

(Translation)

Minutes of the 12th Meeting of Sham Shui Po District Council (6th Term)
under the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

Date: 9 November 2021 (Tuesday)
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Venue: Conference Room, Sham Shui Po District Council

Present

Chairman

Mr CHUM Tak-shing

Members

Mr HO Kwan-chau, Leo (Arrived at 9:32 a.m., left at 3:27 p.m.)
Ms LAU Pui-yuk, MH (Left at 3:27 p.m.)
Mr LI Ting-fung, Jay
Mr MAK Wai-ming (Arrived at 9:40 a.m., left at 1:45 p.m.)
Ms NG Mei, Carman (Arrived at 9:38 a.m., left at 1:45 p.m.)
Ms NG Yuet-lan, Janet
Mr YUEN Hoi-man, Ramon

In Attendance

Mr WONG Yan-yin, Paul, JP District Officer (Sham Shui Po)
Miss TSE Yi-lam, Gloria Assistant District Officer (Sham Shui Po) 1
Miss CHIN Wai-sheung, Doris Senior Liaison Officer 1, Sham Shui Po District Office
Ms CHAN Siu-ping, Daphne Senior Liaison Officer 2, Sham Shui Po District Office
Miss LAU Sze-nga, Vivicia Senior Liaison Officer 3, Sham Shui Po District Office
Mr TAM Kin-fai, Simon Senior Liaison Officer 4, Sham Shui Po District Office
Ms LING Kuk-yi Chief Manager/M (KWS), Housing Department
Mrs CHENG IP Sau-fong, Susanna Senior Housing Manager (KWS1), Housing Department
Mr YU Wai-yip, Ricky District Social Welfare Officer (Sham Shui Po), Social Welfare Department

Mr TSE Yu-ngai, Patrick	Police Community Relations Officer (Sham Shui Po District), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr KWAN Chung-wai, David	Chief Leisure Manager (HKE), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms SHING Lai-kam, Goldie	District Leisure Manager (Sham Shui Po), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms TSENG Chieh, Elsa	Deputy District Leisure Manager (Sham Shui Po) District Support, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr HUI Chi-ping, Edwin	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Sham Shui Po), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr LUI Sai-tat	Chief Health Inspector (Sham Shui Po) 3, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr YEUNG Chong-tak, Clarence	Chief Engineer/S1, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr TSE Kong-wai, Eric	Chief Transport Officer/Kowloon 1, Transport Department
Mr Mike KWAN	General Manager, Planning & Design, Urban Renewal Authority
Ms Daisy LAI	Senior Manager, Planning & Design, Urban Renewal Authority
Ms Connie CHEUNG	Senior Manager, Acquisition and Clearance, Urban Renewal Authority
Ms Ally YU	Manager, Acquisition and Clearance, Urban Renewal Authority
Ms Karen LEUNG	Manager, Community Development, Urban Renewal Authority
Mr CHAN Seng-kuan	Senior Architect 13, Housing Department
Ms KOU Yat-fu, Glory	Architect 101, Housing Department
Ms LAU Lai-ki, Belinda	Senior Planning Officer 5, Housing Department
Mr TSE Yat-kai, Alex	Planning Officer 19, Housing Department
Mr LEE Man-kwong, David	Senior Civil Engineer 3, Housing Department
Mr NG Chun-lap, Andy	Civil Engineer 36, Housing Department
Ms LEE Suk-fun, Nancy	Senior Housing Manager/KE 2, Housing Department
Mr TSE Pui-keung, Derek	District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon (Acting), Planning Department
Miss HO Yuen-ching, Jessica	Senior Town Planner/Sham Shui Po, Planning Department

Miss LEE Wing-sum, Winsome
Mr Charles HO

Town Planner/Sham Shui Po 1, Planning Department
Project Director, Hong Kong Council of Social
Service

Ms Queenie KWOK

Project Manager, Hong Kong Council of Social
Service

Ms LAW Sau-ying

Project Manager (Service Development), Tung Wah
Group of Hospitals

Mr CHOI Sai-kit

Assistant Planning Officer (Service Development),
Tung Wah Group of Hospitals

Secretary

Ms HO Kam-ping, Jennifer

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

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives from government departments to the twelfth meeting of the Sham Shui Po District Council (“SSPDC”). He said that Mr Ricky YU, District Social Welfare Officer (Sham Shui Po) of the Social Welfare Department (“SWD”), would attend the future meetings in place of Ms Wendy CHAU. To reduce the risk of the spread of the epidemic, the attendees had already checked their temperatures and registered their names before entering the Conference Room. Moreover, the public gallery would not be open.

Item 1: Confirmation of minutes of the 2nd special meeting held on 12 August 2021 and the 11th meeting held on 14 September 2021

2. The two sets of minutes of the above meetings were confirmed without amendment.

Item 2: Matters for discussion

(a) Kim Shin Lane/Fuk Wa Street Development Project (SSP-017) and Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road Development Scheme (SSP-018) initiated by the Urban Renewal Authority (SSPDC Paper 119/21)

(d) Request for the Urban Renewal Authority to provide more information about the two redevelopment projects in Sham Shui Po (SSPDC Paper 122/21)

3. The Chairman said that Papers 119/21 and 122/21 were similar in nature and suggested discussing the two papers together.

4. Mr Mike KWAN introduced Paper 119/21 with the aid of PowerPoint presentation.

5. Ms LAU Pui-yuk introduced Paper 122/21.

6. Mr Ramon YUEN said that as there would be more social welfare facilities and public space in the future, he supported the two development projects by the Urban Renewal Authority (“URA”). However, the Air Ventilation Assessment (“AVA”) conducted by the Planning Department (“PlanD”) had proposed the building height restriction (“BHR”) in that area. He enquired whether URA would apply for relaxation of the plot ratio or BHR in respect of the development projects and how URA would maintain the air ventilation in that area.

7. Ms LAU Pui-yuk said that she supported the redevelopment of old buildings and community facilities by URA under the principle of “single site, multiple uses” so as to optimise the use of land resources and address the shortage of social welfare facilities in the district. She also hoped that the Government would conduct a large-scale study on the redevelopment plan of Sham Shui Po District (“SSP District”) as soon as possible by making reference to the newly completed study on Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok. Besides, she enquired about the reasons for objecting the development projects by some residents interviewed and URA’s arrangements for rehousing the existing residents and tenants.

8. Mr Jay LI said that he was glad to note that the District Facilities Committee’s suggestion was adopted by URA. The Cheung Sha Wan Sports Centre would be redeveloped into a community facility complex under the “single site, multiple uses” mechanism, and thereby providing more recreational and community facilities in SSP. Besides, he enquired about the rehousing arrangements for the existing residents and the public space to be provided in the two development projects.

