Police had decided not to send staff to the meeting.
- (iii) The re-opening of Shek Kip Mei Police District involved the deployment of manpower. He would relay members' request for re-opening Shek Kip Mei Police Station to the police district and timely report to the headquarters.

52. Ms Carman NG said that she hoped that the Police would continue to work closely with MAC and the District Council Member of the constituency concerned, and asked the Fight Crime Committee to step up publicity in the district so as to raise the alert of the public and maintain the law and order in the district.

53. The Chairman said that as the new year was approaching, it was hoped that the Police and HD would step up their crime-fighting efforts in the district and consider the views and suggestions raised by the Committee.

(h) Urging HKHS to give an account of the two incidents of tempered glass window panes of the newly completed Heya Aqua cracked and fallen down onto the streets within three months which had seriously endangered the safety of pedestrians (HAC Paper 102/17)

54. Mr CHUM Tak-shing introduced Paper 102/17, and said that the paper title was changed to “Urging HKHS to give an account of the three incidents of tempered glass window panes of the newly completed Heya Aqua cracked and fallen down onto the streets within three months which had seriously endangered the safety of pedestrians.”

55. Mr Alan YENG responded as follows:

- (i) Heya Aqua was one of the urban redevelopment projects of the Hong Kong Housing Society (“HKHS”); with 275 units and a total of 5 800 glass accessories. From its intake in March this year up to now, HKHS had received three reports on shattered glass panes of residential units. A total of three glasses were damaged but fortunately no one was injured.
- (ii) Upon the receipt of reports on shattered glass, the customer service centre had immediately taken follow-up action at the scene and arranged the contractor to clear the glass pieces in the affected units, provide temporary protection measures in the units and enclose the affected areas on the ground for the sake of safety.
- (iii) HKHS had replaced the glass of the units concerned and the fees were borne by HKHS.
- (iv) HKHS considered that the cases were individual cases. There was no evidence to show that there was any problem with the structure or quality of windows and glass of the housing estate. HKHS was very concerned about building safety and would closely monitor the situation.

56. Mr CHUM Tak-shing raised the following views: (i) whether the Department would continue to investigate the reasons for the falling of glass windows, for example, whether the accidents were due to the quality of windows, human errors or improper use; (ii) whether HKHS had requested the contractor to submit works reports and examine glass pieces so as to investigate the causes of the accidents and see whether the quality of windows was up to standard; (iii) he asked how HKHS could avoid similar incidents and ensure the windows of other housing estates had met the standard.

57. Ms NG Yuet-lan opined that the works were of sub-standard quality and queried whether HKHS had put in place penalty to avoid similar accidents.

58. Mr Alan YENG responded as follows:

- (i) The construction materials adopted by HKHS projects complied with the provisions of the Buildings (Construction) Regulation and the relevant Practice Note.
- (ii) The glass window and the tempered glass of the window wall had been tested and installed by authorised persons and registered structural engineers in accordance with the Practice Note (namely PNAP APP-37 Curtain Wall, Window and Window Wall Systems) and a report had been submitted to the Buildings Department (“BD”) for approval.
- (iii) The occupation permit of Heya Aqua was issued by BD on 12 September 2016 which proved that the tempered glass used had complied with the requirement.
- (iv) The flat owners had made reports to the Police after the shattering of glass windows, the representative of BD also visited the scene for inspection and follow up, but the reasons for shattering glass were not found. In this regard, HKHS considered that these cases were individual cases.

59. The Chairman asked whether HKHS had randomly inspected the glass accessories of other units. He urged HKHS to continue to investigate the reasons for the incidents and report the investigation result to the Committee.

60. Ms NG Yuet-lan requested HKHS to inspect window glass to prevent accidents from taking place again and affecting the safety of passers-by and residents.

