

(Translation)

Minutes of the 15th Meeting of the Housing Affairs Committee of
Sham Shui Po District Council (5th Term)

Date: 14 June 2018 (Thursday)

Time: 9:30 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 (Left at 2:10 p.m.)

Mr CHEUNG Wing-sum, Ambrose, BBS, MH, JP (Arrived at 1:23 p.m.)

Ms CHOW Wing-heng, Zoé (Left at 2:10 p.m.)

Mr CHUM Tak-shing (Arrived at 12:20 p.m.)

Mr HO Kai-ming, Calvin (Arrived at 10 a.m.)

Mr KONG Kwai-sang (Arrived at 10:45 a.m.)

Mr LAM Ka-fai, Aaron, BBS, JP (Arrived at 9:40 a.m.)

Ms LAU Pui-yuk

Mr LEE Tsz-king, Dominic (Arrived at 9:40 a.m.; left at 1 p.m.)

Mr LEE Wing-man

Mr LEUNG Man-kwong (Arrived at 9:40 a.m.)

Ms NG Mei, Carman

Ms NG Yuet-lan (Arrived at 9:45 a.m.; left at 2:10 p.m.)

Mr WAI Woon-nam (Left at 2:10 p.m.)

Mr YEUNG Yuk (Arrived at 10:30 a.m.; left at 4:45 p.m.)

Co-opted Members

Mr CHAN Ming-kei (Arrived at 9:35 a.m.)

Mr CHEUNG Tak-wai (Arrived at 9:45 a.m.; left at 5:15 p.m.)

Mr LI Kwing (Left at 12 noon)

Mr MAK Wai-ming (Arrived at 9:35 a.m.; left at 2:10 p.m.)

Mr TSUI Yat-hin

In Attendance

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Miss MAN Ka-wing, Kelly | Assistant District Officer (Sham Shui Po) 1 |
| Miss LAU Sze-nga, Vivicia | Senior Liaison Officer 2, Sham Shui Po District Office |
| Mr LAI Huen-lam, Stephen | Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Sham Shui Po) 1, Social Welfare Department |
| Mrs CHENG IP Sau-fong, Susanna | Senior Housing Manager/KWS 1, Housing Department |
| Miss AU Mei-lin, Rebecca | Senior Housing Manager/KWS 2, Housing Department |
| Mr CHAN Tak-yuen | Building Services Engineer/TKO, Housing Department |
| Mr CHENG Sai-cheong | Building Services Engineer/KLW, Housing Department |
| Mr AU Tze-wai, William | Senior Engineer/General Legislation 3, Electrical and Mechanical Services Department |
| Mr NG Kar-wai | Engineer/General Legislation 3/4, Electrical and Mechanical Services Department |
| Mr WONG Lap-yan, Ivan | Chief Health Inspector 1, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department |
| Ms WONG Man-kwan | Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing/Pest Control)2, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department |
| Ms CHOW Wing-man, Fatima | Building Surveyor/Fire Safety 12, Buildings Department |
| Mr LEE Yiu-lun | Station Commander, Shek Kip Mei Fire Station, Fire Services Department |
| Mr YIK Siu-fung | Senior Station Officer (Building Improvement) 2, Fire Services Department |
| Mr CHUM Tai-kong | Assistant Divisional Officer (Building Improvements) 2, Fire Services Department |

Secretary

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Miss LUI Po-fan, Carol | Executive Assistant (District Council) 3, Sham Shui Po District Office |
|------------------------|---|

Absent with Apologies

Members

| |
|---------------------------------|
| Mr CHENG Wing-shun, Vincent, MH |
| Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, MH, JP |

Absent

Member

| |
|----------------------------------|
| Mr WONG Tat-tung, Dennis, MH, JP |
|----------------------------------|

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed members and representatives of government departments to the 15th meeting of the Housing Affairs Committee (“HAC”), and said that Miss Vivicia LAU, Senior Liaison Officer 2 of the Sham Shui Po District Office (“SSPDO”), would attend the meetings from now on in place of Mr WONG Leung-ping, Ben, who had left his post. He also took this opportunity to thank Mr Ben WONG for his contribution to this Committee during his years in office.

Agenda Item 1: Confirmation of minutes of the 14th meeting held on 26 April 2018

2. The Committee confirmed the minutes of the above meeting without amendment.

Agenda Item 2: Matters arising

(a) Objection to the linking of flat prices of the Home Ownership Scheme and the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme to market prices (HAC Paper 24/18)

3. The Chairman said that the Committee had discussed Paper 24/18 at the 14th meeting and Mr LEUNG Man-kwong had proposed an amended motion in respect of the motion in the paper. He then asked members to refer to and vote on the amended motion concerned which had been tabled. Since the seconder of the amended motion was not present, he enquired whether there would be a change in the seconder.

4. Mr Aaron LAM said that he was the seconder of the amended motion.

5. The Chairman said that as the contents of the two motions were similar, he ruled that they were parallel motions. He also said that he received from Mr Vincent CHENG a written authorisation in which Mr CHAN Wai-ming was appointed to act as his proxy to vote.

6. The Chairman declared that the Committee unanimously passed the two motions.

(b) Flats are not commodities Have a home does not require buying a flat (HAC Paper 25/18)

7. The Chairman said that the Committee had discussed Paper 25/18 at the 14th meeting and agreed to follow up on a motion proposed in the paper at this meeting. He then said that as Paper 25/18 of the matters arising and item 7 of the follow-up matter were similar in nature, he suggested the two matters be discussed together. Members had no objection.

8. Mr WAI Woon-nam said that as one of the submitters of the paper, he agreed that the Committee should vote on the motion proposed in the paper.

9. The Chairman said that the paper was moved by Mr WAI Woon-nam and seconded by Mr TSUI Yat-hin.

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

For: Ms NG Yuet-lan, Mr WAI Woon-nam, Mr CHAN Ming-kei, Mr LI Kwing, Mr TSUI Yat-hin (5)

Against: Mr CHAN Wai-ming, Mr Vincent CHENG (voted by Mr CHAN Wai-ming as a proxy), Mr Aaron LAM, Ms LAU Pui-yuk, Mr LEE Wing-man, Mr CHAN Kwok-wai, Ms Joephy CHAN, Mr Dominic LEE, Mr LEUNG Man-kwong (9)

Abstain: Mr YAN Kai-wing, Ms Zoé CHOW, Ms Carman NG, Mr CHEUNG Tak-wai (4)

11. The Chairman declared that the motion was not carried.

(c) Request the Development and Construction Division of the Housing Department to provide all the required information to DC as usual (HAC Paper 27/18)

12. The Chairman introduced Paper 27/18.

13. Miss Rebecca AU introduced Paper 37/18.

14. The Chairman said that the meeting could not express its views as the Department had not followed the past practices of reporting to the meeting the detailed progress report and the plan of each project regularly.

15. Ms Carman NG raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the Department would arrange visits for Members during the construction period in the past but now such arrangements would only be made after the issuance of occupation permit now. As a result, members could not express their views in a timely manner; (ii) she requested the Department to maintain good communication by providing detailed progress reports and plans regularly for reference of the meeting.

16. Mr TSUI Yat-hin said that he had enquired at the 14th meeting whether Lai Chi Estate would be converted to a Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme (“GFS”) project and the Department said that it had no further information. However, the Hong Kong Housing Authority (“HKHA”) announced on the next day that Lai Chi Estate would be converted to a GFS project. He regretted that the Department did not inform the meeting as soon as possible.