9. Ms Janet NG said that there were insufficient parking spaces for private vehicles and lorries in SSP District, and the provision of social welfare facilities such as residential care homes for the elderly, homes for persons with disabilities and child care centres were also insufficient in the district. She hoped that URA would consider increasing the provision of relevant ancillary facilities in the development projects to facilitate residents and cope with the future demand in SSP District.

10. The Chairman said that he supported URA’s flexible land use with development potential by redeveloping it into new residential buildings and community facility complex as the buildings in the vicinity of Kim Shin Lane already aged over 60 years. He hoped that URA would try to avoid creating a wall effect as far as practicable when designing the buildings. He enquired whether URA would keep the trees within the area of development projects in-situ and about the number of parking spaces to be provided in the two development projects.

11. Mr Mike KWAN gave a consolidated response by saying that URA had adopted the views provided by SSPDC in 2019 and the suggestions in PlanD’s AVA when designing the two development projects. The Kim Shin Lane/Fuk Wa Street Development Project did not need to apply for relaxation of the plot ratio, and the building height had already complied with the relevant restrictions prescribed in the existing outline zoning plan (“OZP”). It was expected that the said project would construct two to three buildings, and the location adjacent to Cheung Wah Street would also provide about 750 metres of open space to enhance the ventilation. To accommodate more community facilities and increase the provision of land access as well as public open space, URA would apply for relaxation of BHR to 140 metres above the Principal Datum (“PD”) for

the Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road Development Scheme. To maintain air ventilation, URA would ensure the two buildings in the project to be at least 15 metres apart. Besides, upon completion of the two development projects, the public open space of the entire district would be slightly increased for about 800 square metres. URA would also discuss with relevant departments to open up more land access for enhancing the accessibility of the said area. In addition, the objections received by URA in respect of the Kim Shin Lane/Fuk Wa Street Development Project accounted for about 2% of the total number of residents interviewed. Some of these objections came from residents who had yet to complete the division of property titles due to family disputes, and there were also owners expressing concerns over their rental business of subdivided units being affected by the redevelopment project. He then said that the two development projects were expected to provide about 380 parking spaces. URA would also examine the possibility of providing more parking spaces for lorries. Moreover, URA would try to keep all the trees within the project areas in-situ as far as practicable unless they had health issues or their locations would affect the foundation works, and would seek the advice of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”) before handling the trees concerned.

12. Ms Connie CHEUNG gave a consolidated response by saying that according to the freezing survey conducted by URA on the Kim Shin Lane/Fuk Wa Street Development Project, flats for rental and flats occupied by owners accounted for about 70% and 30% respectively. Of the flats for rental, there were more flats for one to two persons. After the development projects were approved and confirmed, if the affected owners sold their flats with tenancy agreement to URA, and the eligible tenants fulfilled the criteria for waiting for public rental housing (“PRH”), URA would arrange for PRH for them. URA noted that some owners asked their tenants to move out after the announcement of the projects, the problem had been resolved after URA’s co-ordination with owners and tenants. Besides, URA had implemented a “Project Engagement Programme”. The team would visit each family in the projects and follow up on cases with special needs, which included transferring the cases to social worker team for follow up, arranging for eligible tenants to apply for “Domestic Tenants Compassionate Assistance Programme” or relocation allowance, etc.

13. Mr Derek TSE gave a consolidated response by saying that PlanD had commissioned a consulting firm in 2010 to conduct AVA which was mainly used for reviewing BHR in the Cheung Sha Wan OZP. For individual development projects involving planning application or revising OZP, the project proponents had to conduct assessment on air ventilation and other relevant technical aspects. PlanD would consult relevant government departments on the assessment content and submit the views of government departments and relevant stakeholders to the Town Planning Board (“TPB”) for consideration. Regarding the Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road

Development Scheme, relevant government departments were examining the various assessment reports submitted by URA to PlanD. He then said that as far as the DC constituency was concerned, SSP District already had sufficient district and local open spaces for public enjoyment. As most of the areas in the Cheung Sha Wan OZP had been developed, it was difficult to plan a larger district open space. As a result, the district open spaces in the district were fewer than that of the local open spaces which were smaller in size. In the new coastal development area not far from Cheung Sha Wan District, there were provision of public open spaces in public housing estates and private residential projects which were completed in recent years or due to be completed for public use. Besides, regarding the demand for community care service facilities such as residential care homes for the elderly and child care centres, apart from adding the requirement of providing welfare facilities in the new development projects where suitable, relevant government departments would also increase the provision of such facilities in accordance with the prevailing mechanism so as to meet the district needs and the relevant planning standards.

14. Mr Ramon YUEN said that for the Cheung Wah Street/ Cheung Sha Wan Road Development Scheme, he hoped that URA would, while applying for relaxation of BHR to 140 metres above PD, try to widen the distance between buildings as far as practicable and provide more public space to maintain air ventilation in the district.

15. Ms LAU Pui-yuk enquired whether URA would offer a “Flat-for-Flat” scheme for owner-occupiers in the development projects and about the progress of the study on the SSP District redevelopment plan conducted by URA.

16. The Chairman said that as the planning procedures for the development projects were different, he hoped that URA would try to align the timetables of the two projects as far as practicable and assist in handling the building management problem faced by tenants during flat acquisition. Besides, the Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road Development Scheme would apply for the construction of buildings at 140 metres above PD, which would be higher than the surrounding buildings. He enquired whether URA would provide mitigating measures.

17. Ms Janet NG said that URA should examine the provision of more parking spaces and social welfare facilities in the development projects with relevant departments. In addition, she suggested that DC Members could participate in the co-ordination work of the redevelopment projects so that Members could directly communicate with the stakeholders who were against the development projects.

18. Mr Mike KWAN gave a consolidated response by saying that as the maximum benefit could only be achieved when the two development projects complementing each

other, he hoped that the relevant stakeholders would support the two projects simultaneously. URA would also maintain close communication with PlanD and expedite the planning procedures as far as practicable. Regarding the Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road Development Scheme, PlanD would disclose the views received for public access later. URA had already contacted the relevant stakeholders upon receiving their objections in order to understand the actual situation and ease their concerns. URA welcomed Members' suggestions on the co-ordination work. In addition, although URA would apply for relaxation of BHR in the Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road Development Scheme, URA would ensure the two buildings in the project to be at least 15 metres apart, and that the buildings would not fully cover the entire project area. The space vacated would be used for keeping the present trees and constructing public space on street level, so as to maintain good air ventilation and visual permeability. Regarding the social welfare facilities, URA would relay Members' views to relevant departments. The two development projects would provide a total of about 380 new parking spaces in SSP District. If more parking spaces were to be provided, consideration had to be given in respect of the technical aspects such as the traffic load of nearby roads and resources availability, etc. He then said that since 2011, eligible owner-occupiers affected by the redevelopment projects of URA could opt for "Flat-for-Flat", which included the newly built flats in-situ of the projects, flats under the redevelopment projects within the same district or other suitable flats of URA projects, and details would be announced later. Besides, URA had completed the District Study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok and reported the study result to the Panel on Development of the Legislative Council ("LegCo"). URA was also actively preparing for the district planning studies on Tsuen Wan and SSP District as mentioned in the Policy Address and would consult stakeholders in due course.