61. Mr CHUM Tak-shing raised the following views: (i) he suggested HKHS examine the glass pieces and report the testing result to flat owners; (ii) he suggested the customer service staff of HKHS take the initiative to inspect whether there were cracks on the glass wall and remind flat owners to inspect the tempered window glass of the flats. If any suspected cracks were found, immediate report should be made to the HKHS.

62. Mr Alan YENG responded that the customer service centre would continue to remind residents to inspect glass windows on a regular basis and would closely follow up on the case.

63. The Chairman concluded that: (i) HKHS was requested to investigate the causes of

the shattering and falling of tempered glass windows of the flats and conduct random inspections of other flats to ensure that the quality of the windows was up to standard; (ii) the Committee would include this item in the list of follow-up matters and would continue to follow up the issue at the next time and invited BD staff to the meeting to report the progress of the work.

(i) Strong request for developing all the flats in Tai Hang Sai Estate Phase 1 Redevelopment as low cost housing flats (HAC Paper 103/17) and Item 1 under Follow-up matters (HAC Paper 104/17)

64. The Chairman said that as Paper 103/17 and item 1 under follow-up matters (HAC Paper 104/17) were similar in nature, he suggested the two items be discussed together. Members had no objection.

65. Mr Calvin HO introduced Paper 103/17.

66. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded as follows:

- (i) Tai Hang Sai Estate was a private housing estate built and managed by the Hong Kong Settlers Housing Corporation Limited (“HKSHCL”). For the redevelopment arrangement of the housing estate, HKSHCL had the discretion to decide whether it would be redeveloped, how to redevelop and when to redevelop.
- (ii) The Government was highly concerned with the relocation arrangement for the residents after the redevelopment of Tai Hang Sai Estate and pointed out that HKSHCL must continue to cater for the housing needs of the residents of Tai Hang Sai Estate and make proper arrangement. The Planning Department had not yet received the information concerned submitted by HKSHCL, and HKSHCL was now following up on the redevelopment project.

67. The Chairman raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the Town Planning Board had imposed conditions upon granting approval to the planning of the redevelopment project of Tai Hang Sai Estate, requiring HKSHCL to cater for the needs of the affected tenants and stakeholders if the redevelopment involved changes in land lease conditions; (ii) he noted that HKSHCL and district organisations had carried out questionnaire survey and asked whether sufficient information had been obtained to understand the preference of residents.

68. Mr Calvin HO raised the following views and enquiries: (i) Tai Hang Sai Estate Residents Right Concern Group had carried out a survey in March 2017 to gauge the views of residents on the redevelopment and relocation arrangements. A total of 353

questionnaires were valid, among which 96.8% of the interviewed households considered that the 560 subsidised rental units provided after the redevelopment of Tai Hang Sai Estate would not be sufficient to relocate the existing residents; (ii) he was dissatisfied with the approach of the Transport and Housing Bureau (“THB”) and enquired how THB could ensure that the redevelopment of Tai Hang Sai Estate could provide sufficient subsidised rental units to accommodate the existing residents of Tai Hang Sai Estate; (iii) he asked how THB would manage the redeveloped Tai Hang Sai Estate and requested the Bureau to give its stance on the “lease-cum-purchase model” raised by HKSHCL.

69. Ms NG Yuet-lan expressed her dissatisfaction over the breach of the erstwhile land lease conditions by HKSHCL and criticised the Department for ignoring the relocation needs of several hundreds of residents in the redevelopment project, and she asked: (i) as the redevelopment project involved changes in lease conditions, whether the Department would charge government rent from HKSHCL; (ii) how to set the sale price under the “lease-cum-purchase model”; (iii) how the Department would support the affected residents and respond to their housing needs.

70. Mr Ambrose CHEUNG pointed out that the Response Paper of HKSHCL had mentioned that it was carrying out follow-up work for the redevelopment project. He suggested writing to HKSHCL to obtain information on the progress and requested HKSHCL to submit the numbers of residents who were intended to rent and purchase units.