17. Ms NG Yuet-lan said that the meeting could not play the monitoring role as the

Department had not provided detailed reports of the projects.

18. Mr CHAN Wai-ming reckoned that the Department should be more proactive in providing information to the meeting in a timely manner, with a view to enhancing transparency, allowing Members to put forward their views and relaying the information to the public.

19. Miss Rebecca AU responded that members' views would be relayed to the Development and Construction Division ("DCD") and DCD would be asked to send staff to attend the meetings in a timely manner.

20. The Chairman concluded that the issue would be followed up at the next meeting and views on the issue concerned would be put forward at the next District Council ("DC") meeting.

Agenda Item 3: Matters for discussion

(a) Concern over the difficulties for owners' corporations of old buildings to open bank accounts (HAC Paper 40/18)

21. Ms LAU Pui-yuk introduced Paper 40/18.

22. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had invited The Hong Kong Association of Banks ("HKAB") and the Hong Kong Monetary Authority ("HKMA") to send staff to attend the meeting. HKAB said that it was not in a position to give response while HKMA could not send staff to attend the meeting. He asked members to refer to the written response of HKMA (Paper 62/18).

23. Miss Vivicia LAU introduced Paper 63/18.

24. The Chairman said that as mentioned in the response paper of HKMA, its website contained information about the branches of 20 retail banks in Hong Kong for opening business accounts, including the addresses and hotlines of those branches. Owners' corporations ("OCs") might browse the website concerned if necessary.

25. Mr MAK Wai-ming raised the following views: (i) it was learnt that relevant parties must hold personal bank accounts in order to open business accounts for their OCs ("OC accounts"); (ii) elderly owners could not afford the fees for opening OC accounts, nor could they maintain a minimum balance in the accounts as required by the banks; it would be difficult for them to set up OCs; (iii) it took several months to open an account; which would delay the maintenance and management work of the buildings. He hoped that the Home Affairs Department ("HAD") could provide more assistance so that OCs could open accounts as soon as possible.

26. Ms NG Yuet-lan said that the threshold of opening OC accounts was too high. She requested HAD to relay the problem to HKMA and work out solutions proactively so as to encourage building owners to set up OCs.

27. Ms LAU Pui-yuk raised the following views and enquiries: (i) she requested that letters should be sent to HKMA and HKAB to reflect the difficulties for OCs to open accounts; (ii) she hoped that the Government would face up to the problem by providing assistance proactively and requesting the banking industry to relax the requirements for opening OC accounts, with a view to encouraging building owners to set up OCs and improving building management.

28. Mr LEE Wing-man raised the following views and enquiries: (i) he hoped that HKMA would request the banking industry to waive the minimum balance requirement of OC accounts and shorten the processing time so as to ease the pressure on owners to raise capital and allow OCs to open accounts as soon as possible; (ii) some of the OCs had to deposit the capital in personal accounts of their members as they could not open OC accounts; this might give rise to disputes easily.

29. Miss Vivicia LAU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) Members' views would be relayed to the Department as well as HKMA and HKAB for their reference.
- (ii) If OCs required any assistance, they could provide relevant information to the District Building Management Liaison Team ("DBMLT") of SSPDO while DBLMT would refer the case to HKMA for follow up.

30. Ms LAU Pui-yuk raised the following views: (i) she requested HKMA to face up to the difficulties for OCs to open accounts, and work out ways to solve the problem; (ii) she requested SSPDO to provide a list of banks and the requirements for opening OC accounts so that OCs could make enquiries more easily.

31. The Chairman requested SSPDO to provide a list of banks in the district for opening OC accounts and the contact information for reference of OCs in the district, and relay the needs of the public to relevant policy bureaux and organisations.

32. Miss Vivicia LAU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The response paper of HKMA mentioned that the website of HKMA contained relevant information. OCs might browse the website concerned if necessary. SSPDO had no further information for the time being.
- (ii) SSPDO had the experience of assisting OCs in opening OC accounts and

members were welcomed to make enquiries after the meeting.

- (iii) HAD had communicated proactively with HKMA and relevant organisations to relay the difficulties for OCs to open accounts. HAD would report to the meeting if there were further updates.

33. The Chairman concluded that: (i) the Committee regretted that HKAB had not sent staff to attend the meeting, and would write to express concerns about the difficulties for OCs to open bank accounts; (ii) it was hoped that SSPDO could provide a list of banks in the district for opening OC accounts and the contact information, and suggest relevant parties make reference to the information posted on HKMA's website when opening OC accounts; (iii) the Committee agreed unanimously that the issue should be followed up at the next meeting.

(b) Concern over lift safety Protect life and property of minority owners (HAC Paper 41/18)

34. Mr Calvin HO introduced Paper 41/18.

35. Mr William AU introduced Paper 65/18.

36. Mr CHAN Tak-yuen introduced Paper 55/18.

37. The Chairman said that the Working Group on Public Housing ("WGPH") under the Committee was concerned about lift safety and had requested the Housing Department ("HD") to submit reports at each meeting. He welcomed members to attend the meetings concerned. He then welcomed representatives of the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("EMSD") to the meeting to discuss the lift safety of private premises with members.

38. Mr WAI Woon-nam raised the following views: (i) lift incidents had occurred in both public housing estates ("PHEs") and private premises in recent years. He questioned that the departments concerned had failed to monitor the work of lift contractors ("contractors") effectively; (ii) according to the existing policy, minority owners and OCs had to bear the exorbitant fees for replacement of lifts and parts. He requested EMSD to give a positive response on whether it would subsidise the repair and maintenance costs of lifts, and provide the details of the plan concerned for reference of the meeting.

39. Mr MAK Wai-ming raised the following views: (i) he enquired about the existing lift inspection mechanism of EMSD; (ii) currently, when an OC changed contractor, the new contractor would provide a list of repair items to OC. He enquired why the repair and maintenance works were not completed within the contract period and whether this practice complied with the guidelines.

40. Mr Kalvin HO raised the following views and enquiries: (i) in case a lift company announced its winding-up after a compensation claim was lodged due to lift incident, all the responsibilities would be borne by OC. He suggested the Department consider holding the owner of the lift company legally responsible to avoid the company evading the responsibility to pay compensation by winding-up; (ii) it was difficult for minority owners to afford the fees for repair and maintenance of lifts. He requested the Department to provide subsidies and submit a detailed plan for reference of the meeting.

41. Ms LAU Pui-yuk raised the following views: (i) the Department could not provide reasonable explanation on recent lift incidents to allay public concerns; (ii) she hoped that the Department would launch a funding scheme as soon as possible to improve the safety equipment of lifts which were 20 years old or above; (iii) the Eco Building Fund of CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (“CLP”) would subsidise eligible buildings to implement improvement works on building services including lifts and escalators. She suggested the Department consult the views of CLP before launching funding scheme to avoid duplication.

42. Mr LEE Wing-man raised the following views: (i) after the amendment of law in 2012, apart from management companies and lift companies, OCs was also legally responsible for lift problems; he found this arrangement unfair; (ii) he requested the Department to consider subsidising half the amount of costs for repair and maintenance or replacement of lifts to alleviate the burden of minority owners.