19. Mr Derek TSE gave a consolidated response by saying that PlanD would consult relevant government departments on the Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road Development Scheme and submit the public views received to TPB for consideration. For the time being, it was expected that TPB would consider this development scheme at the meeting to be held at the end of this year or early next year. It was hoped that relevant planning procedures could be completed by the end of next year the earliest.

20. Mr Ricky YU gave a consolidated response by saying that apart from providing residential care services, SWD had all along been committed to implementing various kinds of community support services so that the elderly and the people in need could receive care services at home and continue to live in a familiar neighbourhood. SWD also understood the keen demand for social welfare facilities such as residential care homes for the elderly, residential care homes for persons with disabilities and child care centres from residents in the district. Therefore, SWD would continue to strive for providing more relevant facilities in premises and announce the specific information about

the various kinds of social welfare facilities in the development projects of URA in due course.

21. Ms Goldie SHING gave a consolidated response by saying that Cheung Sha Wan Sports Centre only had one multi-purpose arena at the moment. The specifications and standards of sports facilities would be enhanced after the redevelopment, and different types of facilities such as children's playrooms, fitness rooms, activity rooms would also be newly provided. LCSD would continue to work out the details with URA.

22. Mr Ramon YUEN said that Hing Wah Street West was the main breezeway of that area in accordance with the above AVA, he hoped that URA would ensure the streets had adequate width to maintain air ventilation. Besides, he hoped that URA could provide the introductory brief on the development projects to Members for distribution to the relevant stakeholders for reference.

23. Ms Carman NG said that currently there was not Student Health Service Centre or School Dental Clinic in Kowloon West District, which might cause inconvenience to students in SSP District who had to go to other districts for relevant services. She hoped that URA could co-ordinate with the Department of Health ("DH") and provide relevant facilities in this development project.

24. Mr Mike KWAN gave a consolidated response by saying that URA had already reserved space for DH to provide the proposed student health services in the Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road Development Scheme. As the layout of various facilities was still at the planning stage at the moment, relevant details would be announced later. Besides, apart from maintaining a considerable distance among buildings on both sides of Hing Wah Street West, URA would also widen Cheung Wah Street which was relatively narrow at the moment for enhancing the air ventilation effect. He then said that URA had made public the said brief when consulting the stakeholders and could also let Members have it after the meeting.

25. The Chairman hoped that DH could send representatives to the future DC meetings for examining the Department's expansion schemes of various medical services in the district. He then concluded that SSPDC supported URA to implement the above two development projects and also hoped that URA would properly follow up on the views of various stakeholders and the rehousing issue of affected residents. Moreover, he hoped that URA and relevant departments could complete the planning procedures as soon as possible and consult DC on the detailed design and other works details of the development projects in due course.

(b) Redevelopment of Wang Cheong Factory Estate in Cheung Sha Wan for public

housing development projects (SSPDC Paper 120 /21)

26. Mr CHAN Seng-kuan introduced Paper 120/21 with the aid of PowerPoint.

27. Mr Ramon YUEN said that he had reservation on the “Redevelopment of Wang Cheong Factory Estate in Cheung Sha Wan for public housing development projects” (“Redevelopment Plan”) as the identified site was inappropriate. He pointed out that the traffic noise problem of the West Kowloon Corridor was not conducive to public housing development. The “Redevelopment Plan” and the residential projects in the vicinity would also make the development intensity too high. He was worried that the nearby residents would object. Moreover, it would also seriously affect the livelihood of the original tenants. He then enquired whether the Government would promise that Wang Cheong Factory Estate would only be used for public housing development and Wang Cheong Building and Cheung Sha Wan Temporary Wholesale Poultry Market would be kept for use as open space.

28. Mr David LEE responded that the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) had already conducted the environmental impact assessment (“EIA”) on the “Redevelopment Plan”, and the result showed that with the provision of noise reducing measures, the traffic noise impact brought by the West Kowloon Corridor on the buildings could be reduced. The measures included the designation of a buffer zone between the residential buildings and the West Kowloon Corridor, and the installation of noise reducing windows and architectural fins at individual flats. It was expected that the noise level would comply with the standards. HKHA would also carry out road improvement works near the “Redevelopment Plan” in accordance with the suggestions in the traffic impact assessment report.

29. Ms Belinda LAU added that in response to the suggestion in the 2019 Policy Address, HKHA had conducted a feasibility study on the redevelopment of its factory estates into public housing (“feasibility study”). The result showed that Wang Cheong Factory Estate could be used for public housing development technically. The “Redevelopment Plan” would also provide public open space to actively respond to the residents’ needs in the district.

30. Mr CHAN Seng-kuan responded that given the limitations of the site and the stipulations in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (“HKPSG”), the Housing Department (“HD”) would designate a buffer zone between the proposed buildings and the West Kowloon Corridor so that the proposed buildings would not be affected by the nearby commercial/residential buildings and the traffic noise. Besides, there would be a 15-metre wide ventilation corridor between the proposed residential buildings, coupled with the provision of open space between two buildings, these

measures would help air ventilation in the district.

31. Mr Ramon YUEN requested the Departments to provide the actual distance from Hoi Tat Estate and Hoi Ying Estate to the buffer zone of the West Kowloon Corridor, and the figures of noise level for comparison. He then enquired whether Wang Cheong Building was included in the “feasibility study”, and whether the service content of the Support Centre for Persons with Autism (“Support Centre”) and its sub-office to be located in the “Redevelopment Plan” and the nearby redevelopment project (Yuen Fat Warehouse and Kerry Hung Kai Warehouse (Cheung Sha Wan)) respectively would overlap.

32. Mr MAK Wai-ming enquired about the number of parking spaces to be provided in the “Redevelopment Plan” and the leasing arrangement.

33. The Chairman said that the site of Wang Cheong Factory Estate had been rezoned as open space due to the public housing development in early years. Now, the site was rezoned again for residential purpose. He enquired whether the provision of open space in the district complied with the standards. He said that Wang Cheong Building was a government property, and the relocation cost would be lower. He asked why the Department did not opt for redeveloping the said building. He was worried that the residents under the “Redevelopment Plan” would be affected if Wang Cheong Building was developed by the Government in the future.

34. Mr Jay LI said that the Government was actively promoting re-industrialisation. However, Wang Cheong Factory Estate, which was originally on industrial land, would now be developed into public housing which would affect the industrial development in the district. He then enquired whether the Department would assist tenants affected by the redevelopment.