71. The Chairman concluded that: (i) members were concerned about the needs of residents of renting units, and considered that HKSHCL should set up a social service team to discern the preference of relocation of residents, and report on the investigation result to the Committee at the next meeting; (ii) he asked district organisations to continue to carry out the survey and increase the number of interviewees so as to compare with the data obtained by HKSHCL; (iii) he suggested the item be followed up at the next meeting.

72. Mr Kalvin HO said that the redevelopment project raised by HKSHCL could not meet the housing needs of residents and requested THB to state its stance on the project.

73. Mr CHUM Tak-shing said that THB had not given specific response to the needs of residents of Tai Hang Sai Estate for rental units and suggested further discussion be held at the next meeting.

74. The Committee noted the report by HD, and agreed to continue to follow up on this matter.

### Agenda Item 3: Follow-up matters

(a) Checklist of follow-up actions of matters discussed in the 11th meeting of the Housing

Affairs Committee (HAC Paper 104/17)

75. The Chairman asked members to refer to the written response of HD (Paper 123/17), and asked the representative of the Department to give an update on Item 2 under follow-up matters.

76. Miss Rebecca AU said that there was no timetable for redeveloping Shek Kip Mei Estate for the time being and asked the architect of HD to introduce the market design of Shek Kip Mei Estate Phase 6.

77. Mr WONG Sin-on responded as follows:

- (i) Shek Kip Mei Estate Phase 6 would provide commercial facilities of about 3 600 square metres, among which retail facilities and restaurants would account for around 1 600 square metres respectively, and market stalls would account for about 400 square metres. HA would lease its commercial premises by means of tendering.
- (ii) The anticipated completion date of Shek Kip Mei Estate Phase 6 was the third quarter of 2019 and HA would conduct tender exercise for the shops. As to the management model of the market stalls in Shek Kip Mei Estate Phase 6, it would be the same as that of other shops.

78. Mr Calvin HO raised the following enquiries: (i) whether the Department could submit the plan of the market in Phase 6; (ii) the official tender invitation date of the market; (iii) how the Department would accommodate the shop operators of the old market in Shek Kip Mei Estate.

79. Mr CHAN Kwok-wai raised the following views: (i) the response of the Department was not given in detail, he hoped the Department could submit the plan to give information on the interior design of the market and the categories of tenants; (ii) he requested the Department to respond how to accommodate the tenants of the old market in Shek Kip Mei Estate.

80. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu said that: (i) he agreed to the request for the Department to submit the plan and opined that it would help members understand the whole design; (ii) he considered that the Department had ignored the survival of tenants, and reiterated that the arrangement of two markets in a single housing estate was not acceptable; (iii) he suggested the Committee meet with the Development and Construction Division (“DCD”) of HD to discuss the redevelopment matters of Shek Kip Mei Estate.

81. The Chairman requested the Department to submit a design plan and announce the tendering timetable, and asked the Department to arrange a meeting between the Committee and DCD to discuss the redevelopment of Shek Kip Mei Estate.

82. Mr WONG Sin-on responded that the Department would carry out tendering two to three months before the intake of the new market, and the plan, which would be announced during the tender exercise, might be revised during the works period.

83. The Chairman requested the Department to explain why the plan could not be submitted in advance for members to carry out consultation and give their views.

84. Mr Kalvin HO asked the Department why the plan could not be provided now.

85. Mr WONG Sin-on responded that the design plan would still be amended during the works period and hence would only be released during the tender exercise.

86. The Chairman showed his understanding towards the amendments of the design plan but still considered that the plan could be provided to members first for reference.

87. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) the Department had not provided the information on the floor areas of the commercial facilities and market stalls; (ii) he opined that the stalls of the old market were small, there should be improvement over the design of the stalls in the new market. He requested the Department to submit the plan and provide details.

88. The Chairman agreed that the Department must submit the relevant plan to the Committee.

89. Mr WONG Sin-on responded that to avoid information confusion, the Department would prefer releasing the plan at the time of tendering.

90. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) he suggested the Department submit the plan and indicated that the plan was not finalised or provided an issue date to avoid information confusion; (ii) he agreed to send a letter to the representative of DCD responsible for the redevelopment of Shek Kip Mei Estate Phase 6 and invite them to a meeting so as to discuss the matter.

91. Mr Kalvin HO suggested meeting with the Deputy Director of HD to discuss the matter.

92. The Chairman requested the Department to arrange a meeting after the meeting to meet with the representatives concerned.

93. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu said that the representative of the Department had undertaken to make special arrangement for the old market of Shek Kip Mei Estate, but he found that the current practice had ignored the demands of those shop operators. He requested the Committee to continue to follow up on this item.

94. The Chairman asked members to refer to the written response of HD (Paper 111/17), and asked the representative of the Department to give an update on item 3 under follow-up matters.

95. Mrs Susanna CHENG introduced Paper 111/17.

96. Mr LEUNG Man-kwong said that the leakage of a public pipe at the top floor of Wing Kit House of Wing Cheong Estate on 30 November this year had caused flooding. He pointed out that similar cases had happened in other housing estates and questioned the quality of the materials concerned. He asked whether the Department could provide information and explain the reasons for the incident.

97. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded that there was no information on the case for the time being and would obtain information as soon as possible.

98. The Chairman said that the report of the Department was noted and agreed to continue to follow up on the matter at the next meeting.

99. The Chairman said that the written response of the Urban Renewal Authority (Paper 112/17) on item 4 under follow-up matters was noted and he agreed to continue to follow up on the matter at the next meeting.

100. The Chairman asked the representative of HD to report the latest progress of item 5 under follow-up matters.

101. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded as follows:

- (i) The Department had noted the request of members for providing more hardware facilities in new housing estates to support food waste recycling work.
- (ii) Siu Ho Wan Organic Waste Treatment Facilities (“Siu Ho Wan Facilities”) Phase I of the Environmental Protection Department would be completed shortly and a pilot programme would be launched to treat source separated

food waste of the industrial and commercial sectors with the participation of the markets of nine housing estates under HD.

- (iii) The Department would pay close attention to government policies and carry out work accordingly.

102. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu asked whether the housing estates in Sham Shui Po District could join the food waste recycling programme of Siu Ho Wan Facilities. He opined that the facilities should not serve the commercial and industrial sectors only; it should also treat domestic food waste.

103. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded that Siu Ho Wan Facilities Phase 1 would first treat the source separated food waste generated by the commercial and industrial sectors. The shop operators of the market in Nam Shan Estate in the district also participated in the programme.

104. The Chairman asked when the food waste recycling programme would end and whether the service would be extended to domestic households.

105. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded that there was no information available for the time being for members' reference.

106. The Chairman requested the Department to provide the information after the meeting and report the effectiveness of the waste recycling programme of Siu Ho Wan Facilities Phase 1 for follow up at the next meeting. He then said that item 6 under follow-up matters had been discussed jointly with items 2(b) and 2(c) and no follow up would be required at the next meeting. For item 7 under follow-up matters, as the Joint Offices for Investigation of Water Seepage Complaints and the Water Services Department had no further information to provide, no representative was sent to the meeting. He agreed to invite them to attend the next meeting.

#### Agenda Item 4: Reports from Working Groups under the Committee

- (a) Report from the Working Group on Public Housing (HAC Paper 105/17)

107. The Committee noted and endorsed the above report.

- (b) Report from the Working Group on Private Premises and Urban Revitalisation (HAC Paper 106/17)

108. The Committee noted and endorsed the above report.

Agenda Item 5: Any other business

109. The Committee noted that Paper 107/17 had been endorsed by the Committee earlier by means of circulation.

Agenda item 6: Date of next meeting

110. The next meeting would be held at 9:30 a.m. on 1 March 2018 (Thursday).

111. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1:40 p.m.

District Council Secretariat  
Sham Shui Po District Office  
February 2018