43. Mr LEUNG Man-kwong raised the following views and enquiries: (i) registered lift contractors were responsible for the repair and maintenance costs of the lifts in which incidents had occurred. He enquired why incidents had still occurred under the supervision of the Department; (ii) he requested the Department to review the service quality of registered lift contractors and supervise the standard of repair service provided by lifts technicians to enhance lift safety; (iii) as the OC members were not equipped with professional knowledge, it would be difficult for them to assess whether the lifts were safe or not. He suggested the Department subsidise OCs to engage independent registered engineers at the same time to conduct testing before the repair work so that OCs could handle and discuss the repair issues with the contractors more effectively; (iv) some of the aged lifts were still in good condition due to regular repair and maintenance, thus it might not be necessary to legislate for compulsory repair or replacement across the board.

44. Ms NG Yuet-lan said that the Government should adopt a proactive attitude and take the initiative to assist OCs in handling the issue of repair and maintenance of lifts.

45. Mr William AU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The Department intended to launch a dedicated funding scheme (“DFS”) to

subsidise owners to carry out lift repair and maintenance works so that the lifts would comply with safety standards. However, as the scheme was still at the consultation stage, no further information could be provided for the time being.

- (ii) The existing laws were applicable to OCs, registered lift engineers, registered lift workers, management companies and registered contractors. After the amendment of law, two management companies had been prosecuted due to negligence over lift safety, but there was no case of prosecuting OCs.
- (iii) In accordance with law, the Department was only responsible for handling cases involving criminal offences. Since the case mentioned in the paper did not involve any criminal offence, the Department could not provide any response to it.
- (iv) The Department had held a meeting with registered lift contractors to discuss the replacement of lift parts not produced by the original manufacturers. Except for large safety components or specific parts which were produced by the original manufacturers, most of the parts which would be worn down easily could be replaced by registered lift contractors directly.
- (v) If some of the repair and maintenance items could not be completed within the contract period, the old contractors would provide a list of repair items to the new contractor for follow up. The new contractors would normally request OCs to handle the repair items on the list first to avoid their performance rating being affected in the event that EMSD discovered any non-compliance during inspections. Therefore, if OCs carried out inspections and maintenance works regularly, they could avoid paying a large sum of maintenance fee in one go.
- (vi) If OCs and contractors could not reach a consensus on the repair and maintenance issue, the Department would play a mediating role and consider subsidising OCs to engage professionals to conduct testing in advance so that they would receive more assistance.
- (vii) Basing on the risk assessment result and taking account of factors such as year of service, breakdown rate and performance rating of contractors, the Department would, on a yearly basis, conduct sample inspections on 10% of lifts. It would also inspect lifts suspected of non-compliance, installed newly or with major alterations.

(viii) The Eco Building Fund of CLP had been used up.

46. Mr Aaron LAM said that the Eco Building Fund was still in operation and the allocation had been increased to \$100 million each year.

47. Mr LEE Wing-man said that the OC and the lift company in the case concerned had not been prosecuted by the Department after investigation, hence proving that the relevant parties had already fulfilled their legal obligations. He enquired about the reasons for the Department of Justice (“DoJ”) to seek compensation from the OC and whether DoJ had consulted the views of the Department on the case.

48. Mr MAK Wai-ming raised the following views: (i) the old and new contractors had not discussed the content of the list of repair items at OC meetings. Only after the contract was signed between OC and the new contractor did the new contractor submit the list. He enquired whether the above practice complied with the Department’s guidelines; (ii) he suggested the Department model on the Operation Building Bright and the Building Safety Loan Scheme of the Buildings Department (“BD”) and increase subsidies and offer loans to the elderly; (iii) as the lifts of buildings for both commercial and residential uses would suffer more wear and tear, he suggested the Department step up inspections and request contractors to report cases of suspension of lift service due to incidents to the Department for follow up; (iv) he requested that lift replacement notices should be issued in the name of EMSD to prod OCs to follow up on the relevant work.

49. Mr KONG Kwai-sang raised the following enquiries: (i) whether the scope of DFS would cover PHEs under the Tenants Purchase Scheme (“TPS estates”); (ii) whether HD would assist TPS estates in the repair and maintenance of lifts.

50. Mr William AU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) There was no information about the scope of DFS for the time being.
- (ii) In accordance with law, if there was a failure in the emergency device of a lift, the contractor must complete the repair works within 24 hours. Otherwise, it must notify EMSD in writing and record the details such as the date of resumption of normal lift service on the log-book.
- (iii) The risk assessment conducted by the Department had also included the assessment on the lift usage. It had also stepped up inspections on lifts with frequent heavy loadings and lifts in buildings for both commercial and residential uses and with sub-divided units, etc. The Department would issue warning letters to the contractors concerned if necessary.
- (iv) EMSD would conduct stringent enforcement actions if any inappropriate use

of lifts was found; if such act caused any injuries, the Department would seek the Police's assistance to arrest and prosecute the offenders.

- (v) Regarding the breakdown of lifts in Lei Cheng Uk Estate, the Department would send staff to carry out inspections afterwards.

51. Miss Rebecca AU responded that after a housing estate was included into TPS and its tenants purchased their rental units, HKHA would contribute HKD\$14,000 for each unit to the Maintenance Fund of the estate concerned to cover major maintenance fees other than routine maintenance fees. OCs could make optimum use of the Maintenance Fund to carry out major repair, maintenance or replacement works for lifts in accordance with the relevant provisions in the Deeds of Mutual Covenant.

52. The Chairman concluded that: (i) the representatives of EMSD were requested to relay the Committee's suggestions on DFS to the Department; (ii) the Department was requested to provide the Committee with the latest information about the scheme.

(c) Concern over the criteria of pest control and rodent control of HD and FEHD Request for formulating "Rodent Infestation Rate for Public Housing Estates" (HAC Paper 42/18)

53. Mr TSUI Yat-hin introduced Paper 42/18.

54. Mrs Susanna CHENG introduced Paper 61/18.

55. Mr Ivan WONG responded as follows:

- (i) If a complaint about matter happened within the area of PHEs was received, the Department would inform HD and send staff to carry out inspections with the staff of HD and its contractors. Although the staff of the Department would not place the baits directly, they would teach the contractors to carry out anti-rodent and anti-mosquito work effectively. The Department had carried out 34 and 14 inspections in PHEs in 2017 and 2018 respectively.
- (ii) The Department would also carry out publicity and education work in PHEs regularly to provide residents with information about pest control.
- (iii) The Department would hold monthly meetings to explain the situation of rodent and mosquito infestation in the district to government departments such as HD, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD") and the Highways Department, and enrich the knowledge of environmental hygiene and pest control in PHEs of their staff.

56. Mr CHAN Ming-kei said that the mosquito infestation was serious in So Uk Estate in summer, even the spraying of pesticide had failed to kill mosquitos effectively. Coupled with the fact that an Estate Management Advisory Committee (“EMAC”) had not yet been set up, the problem concerned could not be handled. He enquired whether HD could allocate additional resources to install mosquito-killing machines.

57. Ms Carman NG raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the redevelopment of Pak Tin Estate had worsened the rodent infestation problem in the vicinity, she requested government departments to pay more attention to that; (ii) she enquired whether the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (“FEHD”) could provide information about rodent infestation blackspots in PHEs and private housing estates of the district to facilitate the anti-rodent work of contractors; (iii) she suggested FEHD step up efforts to clean places such as drainage surface channels and gullies for the sake of pest control.

58. Mr LEUNG Man-kwong raised the following views: (i) he appreciated that FEHD assisted HD in carrying out anti-rodent work in Fu Cheong Estate and Wing Cheong Estate. He hoped that government departments would continue to step up collaboration to handle the mosquito and rodent infestation problems in PHEs; (ii) he suggested government departments formulate clear guidelines so that the criteria of mosquito control and rodent control for all PHEs would be the same; (iii) he hoped that HD would allocate additional resources to tackle the problem once and for all.