35. Ms Belinda LAU gave a consolidated response by saying that HKHA would provide the number of parking spaces in accordance with the guidelines stipulated in HKPSG, and would discuss the details and leasing arrangement with relevant departments. The Department would also examine the sites of the Support Centre and its sub-office with SWD, hoping that the social welfare facilities in the project could be enhanced.

36. Mr David LEE gave a consolidated response by saying that the figures of Hoi Tat Estate and Hoi Ying Estate requested by Member could not be provided at the moment. HKHA would use computer modelling to analyse the noise level upon the completion of the proposed buildings and suggested corresponding measures when conducting EIA. It was also planned that a 20-metre buffer zone would be provided between the proposed buildings and the West Kowloon Corridor.

37. Ms Belinda LAU added that the “feasibility study” only targeted at the factory estates under HKHA. Wang Cheong Building was not HKHA’s property and thus was not included in the study.

38. Mr Derek TSE gave a consolidated response by saying that Cheung Sha Wan industrial/business area was mainly located in the vicinity of Castle Peak Road, Wing Hong Street and Cheung Shun Street. The said site was zoned as “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” and could also be used for non-polluting industries. The “Redevelopment Plan” was next to Wang Cheong Building and part of the Cheung Sha Wan Temporary Wholesale Poultry Market. These areas were zoned as “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and reserved for building primary school, and some areas were zoned as “Open Space” and designated for open space purpose in the long-term planning. In general, there was no shortage of open space in SSP District at the moment. The provision of “local open space” and “district open space” was above standard by 20 hectares and 12.5 hectares respectively. Since it was difficult to zone “district open space” which was larger in size in a developed district, the provision of “district open space” was below standard by 11 hectares, while the provision of “local open space” was above standard by 3.4 hectares in the Cheung Sha Wan OZP. PlanD was also committed to zoning more open spaces in newly developed projects in other areas of the district. For instance, the Cheung Sha Wan Waterfront Promenade which was expected to be completed in 2024. Hoi Tat Estate and Grand Victoria also provided public open spaces. There were also large-scale facilities such as Cheung Sha Wan Playground and Sham Shui Po Sports Ground near the “Redevelopment Plan” for residents’ use.

39. Mr Ramon YUEN requested HD to provide the distance between buildings in the district and the buffer zone of the West Kowloon Corridor after the meeting, so as to compare with the design of the “Redevelopment Plan”. He was worried that departments did not adopt other methods to assess the noise level and that the Government might develop Wang Cheong Building in the future. He asked SWD again about the sites of the Support Centre and its sub-office.

40. Mr Ricky YU responded that to facilitate the provision of new service content at the Support Centre, SWD would reserve space in the “Redevelopment Plan” for the setting up of the said Centre’s sub-office to provide more comprehensive services.

41. Mr Ramon YUEN suggested merging the Support Centre with its sub-office to facilitate the person in need and ensure proper use of land resources.

42. Mr Ricky YU said that Members’ views were noted. SWD would explore the feasibility of merging the said Centre with its sub-office. If suitable sites could not be identified, the present proposal would have to be adopted.

43. The Chairman enquired whether a 20-metre buffer zone was enough to reduce traffic noise.

44. Mr CHAN Seng-kuan responded that HD would examine the issue of the sub-office of the Support Centre with SWD. As the façade of the residential buildings in the “Redevelopment Plan” directly facing the West Kowloon Corridor was relatively small, and more flats were facing the inner court, coupled with the fact that a buffer zone would be designated between the residential buildings and the West Kowloon Corridor, it was believed that the impact of the traffic noise from the West Kowloon Corridor could be minimised.

45. The Chairman concluded that the content of the paper was noted. Members present at the meeting did not strongly object to the plan, and they understood that the Government was doing it for meeting the housing needs of the public. However, they had concerns over the arrangements for social welfare facilities, traffic noise problem, and the planning for land use in Cheung Sha Wan in the future. It was hoped that departments could properly handle the requests of tenants so as to balance the development of different industries in the district.

46. Mr Ramon YUEN said that he opposed the plan as there were technical problems to be resolved and the nearby residents would be affected.

47. The Chairman said that Members’ views were noted and would be put on record. It was hoped that departments would properly address Members’ concerns. He then concluded that most of the Members present at the meeting did not oppose the “Redevelopment Plan”.

(c) Proposed amendments to the Approved Cheung Sha Wan OZP No. S/K5/37 (SSPDC Paper 121/21)

48. Mr Derek TSE and Miss Jessica HO introduced Paper 121/21 with the aid of PowerPoint.

49. Mr Ramon YUEN suggested that departments should take the land exchange compensations for Lai Tsui Court as reference and rezone the two sites beside Wang Cheong Factory Estate and at the junction of West Kowloon Corridor and Lai Chi Kok Road from “G/IC” to “Open Space”, so as to compensate for the rezoning of open space in the “Redevelopment Plan”. Departments were also tasked to plan for larger open space as far as practicable. He then enquired about the impact of the “Redevelopment Plan” on the supply of open spaces in Cheung Sha Wan area.

50. The Chairman said that there were lands in the district with their actual use being inconsistent with the plan. He enquired whether departments would draw up a timetable for the improvement on land use development in the district.

51. Ms Carman NG enquired whether Item E fell within Cheung Sha Wan area.

52. Mr Ramon YUEN enquired about the reason for rezoning the land use only after the completion of relevant developments in the amendments to Items C, D and E.

53. Mr Derek TSE gave a consolidated response by saying that Item E was located in the section of Tai Po Road near Ching Cheung Road and fell within the Cheung Sha Wan OZP. The sites in the amendments to Items C, D and E were all zoned as “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) in the OZP, and planning approval from TPB must be obtained before development. In general, PlanD would suggest rezoning CDA for other appropriate uses to reflect their as-built conditions upon completion of the concerned development. It was noted that the Civil Engineering and Development Department expected that the technical feasibility studies on the relocation of existing wholesale markets, including Cheung Sha Wan Temporary Wholesale Poultry Market and Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Vegetable Market, would be completed in the middle of next year. Relevant government departments would consider the relocation arrangements for the above wholesale markets with regard to the study results, and the concerned sites were already zoned respectively as “Open Space” and “G/IC”, and “Residential (Group A)”. As for the G/IC site at the junction of West Kowloon Corridor and Lai Chi Kok Road, it was already reserved for CLP Power Hong Kong Limited to build electricity substations to meet future demand and supply of electricity in the district. Therefore, the Department did not tend to rezone the land use of that site. He then said that there was a lack of district open spaces in the current Cheung Sha Wan OZP, but the overall planned district open spaces and local open spaces in SSP District were both sufficient for the needs of population in the district. The newly developed open spaces in the district were concentrated in the new development areas for the time being, including the public open space in Hoi Tat Estate (about one hectare), the at-grade open space in Seaside Sonata (about 1 500 square metres), and the public open space in Grand Victoria (not less than 3 600 square metres) and Cheung Sha Wan Waterfront Promenade (about 0.99 hectare) to be completed, for use by residents in the district.