59. Mr CHUM Tak-shing raised the following views: (i) he requested that “Rodent Infestation Rate for Public Housing Estates” should be formulated to reflect the effectiveness of rodent control by objective statistics; (ii) the PHEs with serious rodent infestation in recent years were situated near construction sites, he enquired whether government departments had worked out measures to prevent rodents from entering PHEs; (iii) he hoped that HD would allocate additional resources to install mosquito-killing machines in PHEs so as to solve the mosquito problem completely.

60. Mr TSUI Yat-hin raised the following views and enquiries: (i) he hoped that government departments would step up collaboration to solve the mosquito and rodent infestation problems in the district completely; (ii) whether FEHD could provide the mosquito and rodent control guidelines, which were given to its contractors, for HD’s reference; (iii) whether HD could make public the requirements for mosquito and rodent control stipulated in the contracts signed with contractors so that members could monitor their work.

61. Mr MAK Wai-ming raised the following views: (i) according to experience, there was a definite relationship between construction works and rodent infestation. He requested government departments to address the problem proactively; (ii) construction works was underway in the redevelopment site of So Uk Estate, he requested government

departments to adopt suitable measures in order to prevent mosquito infestation in the construction site and solve the long-standing mosquito problem.

62. Mr CHAN Wai-ming raised the following views: (i) he thanked FEHD for taking the initiative to handle the problem; the situation had improved significantly. He hoped that the Department would keep up its effort to improve the environmental hygiene in the district; (ii) he requested FEHD to formulate clear guidelines on pest and rodent control for contractors as well as “Rodent Infestation Rate for Public Housing Estates” to facilitate the follow-up work carried out by HD.

63. Ms LAU Pui-yuk raised the following views: (i) she thanked FEHD for taking the initiative to handle various hygiene problems in the district; (ii) she requested the Food and Health Bureau (“FHB”) to allocate additional resources to handle the environmental hygiene problems in the district.

64. Mrs Susanna CHENG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The request for installing mosquito-killing machines in So Uk Estate would be relayed to the Property Service Manager of the estate for follow up.
- (ii) In addition to the funds allocated to EMAC, the Department would consider allocating additional resources depending on the situation.
- (iii) The Department had set out requirements for pest control, mosquito control and rodent control, etc. in the contracts signed with cleansing contractors. The contractors would draw up a work schedule and report their work at EMACs. They would also carry out relevant work subject to the situation of PHEs and suitably increase the frequency of the work concerned.
- (iv) The Department had also invited the staff of FEHD and the experts of the Pest Control Section to provide professional advice, with a view to improving the environmental hygiene in PHEs.

65. Mr Ivan WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The Department had set out work requirements for pest control, mosquito control and rodent control, etc., including the scope and time of work, in the contracts signed with contractors. The Department would inspect and monitor the situation of mosquito and rodent infestation in the district on a regular basis, and assist HD in reviewing the effectiveness of the measures implemented in PHEs.
- (ii) The Department would hold monthly meetings, and hoped that HD, LCSD

and other government departments would send staff to attend the meetings so as to discern the situation of rodent and mosquito infestation in the district and have better knowledge of the environmental hygiene and pest control in the areas under their management.

- (iii) The Department would examine the mosquito and rodent infestation problems in public places (especially the construction sites) in the vicinity of PHEs, and step up cleansing service and pest control work.

66. The Chairman concluded that FEHD and HD were requested to keep handling the mosquito and rodent infestation problems in the district proactively.

(d) The market of the new public housing estate in Site 6 will complete soon HD should not contract out the management work 90% of the residents urge HD to manage the market on its own (HAC Paper 43/18)

67. Mr YEUNG Yuk introduced Paper 43/18. He added that he had carried out a survey on the needs and management of the market concerned, the result showed that 92.8% of the respondents agreed or extremely agreed that the Department should bear all the responsibilities for managing and operating the market.

68. Mrs Susanna CHENG introduced Paper 59/18.

69. Mr LEUNG Man-kwong supported the suggestions in the paper, and raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the Department leased its markets to single operators (“SOs”) for administrative convenience. However, many operators of sublet stalls complained that the SOs had only aimed at making profit and the needs of stall operators were ignored; (ii) the arrears of rent by the SO of Ching Long Market reflected that there were loopholes in the system and the Department had failed to monitor SOs effectively. He reckoned that services such as cleansing and security services of the markets could be contracted out, but the Department should be responsible for matters such as the leasing of stalls and fixing of rents; (iii) he suggested the Department managing the new market of the PHE in Site 6 at Sham Mong Road in Lai Chi Kok (“new market”) on its own.

70. Mr Ambrose CHEUNG enquired about the number of stalls, facilities and design of the new market.

71. Mr YEUNG Yuk was disappointed by the response of the Department, and raised the following views and enquiries: (i) although the contract under the single-operator system had restricted the amount of deposits and management fees that SOs could charge on stall operators, stall operators still faced the problem of increasing rents; (ii) many residents said that they intended to bid for the stalls in the new market, but they were worried that they could not compete with large companies or chain stores under the

single-operator system; (iii) the new market might bring mosquito and rodent infestation problems to PHEs in the vicinity, but it would be difficult to hold anyone accountable for these problems under the single-operator system. Therefore, he urged the Department to take up the management responsibility; (iv) the Department had sufficient time to examine the management problem as it took three more years for the completion of the new market. He hoped that the Department would consider the issue prudently.

72. Mrs Susanna CHENG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) Ching Long Market had already been managed and operated by a new SO and the service performance had improved.
- (ii) According to existing policies, all newly-built markets under HKHA would be leased out under the single-operator system. The Commercial Properties Committee of HKHA had conducted a detailed review and worked out improvement measures in 2017.
- (iii) The new market was expected to be completed in 2021. As reported at the Sham Shui Po District Management Committee meeting by the Senior Engineer in charge of the project, the estimated number of stalls was 90.

73. Mr Ambrose CHEUNG enquired whether air-conditioning facilities would be provided in the new market.

74. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded that there was no further information for the time being, but newly-built markets would be equipped with air-conditioning facilities in general.

75. Mr Ambrose CHEUNG supported the suggestions in the paper and raised the following views: (i) he hoped that the Department would provide information such as the number and area of stalls in the new market, the number of storeys of the new market and the parking facilities nearby in writing after the meeting for reference of the meeting; (ii) the Department should not only focus on cost effectiveness. Since the single-operator system was porous, he requested the Department to conduct a review before the completion of the new market.

76. Mr LEUNG Man-kwong raised the following views: (i) he was a member of the Commercial Properties Management Unit of HD. Since the members of the unit mainly consisted of professionals and merchants, most of them supported the adoption of single-operator system; (ii) as it took three more years for the completion of the new market, the Department could consider using the new market as a pilot market to see whether the Department could manage the market on its own.

77. Mr YEUNG Yuk raised the following views: (i) the SO of Hung Fuk Market had terminated the contract due to losses but was awarded a new contract again in the re-tendering; this showed the laxity of the existing system; (ii) SOs could sublet the stalls to their subsidiaries, giving rise to monopoly easily. With no restriction on this aspect in the contract terms, the Department could not monitor the situation. He hoped that the Department would review the single-operator system seriously.

78. The Chairman asked members to vote on the motion proposed in Paper 43/18. The motion was moved by Mr YEUNG Yuk and seconded by Mr Kalvin HO, and it read as follows:

“This Committee requests HD to stop contracting out the management right of its markets to SOs again, take the views of residents seriously and manage the market of new PHEs, including tenancy management, on its own so as to provide a stable business environment and ensure that markets of PHEs can serve the needs of residents in the district.”

79. The Chairman declared that the Committee unanimously passed the above motion and concluded that the Committee agreed to follow up on the issue at the next meeting.

(e) Request the Housing Department to install emergency lighting systems (HAC Paper 44/18)

80. Ms Carman NG introduced Paper 44/18.

81. Mr CHUM Tai-kong responded as follows:

- (i) According to the requirements of the Fire Safety (Buildings) Ordinance (Cap. 572) (“the Ordinance”), the shop tenants of Chak On Estate mentioned in the paper were “occupiers of composite buildings in respect of parts intended for non-domestic purposes” while HD was “owners of composite buildings”. In accordance with Schedule 3 of Section 5(3) of the Ordinance, the shop tenants of Chak On Estate, as the occupiers of composite buildings in respect of parts intended for non-domestic purposes, should provide or improve emergency lighting within the areas they occupied.
- (ii) The Fire Services Department (“FSD”) would carry out site inspections and issue letters to shop tenants, asking them to implement improvement works if it found out that emergency lighting systems commonly known as “cat’s eye lights” should be installed in order to comply with legal requirements.
- (iii) If occupiers did not or could not complete the improvement works before the deadlines, they should inform their case officers and FSD would

consider extending the deadlines.

82. Mr CHENG Sai-cheong introduced Paper 56/18, and added that some of the shop tenants had already installed emergency lighting systems on their own before the issue of Fire Safety Improvement Direction by FSD.

83. Ms Carman NG raised the following views and enquiries: (i) despite the implementation of the Ordinance in 2007, HD did not complete the relevant improvement works until 2014. She enquired whether there was a grace period; (ii) shop tenants had to suspend their business when HD carried out improvement works for fire-fighting system in the estate recently. Their livelihood would be affected seriously if they had to bear the installation fee for “cat’s eye lights” as well; (iii) some shops in the estate were not equipped with air-conditioning facilities and the entrances and exits were kept clear. She doubted whether it was necessary for them to install “cat’s eye lights”; (iv) it was learnt that other markets or shop tenants in the district had not received the request concerned, she doubted that the Department had taken enforcement actions only against the shop tenants in Chak On Estate, who were more disadvantaged, without considering their affordability.

84. Mr LEE Wing-man raised the following views and enquiries: (i) HD should provide comprehensive fire-fighting equipment before leasing out the units. It was unfair that the Ordinance required tenants to bear the costs for the fire safety improvement works; (ii) he enquired whether the costs for the fire safety improvement works for vacant shops were borne by HD and whether FSD would initiate prosecution if the fire-fighting equipment in vacant shops had violated legal requirements; (iii) he requested HD to improve the fire-fighting equipment concerned in the capacity of majority owner to protect public interest.

85. Mr CHUM Tak-shing raised the following views and enquiries: (i) upon expiry of the contract, the former occupier would remove the equipment while the new occupier would have to install them again; this would cause wastage and was not environmentally-friendly. He suggested FSD consider amending the law to require owners to be responsible for installing the equipment concerned; (ii) he requested HD to provide the tenancy agreement for reference of the meeting, and enquired about the definition of fire-fighting equipment and which party should pay for the installation costs according to the agreement; (iii) many shop tenants faced operating difficulties and could not afford the costs concerned. He suggested HD provide subsidies to shop tenants.

86. Mr LEUNG Man-kwong raised the following views and enquiries: (i) as the fire safety problem concerned was a long-standing one, he doubted why the shop tenants were required to make improvements now; (ii) he enquired about the specific schedule and arrangements about FSD’s inspections on the fire safety equipment in the estate; (iii) he

doubted that HD had not improved the fire-fighting equipment of its properties immediately after the amendment of the Ordinance. Instead, it had transferred the responsibility to shop tenants. He urged the Department to improve the relevant equipment immediately to ensure the safety of shop tenants and users of the facilities.

87. The Chairman enquired how FSD would handle the situation that both the occupier and owner of a shop did not comply with the Fire Safety Improvement Direction and finish the works concerned.

88. Mr CHENG Sai-cheong said that the Department had completed the improvement works for the emergency lighting system and the automatic sprinkler system in the public area of the estate.

89. Ms Carman NG said that the addition works for the automatic sprinkler system in the estate was still in progress, she requested HD to clarify the progress of the works concerned.

90. Mr CHENG Sai-cheong gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The aforementioned automatic sprinkler system was situated in the public area of the estate, while the one mentioned by Member should be the works carried out in the shops of Fu Chak House.
- (ii) Some of the units in the other three buildings of the estate (namely Wing Chak House, Wah Chak House and Lai Chak House) had been leased to social welfare organisations. The Ordinance required the organisations concerned to properly install fire-fighting equipment before commencement of operation.
- (iii) The information of the Department showed that many tutorial schools, supermarkets, Automatic Telling Machines and social welfare organisations in the estate had completed the improvement works concerned.

91. The Chairman said that the paper mainly discussed the situation of small shop tenants who had run their business in the estate for long, instead of that of the shop tenants or social welfare organisations which had started their operation there in recent years. He hoped that the Department would give a supplementary response.

92. Mr CHENG Sai-cheong responded that the Department had received the Fire Safety Improvement Direction in respect of Chak On Estate from FSD, requiring the Department (the owner) to complete the fire safety improvement works for parts intended for non-domestic and domestic purposes in the estate before the deadline for compliance with the existing law.

93. The Chairman said that the Department had carried out improvement works for the automatic sprinkler system in Pak Tin Estate, and the scope of works had covered the shop area. He enquired about the reason for not including the shop area for the improvement works this time.

94. Mr CHENG Sai-cheong responded as follows:

- (i) In addition to the Ordinance, as the automatic sprinkler system, including the fire services water tank, the water pump and the relevant ducts, etc., was owned by HD, the Department had extended the improvement works area to the shop area of the occupiers for compliance with the legal requirements.
- (ii) Before leasing the shops to tenants or social welfare organisations, HD would only install the emergency lighting system commonly known as “building inspection lights” to comply with the legal requirements, and would remove it before the in-take of shop tenants. The shop tenants had to install the “cat’s eye lights” on their own after moving in, and might remove it before moving out.

95. Mr CHUM Tai-kong gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The Ordinance was implemented in July 2007, mainly targeting at the buildings with their plans submitted before 1987. The Ordinance aimed at improving the fire-fighting installations and equipment of the relevant buildings so as to comply with the fire safety standards in 1994. In view of the large number of such buildings, the Department decided to take enforcement actions in phases. The buildings under HD had to comply with the relevant requirements as well.
- (ii) The Ordinance clearly set out the responsibilities of building owners and occupiers, the owners had to comply with the fire safety measures stipulated in Schedules 1 and 2 of the Ordinance. Regarding the responsibility of installing emergency lighting system, the Ordinance stipulated that the owners were responsible for public areas whereas the occupiers were responsible for the occupied area (i.e. within the shop) to ensure that people could evacuate safely when there was a fire in the shop.
- (iii) In the event that the owner or the occupier of a building did not comply with relevant requirements and failed to provide reasonable explanation, FSD would initiate prosecutions accordingly.