54. Mr Ramon YUEN enquired why the G/IC site adjacent to Wang Cheong Factory Estate could not be rezoned as “Open Space”. He also enquired about the reason for not adopting the same land exchange compensations for open space in the “Redevelopment Plan” as for Lai Tsui Court.

55. The Chairman enquired whether the reservation of the above site for primary

school development was already officially included in the long-term planning, and whether there were any regulations stipulating that alternative area in the district must be found for compensation when rezoning land use.

56. Mr Derek TSE gave a consolidated response by saying that as requested by the Education Bureau (“EDB”), that G/IC site had to be reserved for the construction of a 30-classroom primary school. Besides, the concerned rezoning arrangements for Lai Tsui Court were made according to the situation at that time. As mentioned before, there were numerous open spaces newly developed in recent years, and the planned open spaces in SSP District were already sufficient for the needs of population in the district. PlanD would also strive to identify other suitable open spaces in the district. Moreover, large recreational facilities were already provided near Wang Cheong Factory Estate.

57. Mr Ramon YUEN said that the vicinity of “Four Little Dragons” was densely populated and he was worried that open spaces provided by private projects could not satisfy residents’ needs. Besides, apart from the construction of new school premises, that site could also be used for the relocation of “matchbox-style school premises” in the district. He suggested that EDB should assess the allocation of resources according to actual demand. He then enquired of PlanD whether that site could be restricted for school development or open space use only.

58. Ms Janet NG said that many old school premises in the district had structural problems and she hoped that the land resources in the district could be properly planned to facilitate relocation.

59. The Chairman concluded that members’ views were noted. The meeting agreed with the proposed amendments to Items B to E, and intended to enquire of EDB concerning Item A about the feasibility of relocating school premises and constructing new school premises. The suggestion of rezoning the G/IC site as open space would be further discussed in due course.

(e) Request for allocating additional resources to carry out pre-Chinese New Year cleansing at the staircases and open yards of buildings with poor management and environmental hygiene in Sham Shui Po (SSPDC Paper 123/21)

60. Ms LAU Pui-yuk introduced Paper 123/21.

61. Mr Simon TAM responded that there were 458 old buildings in Sham Shui Po which did not have any owners’ corporations (“OCs”) or any form of residents’ organisations, or had not engaged any property management companies (i.e. “three-nil” buildings), or had OCs that had ceased operation, accounting for about 23% of the total

number of private buildings in the district. The “District-led Actions Scheme” (“DAS”) of Sham Shui Po would provide free cleaning service to selected target buildings once during each contract period and increase the frequency of cleaning on a case-by-case basis, covering common parts of buildings such as staircases, wells, canopies, etc. where cleaning teams would have safe access to carry out cleaning work to remove rubbish accumulation, but excluding the disposal of construction waste, renovation waste and used electrical appliances and computer products. From early this year to October, the “DAS” provided 452 cleansing services to 367 target buildings in the district. The District Office welcomed nominations from DC Members and recommendations from members of the local community for suitable buildings to join the Scheme and would add eligible buildings to the list in due course and endeavour to provide cleansing services to the newly included buildings within six months after updating the list. In addition, to further improve the rodent problem in the “three-nil” buildings, the Sham Shui Po District Office (“SSPDO”) had requested, in the new “DAS” tender contract which would come into effect in December this year, the contractor to place bait boxes and poisonous baits at suitable locations in the common parts of each building upon completion of cleaning, in order to tie in with the rodent prevention and control work carried out by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (“FEHD”) in the streets and back lanes. Shortly before the lunar year, additional resources would be allocated to provide one-off cleaning services to buildings with noticeable problems of rubbish and article accumulation, especially those with environmental hygiene problems in the well and canopy areas of buildings. Furthermore, the “Pilot Scheme to Assist Owners of Three-Nil Buildings to Set Up Owners’ Corporations” launched by the Home Affairs Department (“HAD”) in SSP District had been providing cleaning services to 135 “three-nil” buildings in the district since September 2019. During the COVID-19 epidemic, the Department also arranged for contractors to thoroughly disinfect and clean the 85 buildings in the district where confirmed cases were found. SSPDO would continue to help and encourage owners to form OCs with a view to actively improving the environmental hygiene of their buildings and reducing the risk of virus transmission.

62. Mr Edwin HUI responded that FEHD had set up a total of 12 public refuse collection points in the district and most of the refuse collection points in the district were open from 6:30 am to 11 pm to facilitate the disposal of household waste by residents. To improve the environmental hygiene of the “three-nil” buildings, the Department would, subject to the availability of resources, provide large refuse bins of larger capacity in the vicinity of some “three-nil” buildings which were farther away from the refuse collection points, so as to facilitate the disposal of household waste by residents. Moreover, the Department would distribute leaflets to tenants of the “three-nil” buildings to remind them about proper disposal of household waste. The Department would continue to actively complement the “DAS” for improving the environmental hygiene of the “three-nil” buildings.

63. Ms LAU Pui-yuk thanked SSPDO for responding proactively to residents' requests and enquired about the commencement date of the year-end cleaning service and the estimated number of buildings to be benefited. She continued to suggest that upon completion of the cleaning service, the Department could put up notices at the conspicuous places of the buildings to remind residents to keep the common areas clean and could distribute face masks to them to reduce the risk of being exposed to infection. She also urged FEHD to step up efforts to clean the back lanes of buildings and conduct rodent control work to improve the overall environmental hygiene.

64. Mr Jay LI enquired about the target user and commencement date of the year-end cleaning service and suggested that the "DAS" should include cleaning of common areas and disposal of rubbish. He added that it would take time to set up the OCs and the Department should implement short-term measures to improve the environmental hygiene of the "three-nil" buildings. Moreover, he also commended the solar-powered mobile refuse compactors ("SMRCs"), which were deployed to Sham Shui Po for trial use, for their effectiveness in improving the odour problem, and hoped for further trial runs in the district.

65. The Chairman said that the placing of large refuse bins and the provision of one-off cleaning service could not treat the root cause. Apart from assisting in the formation of OCs, SSPDO should also take the initiative to co-ordinate the collection of household waste from the "three-nil" buildings, such as assisting them in hiring outsourced service contractors to collect waste, so as to improve environmental hygiene in practice.

66. Mr Simon TAM provided a consolidated response by saying that Members' suggestions were noted and he would contact the residents of the "three-nil" buildings through the Resident Liaison Ambassadors to deal with the removal of waste. The SSPDO's special year-end cleaning service was expected to commence in January next year, but would not overlap with the "DAS". If Members were aware of any buildings with serious rubbish accumulation problems in common areas such as staircases, wells and canopies, they might provide information to SSPDO for follow-up action. In addition, the "DAS" also included the use of diluted bleach to clean and disinfect the floor of the common areas, and SSPDO had distributed two boxes of face masks to each resident of the "three-nil" buildings a month ago.

67. Mr Edwin HUI gave a consolidated response by saying that the pilot scheme for the use of SMRCs in various districts launched by FEHD was found to be effective, but the suppliers had reported that the electricity in storage batteries, which was generated from solar energy, was not sufficient for long-term operation and thus the scheme could not be pressed on for the time being. Moreover, the Department had started to put up notices at the conspicuous places at the main entrances and exits of the "three-nil" buildings to indicate the locations of the nearby refuse collection points so that residents can properly

dispose of their household waste. The Department would continue to work with SSPDO to actively complement the implementation of “DAS” for enhancement of street cleaning services and pest control work in the back lanes near the target buildings.

68. The Chairman concluded that he was pleased to note that SSPDO would provide year-end cleaning services to the buildings in need in the district, and hoped that through the above services, residents would be encouraged to dispose of waste properly everyday to maintain the environmental hygiene of their buildings. Also, it was noted that the “DAS” would continue to provide a one-off cleaning service for the “three-nil” buildings and suggested assisting the “three-nil” buildings in hiring outsourced service contractors for refuse collection.

(f) How to implement the “Modular Social Housing Scheme” to facilitate its role in providing transitional housing- using the project of “Nam Cheong 220” as an example (SSPDC Paper 124/ 21)

69. Mr Jay LI introduced Paper 124/21.

70. The Chairman said that Members could refer to the consolidated Response Paper 124a/21 submitted by the Transport and Housing Bureau (“THB”) and the Home Affairs Bureau (“HAB”).

71. Mr Charles HO responded that the Hong Kong Council of Social Service (“HKCSS”) took up a lease of land from the landowner of “Nam Cheong 220” in late 2017 for a two-year Modular Social Housing Scheme (“MSHS”), which was formally occupied in August 2020 and the land tenure would expire in December 2022. As HKCSS had to return the land to the landowner when necessary, it had been in constant communication with the parties concerned to have knowledge of the development of the land and to confirm the actual evacuation date for relocation arrangement.

72. Mr CHOI Sai-kit added that as at November, eight households had been allocated PRH units and 13 applications were being followed up by HKHA. The average waiting time of existing households for PRH was about seven years. As an operator, Tung Wah Group of Hospitals would have regular meetings with the tenants to understand their living conditions, future housing preferences and plans for moving out, and would help them apply for other modular social housing if necessary.

73. Mr Jay LI expressed disappointment that no representatives from government departments were present at the meeting. “Nam Cheong 220” was the first “MSHS” developed on a privately owned land, but the Government had not taken it forward in terms of policy, and the operator was responsible for the design, construction, operation and

assistance in the relocation and rehousing of residents. He added that the construction of modular social housing would tie in with the current housing policy, but the rate of the tenants of “Nam Cheong 220” who were successfully housed to PRH was low and could not serve its “transitional” purpose. It had been learnt that the Government intended to implement the “MSHS” on privately owned lands in the Northern Metropolis in the New Territories, and he hoped that the relevant departments and operators would look into ways to improve efficiency.

74. Ms Janet NG thought that the purpose of transitional housing should be to cope with emergency situations and said that residents affected by the fire incident in Pak Tin Estate earlier might not need to stay in the temporary shelters if there was sufficient supply of transitional housing. She added that it was a waste of resources to construct the modular social housing units and disassemble them after two years, and increasing the supply of PRH was the key to solving the housing problem in the long run, but the current slow progress of PRH construction had resulted in an excessively long waiting time.

75. Mr Jay LI enquired about the relocation arrangements for tenants of “Nam Cheong 220” upon expiry of their tenancies and pointed out that if the organisation arranged for tenants to move to another transitional housing, it might affect the waiting time of other applicants.

76. Ms LAU Pui-yuk said that expediting the construction of public housing was the best way to solve the problem of inadequate housing, however, the target of shortening the waiting time for PRH to three years would be difficult to achieve in the short term. The tenants of “Nam Cheong 220” were aware of the two-year tenancy period before they moved in. As far as she knew, the purpose of transitional housing was to alleviate the hardship faced by families on the PRH waiting list and other families and people who were inadequately housed. The Government did not guarantee that all tenants would be offered PRH units within the tenancy period. She added that she hoped that THB would help to rehouse the tenants of “Nam Cheong 220” properly.

77. The Chairman said that landowners were required to give pledges of period of land use to the operators to avoid any discrepancy between tenants’ expectation and actual tenure. He added that the Government should position the use of transitional housing and review the need to guarantee that all households would be offered PRH units within the tenure. In addition, THB should also review the planning, relocation and rehousing arrangements for the “MSHS”.

78. Mr Charles HO gave a consolidated response by saying that the land use period of “Nam Cheong 220” was five years and the occupancy period for the tenants was two years, which was the same as the pre-occupancy commitment. The modular social housing

constructed with “Modular Integrated Construction” method at that time would facilitate quicker reuse after disassembly and increase its cost effectiveness. The organisation was discussing the arrangements to relocate the components after the disassembly of “Nam Cheong 220” with the Buildings Department and THB. HKCSS intended to encourage tenants to apply for other social housing three months before the expiry of their tenancies and to assist those who had not yet applied for PRH to find suitable accommodation or apply for emergency relief to lighten their burden of relocation. As for the residence eligibility, applicants must be individuals or families who were proven to be in need of transitional housing and had been waiting for PRH for at least three years, or currently living in inadequate housing and in urgent need for community support.

79. Mr CHOI Sai-kit gave a supplementary response by saying that all households in “Nam Cheong 220” had been waiting for PRH for more than three years. The organisation would provide support and services to the households to enable them to learn about different community resources, enhance their life skills and assist those who had not been offered any PRH units in relocation.

80. Mr Jay LI said that there was no security of tenure for transitional housing on privately owned lands as the operator would have to surrender the land as and when required by the landowner, and he doubted its effectiveness. He added that there would be a number of “MSHSs” to be launched in the future, with a larger number of flats to be constructed, and he was concerned about the rehousing arrangements for tenants after the “MSHSs” ended.

81. The Chairman concluded that “Nam Cheong 220” was the first “MSHS” developed on a privately owned land and that the Government should review its effectiveness in due course. He added that the “Modular Integrated Construction” method could expedite the subsequent implementation of modular social housing projects. In addition, he hoped that the operators would help those who had not been offered PRH units, and that the Government should provide one-stop, coordinated support for future “MSHSs” developed on privately owned lands.

82. Ms Carman NG said that she hoped HKCSS could submit a paper to DC to report on the follow-up actions and the number of households that had been offered PRH units.