96. The Chairman enquired whether FSD would prosecute the shop owners if their shops did not follow the instruction.

97. Mr CHUM Tai-kong responded that if the fire-fighting equipment of the shop did not comply with the requirements of the instruction and the occupier could not provide reasonable explanation, the Department would initiate prosecutions; if the owner did not comply with the requirements, the Department would also initiate prosecutions accordingly.

98. Mr CHUM Tak-shing raised the following views and enquiries: (i) old shops in the estate were not located inside the shopping centre and most of them were shops with street frontage, he enquired whether they had fulfilled the minimum fire safety requirements and whether exemptions could be granted; (ii) he requested HD again to provide the relevant provisions on fire safety equipment stipulated in the tenancy agreements; (iii) he requested the Department to respond positively whether it would provide ring-fenced subsidies to shop tenants. Otherwise, he would consider moving a provisional motion to urge the Department to provide subsidies to avoid shop tenants bearing all of the costs.

99. Mr LEE Wing-man was dissatisfied with the responses of government departments, and raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the Ordinance had been implemented in 2007, but the Department did not discuss with HD immediately ways to improve the fire-fighting equipment and only issued the Fire Safety Improvement Instructions by batches until now; (ii) he enquired about the number of prosecutions initiated by the Department against HD after the implementation of the Ordinance; (iii) HD had the responsibility to ensure that the fire-fighting equipment of the units complied with the requirements of the Ordinance; (iv) he suggested the Committee write to the Office of The Ombudsman or other relevant government departments.

100. Mr WAI Woon-nam said that HD did not observe the Ordinance immediately after its implementation. He urged the Department to strictly comply with the Fire Safety Instructions, review its projects completed before 1987, and allocate additional resources to improve fire safety equipment to avoid the Department and the shop tenants being prosecuted.

101. Mr MAK Wai-ming raised the following views: (i) as the aforementioned automatic sprinkler system was owned by HD, he considered that the Department should install the “cat’s eye lights” at the same time, instead of selectively requiring shop tenants to install the lights on their own; (ii) he suggested HD upgrade the fire-fighting system of that estate comprehensively, including installing the “cat’s eye lights” for shop tenants. This could lower the costs and avoid the resultant works delay or even prosecution if shop tenants could not afford the expenses.

102. Ms Carman NG raised the following views and enquiries: (i) shop tenants had earlier suspend their business due to the improvement works for fire-fighting system in Fu Chak House and were now required by HD to install “cat’s eye lights” at their own

expenses; all of these would affect their livelihood seriously; (ii) HD should install both the automatic sprinkler system and the “cat’s eye lights”. Otherwise, the shop tenants might refuse to cooperate so that the works could not be completed as scheduled by the Department; (iii) some of the shop tenants reflected that they had received the notification of rent increase from HD, which made them even more difficult to do business; (iv) as other PHEs would receive the Fire Safety Instructions one after the other, she suggested HD bear the costs for the improvement works or subsidise the shop tenants in need.

103. Miss Rebecca AU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The tenancy agreements signed between HKHA and shop tenants stipulated that the shop tenants should comply with all laws, ordinances and regulations, and the requirements of all bylaws, instructions and acts of other organisations; they were also required to obtain relevant licences and permits required for their business operations from the authorities at their own expenses.
- (ii) In accordance with the Ordinance, HD would properly install fire safety equipment of which the owner was responsible for whereas the shop tenants would take up the installation works for the parts responsible by the occupants. If there were specific requirements of the Ordinance in respect of individual shop tenants such as restaurants or tutorial schools, the shop tenants concerned had to install the relevant equipment on their own for obtaining the licences.
- (iii) HD understood that shop tenants might not understand well the Fire Safety Directions on the installation of “cat’s eye lights” in accordance with the requirements of the Ordinance, but he hoped that shop tenants could respect the law and the spirit of the contract.
- (iv) Members’ views on subsidising shop tenants to carry out improvement works would be relayed to the relevant units.

104. Mr CHENG Sai-cheong gave a supplementary response that the Ordinance stipulated that building owners were responsible for automatic sprinkler systems whereas occupiers were responsible for emergency lighting systems within the separately occupied areas (i.e. within the shop). He clarified that HD had not selectively required shop tenants to install some of the fire safety equipment.

105. The Chairman enquired whether FSD had prosecuted HD in accordance with the Ordinance and requested FSD to provide relevant records.

106. Mr CHUM Tai-kong gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) During the enforcement of the Ordinance, the Department would carry out site inspections with BD, and decide whether it was necessary to install emergency lighting according to the actual circumstances of the shops. After inspecting Chak On Estate, the Department considered that it was necessary for the shops concerned to install emergency lighting.
- (ii) In accordance with the Ordinance, FSD had instructed the PHEs under HD to comply with relevant fire safety measures, and the PHEs concerned had complied with the instruction. In case the instruction was not complied with, the Department would take suitable follow-up actions according to the Ordinance.

107. Ms Carman NG raised the following views: (i) exemptions should be granted to the shops in Chak On Estate as they had fulfilled the requirements on shop frontage and pedestrian flow; (ii) except for some restaurants and supermarkets, most of the shops would not operate in the evenings. She hoped that FSD would re-consider granting exemptions to these shop tenants.

108. The Chairman said that a provisional motion moved by Ms Carman NG and seconded by Mr CHUM Tak-shing was received, and it read as follows:

“This meeting strongly demands that HD set up ring-fenced subsidy scheme immediately to assist shop tenants of old PHEs including Chak On Estate in installing fire-fighting system and equipment in compliance with the Fire Safety (Buildings) Ordinance (Cap. 572).”

109. Mr CHUM Tak-shing added that he agreed that law amendment was necessary but pointed out that it took time to do so. The representatives of HD had promised to relay members’ suggestions of providing subsidies to the relevant units but the results were not guaranteed. Therefore, by means of provisional motion, he hoped to request the Department to give a reply as soon as possible on whether subsidies would be provided.

110. The Chairman declared that the Committee unanimously passed the above motion and concluded that HD was requested to subsidise shop tenants of PHEs who were in need for installing emergency lighting systems.

(f) Promote the “redevelopment of aged public housing estates” “Strive for the redevelopment of Shek Kip Mei Estate” (HAC Paper 45/18)

111. Mr CHAN Kwok-wai introduced Paper 45/18.

112. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had invited the Task Force on Land Supply (“Task Force”) to send staff to attend the meeting, but the Task Force could not send staff to attend the meeting. He asked members to refer to the written response of the Task

Force (Paper 49/18).

113. Miss Rebecca AU introduced Paper 57/18.

114. Mr CHAN Kwok-wai raised the following views: (i) the Refined Policy on Redevelopment of Aged Public Rental Housing Estates (“Refined Policy”) of HKHA consisted of four redevelopment principles. He requested the Department to explain which principles the “numbered blocks” of Shek Kip Mei Estate had not complied with; (ii) the “numbered blocks” of Shek Kip Mei Estate were dilapidated, the ceilings of some units had even collapsed. He requested the Department to carry out redevelopment as soon as possible.

115. Ms LAU Pui-yuk raised the following views: (i) she requested the Department to explain which principles of redevelopment the “numbered blocks” of Shek Kip Mei Estate had not complied with; (ii) many households of the “numbered blocks” had reflected that their units were dilapidated and requested redevelopment; (iii) the redevelopment of Shek Kip Mei Estate could not only improve the living condition of the existing households, but also increase the supply of public housing and shorten the waiting time of applicants on the Waiting List.