83. Mr Charles HO said that a paper could be submitted to DC upon completion of the “MSHS”.

84. The District Officer clarified that the temporary shelters provided by SSPDO were mainly used to cope with emergency situations and had nothing to do with the transitional housing policy. Furthermore, after the fire incident in Pak Tin Estate, SSPDO had secured free hotel rooms in the district for the affected residents, but the residents opted to stay in the

temporary shelter after due consideration. He went on saying that some of the content of the above discussion might involve the territory-wide transitional housing policy and SSPDO would examine whether it was outside the remit of DC, and would handle it in accordance with the established procedures if necessary.

(g) The Hong Kong Settlers Housing Corporation Limited is incapable of properly rehousing the residents Carrie Lam's government must provide assistance (SSPDC Paper 125/21)

85. Mr Jay LI introduced Paper 125/21.

86. The Chairman said that before the meeting, the Secretariat had invited THB and the Hong Kong Settlers Housing Corporation Limited ("HKSHCL") to the meeting but were declined by the parties concerned. He continued to ask Members to refer to the Response Paper 125a/21 submitted by THB.

87. Miss Jessica HO said that HKSHCL and URA had submitted planning applications to TPB for minor relaxation of the plot ratio, height and non-building areas restrictions mainly in accordance with the development parameters of the comprehensive development area under the OZP to meet the objectives of the redevelopment project, including the provision of about 1 300 rental units for rehousing the existing tenants by the HKSHCL and about 2 000 residential units of Starter Homes by URA. TPB received the above applications on 18 October and collected public views under the Town Planning Ordinance on 29 October for three weeks. Members of the public could submit their views to the TPB Secretariat by 19 November. In general, the TPB would consider planning applications within two months upon receipt of such applications. In processing the applications, PlanD would seek departmental views on technical aspects such as traffic conditions, air quality and circulation, and would also submit the public views to TPB for consideration.

88. Mr Jay LI said that the Government had mentioned in the past three years' Policy Addresses that it would assist in the redevelopment project, but had not yet identified the department responsible for it. He expressed disappointment that HKSHCL did not attend the meeting and did not consult DC on the redevelopment project. He considered that the ex-gratia rent allowance disbursed by HKSHCL to the residents was not a "proper rehousing" arrangement. He hoped that the relevant government departments would explain the redevelopment and rehousing arrangements and help rehouse the residents of Tai Hang Sai Estate properly.

89. The Chairman said that the Government was also concerned about the redevelopment of Tai Hang Sai Estate, which had been mentioned in the past two Policy Addresses. He added that the results of a survey conducted by concern groups showed that

residents were dissatisfied with the “move out first, move back later” arrangement. Moreover, there were many elderly tenants in the estate and it would be extremely inconvenient for them to move twice. He suggested that HD should rehouse the residents to PRH and that some of the units could be dedicated to PRH waiting list upon the completion of the redevelopment of Tai Hang Sai Estate. He also suggested writing to urge HKSHCL and THB to negotiate with the residents to reach a consensus on the relocation arrangements.

90. Mr Jay LI said that as key stakeholders such as HKSHCL and THB were not present at this meeting, he wished to withdraw the motion in the discussion paper and move a provisional motion.

91. The Chairman stated that the withdrawal of the motion in the paper required the consent of the Members present. However, a quorum was not present, and he declared that the meeting would be adjourned for two minutes.

[The meeting was adjourned for two minutes.]

92. The Chairman announced that the meeting was resumed. He asked Mr Jay LI if he intended to move a provisional motion.

93. Mr Jay LI reiterated that he would like to withdraw the motion in the paper and gave reasons for moving a provisional motion.

94. The Chairman stated that according to the Sham Shui Po District Council Standing Orders, no motion could be withdrawn unless it was unanimously agreed to by the Members present (excluding abstentions).

95. Since no Member voted against it or abstained from voting, the meeting unanimously agreed to withdraw the motion in the paper.

96. Mr Jay LI said that Members could refer to the letter submitted to DC by the Concern Group on the Rights of Tai Hang Sai Estate Residents. He continued to introduce the Provisional Motion, which read as follows:

“Strongly demands TPB to suspend the vetting and approval of planning application A/K4/76 and forge consensus to start redevelopment”

SSPDC strongly demands TPB to suspend the processing of planning application A/K4/76 for the following reasons:

1. HKSHCL and URA' s relocation arrangement to “move out first and move back later” is obviously not accepted and recognised by the residents of Tai Hang Sai Estate. According to the findings of a survey conducted by the Concern Group on the Rights of Tai Hang Sai Estate Residents and the Mutual Aid Committees of eight blocks of the estate at the end of last month, of the 644 households successfully interviewed, over 99% considered that the “move out first, move back later” rehousing arrangement unilaterally introduced by HKSHCL and URA could not properly rehouse the residents. Without proper rehousing, how can the first important objective of the planning application A/K4/76 be achieved?

2. Over the past five years, HKSHCL kept refusing to discuss the redevelopment of Tai Hang Sai Estate and the rehousing of its residents with the resident organisations and representatives of Tai Hang Sai Estate. How can a consensus on redevelopment and rehousing be reached without any contact and discussion? This is obviously contrary to the outcome of the deliberations on the redevelopment of Tai Hang Sai Estate at the TPB meeting in 2016. According to the above-mentioned household opinion survey of Tai Hang Sai Estate, nearly 90% of the interviewed households also felt that TPB should suspend the processing, approval and vetting of the planning application A/K4/76 until HKSHCL and the residents have discussed and reached a consensus on the rehousing arrangements.

3. To suspend the processing, approval and vetting of applications so that HKSHCL can re-examine the relevant redevelopment and rehousing arrangements and seriously address the rehousing needs and aspirations of the tenants. Also, to consider making a submission to the SAR Government on lending PRH units in the district to help meet the rehousing needs of the residents, with a view to reaching a consensus on rehousing and starting redevelopment!'

97. The meeting voted on the Provisional Motion by open ballot and the result was as follows:

For: Mr CHUM Tak-shing, Mr Jay LI, Ms Janet NG (3)

Against: (0)

Abstain: (0)

98. The Secretary announced the voting result: 3 Members voted for it, no Member voted against it and no Member abstained. The Chairman declared that the Provisional Motion was carried.

99. The Chairman concluded that he hoped that the representatives of PlanD would forward the outcome of the discussion at this meeting to TPB for consideration and that HKSHCL could discuss the rehousing arrangements with the residents, and he reiterated that the provision of ex-gratia rent allowance was not the most appropriate arrangement to meet the needs of the residents.

(h) Concern over the effectiveness of providing pre-arranged transport to take residents to receive vaccination in Sham Shui Po District and the arrangements for the Community Vaccination Centre in the district (SSPDC Paper 126/21)

100. Mr Ramon YUEN introduced Paper 126/21.

101. The Chairman said that before the meeting, the Secretariat had invited representatives of the Civil Service Bureau to the meeting but were declined by the Bureau. Members were asked to refer to the Response Paper 126a/21. He went on saying that no response or follow-up would be made as some departments considered that the content of Question 3 of the paper was not compatible with the functions of DC.