116. Mr LEUNG Man-kwong raised the following views: (i) he requested the Department to explain which principles of redevelopment the “numbered blocks” of Shek Kip Mei Estate had not complied with; (ii) if the Department redeveloped the “numbered blocks” now, it could use the units of Shek Kip Mei Estate Redevelopment Phases 3, 6 and 7 to rehouse the households affected by the redevelopment. He was worried that it would be difficult to look for suitable rehousing resources and achieve in-situ rehousing if the redevelopment was delayed; (iii) he hoped that the representatives of the Department would relay members’ views to HA.

117. Ms Carman NG raised the following views: (i) she requested the Department to explain which principles of redevelopment the “numbered blocks” of Shek Kip Mei Estate had not complied with; (ii) she hoped that the Department would consider using Shek Kip Mei Estate Phases 3, 6 and 7 to rehouse the households of “numbered blocks”; otherwise, the “numbered blocks” could not be redeveloped in the short term due to the lack of suitable rehousing resources; (iii) HKHA had not yet announced the redevelopment plan of the “numbered blocks”, disappointing the households who hoped to improve their living condition through redevelopment.

118. Mr Aaron LAM raised the following views: (i) the “numbered blocks” of Shek Kip Mei Estate were nearly 40 years old and there was a reasonable expectation for redevelopment; (ii) the redevelopment of “numbered blocks” could increase housing

supply and alleviate the problem of housing shortage in the long term; (iii) the Department had shelved the redevelopment plan for the reason that the “numbered blocks” had not complied with the four basic principles. He hoped that the Department would address the demands of the residents of “numbered blocks” and carry out the redevelopment as soon as possible.

119. Miss Rebecca AU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) Members’ views would be relayed to the Department.
- (ii) Under the Refined Policy formulated by HKHA in 2011, HKHA would consider the redevelopment of individual PHEs in accordance with the four basic principles, which included the structural conditions of buildings, cost effectiveness of repair works, availability of suitable rehousing resources in the vicinity of the estates to be redeveloped, and build-back potential upon redevelopment.
- (iii) The PHEs under the “Comprehensive Structural Investigation Programme (‘CSIP’)” would be assessed every 15 years to ascertain whether the buildings were structurally safe. The CSIP carried out by HKHA in 2015 showed that the buildings and market of old Shek Kip Mei Estate were structurally safe and there were no pressing needs for redevelopment.
- (iv) The Department would continue to maintain and improve the condition of the “numbered blocks” of Shek Kip Mei Estate through the existing Estate Improvement Programme and the Total Maintenance Programme.

120. Mr Ambrose CHEUNG raised the following views and enquiries: (i) he suggested submitting members’ views to the Task Force for reference, and requested that the redevelopment of aged PHEs should be included as a land supply option for reference and discussion by the public; (ii) he reckoned that the four basic principles had their own importance and the redevelopment plan should not be shelved only because the buildings were structurally safe; (iii) the redevelopment of the “numbered blocks” of Shek Kip Mei Estate could improve the living condition of the households and increase the supply of public housing. He hoped that government departments would consider redevelopment proactively.

121. Mr CHAN Wai-ming raised the following views: (i) the notice period for redevelopment of PHEs was 30 months in general. However, the Department had not strictly complied with this requirement, which had confused the meeting; (ii) there were now suitable rehousing resources to rehouse the households of “numbered-blocks” of Shek

Kip Mei Estate. He requested the Department to consider redevelopment; (iii) the households of the “numbered blocks” hoped that the Department could carry out redevelopment as soon as possible to improve their living condition.

122. Mr CHAN Kwok-wai raised the following views: (i) the availability of suitable rehousing resources was one of the four basic principles of redevelopment. If the “numbered blocks” had structural problems in the future and there was no unit for rehousing in the vicinity, redevelopment could not be carried out at that time; (ii) he requested the Department to consider using the units of Shek Kip Mei Estate Phases 3, 6 and 7, which had not yet been allocated to the applicants on the Waiting List of public housing, as rehousing resources.

123. Mr CHUM Tak-shing said that the criteria of redevelopment of the Department were ambiguous; which had confused the meeting and the residents. He urged the Department to make public the research report on Shek Kip Mei Estate redevelopment and hoped that the Committee would allocate additional resources to examine the urgency and feasibility of redeveloping the “numbered blocks” of Shek Kip Mei Estate.

124. The Chairman said that he welcomed members to attend the meetings of WGPH and discuss the issue of allocating additional resources for the study on the redevelopment of “numbered blocks” of Shek Kip Mei Estate. He then requested HD to listen to the views of the Committee and redevelop the “numbered blocks” as soon as possible. He also agreed that the views of the Committee should be relayed to the Task Force.

(g) Request the Housing Department to finalise the in-take arrangement for Camellia House and properly arrange the allocation of So Uk Estate Phase 2 units as soon as possible (HAC Paper 46/18)

125. Mr CHAN Wai-ming introduced Paper 46/18.

126. Mrs Susanna CHENG introduced Paper 60/18.

127. The Chairman enquired whether the Department could provide the plans of the shopping centre of So Uk Estate Phase 2.

128. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded that the Department could provide the plans concerned only after the new PHE was completed and the occupation permit obtained.

129. Ms Carman NG raised the following views and enquiries: (i) regarding the Pak Tin Estate tenants who would be rehoused to Camellia House, she enquired from which blocks of Pak Tin Estate did these tenants come from; (ii) she enquired why the tender exercise for the shopping centre of So Uk Estate Phase 2 could be commenced before obtaining the occupation permit, and what kinds of facilities and services would be provided in the

shopping centre; (iii) there were sources saying that rehousing registration would be arranged for tenants from Pak Tin Estate in July and August this year. She was worried that these tenants would be allocated with the remaining units after the in-take of applicants on the Waiting List, she requested the Department to provide a detailed schedule to allay the concerns of the residents.

130. Mr CHUM Tak-shing raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the Department anticipated that letters would be sent to the prospective tenant within one month after obtaining the occupation permit in the third quarter to notify them to proceed with the in-take formalities. He requested the Department to send letters at an earlier time so that the prospective tenants could arrange the school registration for their children. He also enquired whether the Department had discussed special arrangements with the Education Bureau (“EDB”) and schools in the district; (ii) a lot of relevant information had been circulated on the Internet in recent years, some of them were even more detailed than those provided by the Department. He hoped that the Department would pay attention to that.

131. Mr CHAN Ming-kei raised the following views: (i) the meeting was very concerned about the in-take arrangement for Camellia House of So Uk Estate as well as the advance allocation of So Uk Estate Phase 2 units. However, the response of the Department had failed to answer the enquiries of Members and the residents; (ii) the issuance of notification letters was too late, such that the prospective tenants would be unable to properly arrange the school registration for their children; (iii) he requested the Department to strictly follow the schedule of completion, allocation and in-take of the PHE, as well as provide the plans of the shopping centre of So Uk Estate Phase 2 for reference of the meeting and the residents.

132. Mr CHAN Wai-ming raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the Department had not strictly followed the allocation and in-take schedule of the PHE, which had confused the residents. He was worried that similar situation of serious delay in the advance allocation and in-take of So Uk Estate Phase 1 would occur again; (ii) despite having made advance allocation for the units of Camellia House as early as in April, the Department would only send notification letters to the prospective tenants within one month after obtaining the occupation permit, which would make it difficult for the prospective tenants to arrange the school registration work for their children; (iii) he hoped that the Department would discuss with EDB and schools in the district special arrangement for the affected students, and announce the plans of the shopping centre of So Uk Estate Phase 2 as soon as possible.