102. The District Officer responded that coaches to provide “dedicated vaccination transport service” (“Coaches”) were arranged, in response to the demand, to take elderly persons from four housing estates in the district to and from the vaccination centre once daily.

103. The Chairman asked whether the Government would make arrangements if local organisations in the district were interested in participating in the Coach scheme.

104. The District Officer responded that SSPDO welcomed suggestions from organisations for encouraging residents to receive vaccinations.

105. Ms Janet NG enquired about the details of the third dose of the COVID-19 vaccine as the residents in the district were concerned, and pointed out that relaying the views of the local residents to the Government was also a district level issue, and therefore could not understand why the departments concerned stated that certain content of the paper was not compatible with the functions of DC.

106. The Chairman said that Mr Ramon YUEN just now asked in his speech whether residents of Fu Cheong Estate and Hoi Lai Estate could receive the third dose of the COVID-19 vaccine and his verbal enquiry was directly related to the residents of this district.

107. Mr Ramon YUEN felt that all the questions in Paper 126/21 were related to local residents, and he would like to enquire about the vaccination arrangements as the Government had previously made reference to experts' recommendations that the third dose of the COVID-19 vaccine be given to eligible persons under certain groups. Also, he wished to know why the Coaches only transported residents to the Community Vaccination Centre at Kwun Chung Sports Centre in Jordan.

108. The Chairman concluded that it was recommended to check with the bureau and relevant departments whether the Coach service would be extended to encourage the public to receive vaccinations.

Agenda Item 3: Follow-up matters

(a) Proposed Study of the Working Group on Healthy and Safe Community

109. The Chairman advised that this item was a matter arising. He continued to enquire if SSPDO would supplement anything to the approval of the funding authority for the Community Involvement Project ("CIP").

110. Mr Ramon YUEN said that the Acting District Officer had indicated at the last meeting that a meeting could be arranged in early October to clarify the technical aspects of the proposed study if necessary; however, no meeting had been arranged and he would like to enquire the reasons. He also enquired about the administrative arrangements following the LegCo's approval of the withdrawal of DC's funding authority for the CIP.

111. The District Officer said that HAB and HAD were originally scheduled to submit a paper to the LegCo Panel on Home Affairs in early October to discuss the "Revising the Arrangements for Implementing CIP and District Minor Works Programme", but the discussion was subsequently postponed, and SSPDO had to await the outcome of the discussion at LegCo before adjusting the funding approval process and arrangements. He added that the LegCo finally approved the proposed revisions to the above-mentioned paper on 22 October. All funding under CIP would be used by HAD, DOs and LCSD, taking into account the views of the communities, to propose organising projects featuring local characteristics or worthy of funding under CIP, with a view to promoting harmony in the district.

112. Mr Ramon YUEN said that DCs should reflect the needs of the districts. There were academic institutions and community health organisations that wanted to collect the data on community diagnosis so as to provide more appropriate services to residents. He asked whether SSPDO would consider carrying out the above study.

113. The Chairman asked whether the above proposal was based on the previous “Community Diagnosis Report” survey.

114. Mr Ramon YUEN said that the above proposal was broadly in line with the direction of the survey in the “Community Diagnosis Report”. He asked if SSPDO would consider conducting the study.

115. The Chairman enquired about the channels for DC to make proposals and the approval criteria of SSPDO.

116. The District Officer said that SSPDO welcomed and was willing to listen to any suggestions that would be conducive to promoting harmony in the community. As for the study mentioned by Members, SSPDO would need to have more concrete details before considering whether it was worthwhile to implement. In addition, organisations or groups would generally apply for funding under CIP themselves to organise activities.

117. The Chairman enquired whether certain specific criteria had to be met if any organisations or groups were interested in applying for funding.

118. Mr Ramon YUEN said that apart from the recurrent funding, he suggested that the Government could consider adjusting the cap and opening up specific funding themes for organisations or groups to apply. Moreover, he enquired about the follow-up arrangements for the funding applications of the Working Group on Community Involvement and District Publicity (“WGCIDP”) and the Working Group on the Conservation Work of the Service Reservoir at Mission Hill.

119. The District Officer said that the revised CIP funding arrangements had taken immediate effect after the approval of the LegCo. In short, funding applications that had not yet been processed by SSPDC would be processed in accordance with the revised funding mechanism; funded activities that had already been approved, i.e. those for which approval letters had been issued to the applicants, would not be affected and could continue in the current financial year in accordance with the funding criteria and the requirements set out in the approval letters.

120. The Chairman said that DC had not yet approved the funding application of the WGCIDP and therefore the application would not be classified as an approved funded activity.

121. Ms Janet NG said that in the past, the annual calendars, wall calendars and calendars produced by DC were printed with information about DC Members for residents to seek help easily. She enquired whether SSPDO would produce the above publicity

materials this year and about the distribution arrangement.

122. The District Officer understood that the residents had a keen demand for calendars, and Spring Festival couplets, etc. SSPDO would follow it up and make reference to the previous distribution arrangements.

[Post-meeting note: SSPDO distributed calendars and Spring Festival couplets to local organisations and DC Members' ward offices in December 2021.]

123. The Chairman said that he understood SSPDO had to act prudently, but as the year was coming to an end, he reminded SSPDO to follow it up as soon as possible.

124. Ms Janet NG said that she would inform the residents that SSPDO was dealing with the publicity materials.

125. The Chairman concluded that under the current practice, DC could submit proposals for funding activities for the Government's consideration.

Agenda Item 4: Reports from the Committees under the District Council

(a) Reports from the Committees

- (i) District Facilities and Community Affairs Committee (SSPDC Paper 127/21)
- (ii) Environment, Hygiene and Housing Affairs Committee (SSPDC Paper 128/21)
- (iii) Planning Development and Transport Affairs Committee (SSPDC Paper 129/21)

126. The meeting noted and endorsed the content of the aforesaid reports.

Agenda Item 5: Any other business

(a) Arrangement for co-opted members

127. The Chairman said that in view of the restructuring of the SSPDC, the Secretariat would arrange nomination for co-opted members and the drawing of lots after the meeting.

128. The meeting noted and endorsed the above arrangements.

(b) Timetable of Meetings of SSPDC and its Committees in 2022

129. The Chairman stated that a proposed amendment had been received prior to the meeting.

130. Mr Ramon YUEN said that he would like to amend the meeting dates of the Environment, Hygiene and Housing Affairs Committee, and Planning Development and Transport Affairs Committee in July next year; from 14 July and 21 July to 12 July and 14 July 2022 respectively.

131. The meeting noted and endorsed the above proposal.

Agenda Item 6: Date of next meeting

132. The next meeting would be held at 9:30 a.m. on 11 January 2022 (Tuesday).

133. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 3:43 p.m.

District Council Secretariat
Sham Shui Po District Office
January 2022