133. Mr Kalvin HO said that Members could not respond to the enquiries and address relevant demands of residents as the Department had not provided the meeting with the

information about Shek Kip Mei Estate redevelopment as well as the advance allocation and in-take of So Uk Estate Phase 2 in a timely manner. He requested the Department to provide the meeting with the information and works plans concerned as early as possible in the future.

134. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded that members' views would be relayed to the relevant units and notification letters would be sent once the occupation permit of Camellia House was obtained so that the prospective tenants could complete the in-take formalities as soon as possible.

135. Miss Rebecca AU gave a supplementary response as follows:

- (i) The Department had made arrangement for advance rehousing registration for the households of Blocks 9, 10, 11 and 13 of Pak Tin Estate. After considering their preferences, the Department would as far as possible reserve sufficient and suitable units in So Uk Estate for rehousing.
- (ii) To tie in with the in-take of So Uk Estate Phase 2, the Department would arrange tenants affected by the redevelopment of Pak Tin Estate to apply for rehousing as soon as possible.

136. The Chairman concluded that: (i) a letter would be sent to HD to express the concerns about the delay in the in-take of Camellia House of So Uk Estate and the advance allocation of So Uk Estate Phase 2; (ii) the Committee was dissatisfied that DCD of the Department had not provided detailed information and sent staff to attend the meeting, and requested the Division to send staff to attend the next meeting.

(h) Strong request for retaining the seamless transition plan for Shek Kip Mei Health Centre (HAC Paper 47/18)

137. Mr Calvin HO introduced Paper 47/18.

138. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had invited FHB to send staff to attend the meeting, but the Bureau could not send staff to attend the meeting. He asked members to refer to the written response of FHB (Paper 64/18).

139. Miss Rebecca AU introduced Paper 58/18.

140. The Chairman said that the temporary health centre proposed in the paper would occupy only part of the shopping centre of Shek Kip Mei Estate Redevelopment Phase 6 ("Phase 6"), he hoped that the Department would consider this suggestion.

141. Mr Ambrose CHEUNG agreed with the proposal of the paper, and raised the

following views: (i) if HD arranged the stall operators of Shek Kip Mei Market to move into Phase 6, he suggested the Bureau consider using that market or the school premise of Chi Yun School in Lei Cheng Uk Estate for the temporary health centre so that the provision of services could continue; (ii) he hoped that the Bureau would proactively provide the meeting with information about the relocation proposal of Shek Kip Mei Health Centre (“SKMHC”) and maintain good communication.

142. Mr Kalvin HO said that the response paper of the Department mentioned that Phase 6 would be completed soon, he requested the Department to provide the plans for reference of the meeting.

143. Ms Carman NG raised the following views: (i) the commercial facilities of Phase 6 were not yet available for lease, the Department could still amend its planning and design. As the proposal of the paper could benefit residents in the district, she hoped that the Department could consider it prudently; (ii) Chi Yun School was too far away from the original site of SKMHC, which might affect residents in the district who had to seek medical treatment there.

144. Mr CHAN Kwok-wai said that residents in the district hoped that SKMHC could achieve seamless transition. He requested government departments to proactively identify vacant sites in Shek Kip Mei area for setting up the temporary health centre, so as to cope with the service demand during the removal and relocation of SKMHC.

145. The Chairman concluded that the Committee was very concerned about the setting up of a temporary health centre in Shek Kip Mei. It also agreed to write to FHB, recommending it to consider setting up a temporary health centre in the shopping centre of Shek Kip Mei Redevelopment Phase 6.

Agenda Item 4: Follow-up matter

(a) Checklist of follow-up actions of matters discussed in the 14th meeting of the Housing Affairs Committee (HAC Paper 48/18)

146. The Chairman asked members to refer to the written responses of the Planning Department, the Lands Department and The Hong Kong Settlers Housing Corporation Limited (Papers 50/18, 51/18 and 52/18). He also asked HD to report the latest development of item 1 of the follow-up matter.

147. Mrs Susanna CHENG said that the Department had no further information for the time being.

148. The Committee noted the report by HD and agreed to continue to follow up on the issue.

149. The Chairman said that item 2 of the follow-up matter had been discussed together with item 3f of matters for discussion. He asked members to refer to the written response of HD (Paper 53/18), and then asked HD to report the latest development of item 3 of the follow-up matter.

150. Mrs Susanna CHENG introduced Paper 53/18.

151. The Chairman enquired about the names of the PHEs mentioned in the Response Paper in which the pipe replacement works had been completed.

152. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded that the PHEs in which pipe replacement works had been completed included Shek Kip Mei Estate, Wing Cheong Estate and Un Chau Estate.

153. The Chairman requested the Department to provide the number of units in which the pipe replacement works had been completed.

154. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded that the information would be obtained from the relevant units.

155. The Committee noted the report by HD and agreed to continue to follow up on the issue.

156. The Chairman asked HD to report the latest development of item 4 of the follow-up matter.

157. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded that the Organic Resources Recovery Centre Phase 1 under the Environmental Protection Department (“EPD”) in Siu Ho Wan would commence operation on 1 July, handling the food waste collected from 40 markets under FEHD and nine markets under HKHA. The two-year pilot scheme would be implemented by EPD.

158. The Committee noted the report by HD and agreed to continue to follow up on the issue.

159. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had invited the Joint Offices for Investigation of Water Seepage Complaints (“JO”) to send staff to attend the meeting in respect of item 6 of matters for discussion. However, JO said that no further information could be provided. He then asked members to refer to the written response of JO (Paper 54/18), and requested JO to send staff to attend the next meeting.

160. The Committee noted the report by JO and agreed to continue to follow up on the issue.

161. The Chairman asked HD to report the latest development of item 6 of follow-up matter.

162. Mrs Susanna CHENG responded as follows:

- (i) Both the car parks in Shek Kip Mei Estate Phase 2 and Nam Shan Estate had two-way entrance/exit. If the audible signal was installed at the exit only, this might not accurately reflect the situation of the entrance/exit of the car park and might give rise to pedestrian safety problem. Besides, as a university campus was situated above the car park in Nam Shan Estate, the audible signal might cause inconvenience to it. In view of the above, the Department had no plan to install audible signals in the above two car parks for the time being.
- (ii) The Department had already placed an additional “Beware of the pedestrians” sign prominently at the entrance/exit of the car park in Nam Shan Estate to remind drivers to watch out for pedestrians.
- (iii) The Department would continue to discuss with Members whether it was necessary to provide other additional facilities to improve pedestrian safety.

163. The Committee noted the report by HD and agreed to continue to follow up on the issue.

164. The Chairman said that item 7 of follow-up matter had been discussed together with item 2b of matters arising, and it was agreed that there was no need to follow up on this item at the next meeting.

Agenda Item 5: Reports from Working Groups under the Committee

(a) Report from the Working Group on Public Housing (HAC Paper 29/18)

165. The Committee noted and endorsed the above report.

(b) Report from the Working Group on Private Premises and Urban Revitalisation (HAC Paper 30/18)

166. The Committee noted and endorsed the above report.

Agenda Item 6: Any other business

167. The next meeting would be held at 9:30 a.m. on 26 July 2018 (Thursday).

168. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:30 p.m.

District Council Secretariat
Sham Shui Po District Office
July 2018