

Sha Tin District Council
Minutes of the 3rd Meeting of
the Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee in 2018

Date : 5 July 2018 (Thursday)
Time : 10:00 am
Venue : Sha Tin District Council Conference Room
 4/F, Sha Tin Government Offices

<u>Present</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Time of joining the meeting</u>	<u>Time of leaving the meeting</u>
Mr CHIU Man-leong (Chairman)	DC Member	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Ms CHAN Man-kuen (Vice-Chairman)	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Mr HO Hau-cheung, SBS, MH	DC Chairman	10:16 am	12:35 pm
Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas, SBS, JP	DC Vice-Chairman	10:04 am	12:33 pm
Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	DC Member	10:13 am	11:39 am
Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, James	"	10:18 am	12:35 pm
Mr CHAN Nok-hang	"	10:28 am	11:38 am
Mr CHENG Tsuk-man	"	10:24 am	12:35 pm
Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Sunny	"	10:09 am	11:39 am
Mr HUI Yui-yu, Rick	"	10:04 am	11:45 am
Mr LAI Tsz-yan	"	10:14 am	12:35 pm
Ms LAM Chung-yan	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Mr LEE Chi-wing, Alvin, MH	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Mr LEUNG Ka-fai, Victor	"	10:04 am	11:34 am
Mr LI Sai-hung	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Mr LI Sai-wing	"	11:25 am	12:35 pm
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	"	10:04 am	12:34 pm
Mr MAK Yun-pui	"	11:28 am	12:30 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Ms PONG Scarlett Oi-lan, BBS, JP	"	10:04 am	11:06 am
Mr PUN Kwok-shan, MH, JP	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Mr SIU Hin-hong	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Mr TING Tsz-yuen	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Mr TONG Hok-leung	"	10:09 am	12:35 pm
Ms TSANG So-lai	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Ms TUNG Kin-lei	"	10:04 am	10:24 am
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Mr WONG Fu-sang, Tiger	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Mr WONG Hok-lai	"	10:04 am	12:21 pm
Mr WONG Ka-wing, MH	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Mr WONG Yue-hon	"	11:04 am	12:35 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun	"	10:04 am	11:01 am
Mr YIU Ka-chun, MH	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael	"	10:04 am	12:35 pm
Ms LUK Tsz-sum, Ada (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council) 2 / Sha Tin District Office		

In Attendance

Ms LEE Po-yee

Ms LI Wing-size, Grace

Miss LEE Mei-yee

Miss CHAN Siu-kin, Ester

Mr LEUNG Cheuk-ming, Rico

Ms SAM Fung-mei, Esther

Ms YAU Ming-wai, Nellie

Ms CHENG Siu-ling, Katy

Ms LEUNG Wai-shan, Cecilia

Mr YUEN Chun-kit, Derek

Title

Senior Community Relations Officer /

Independent Commission Against Corruption

Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Sha Tin) 2 /
Social Welfare Department

Senior Librarian (Sha Tin) /

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Sha Tin /
Leisure and Cultural Services DepartmentSenior Manager (New Territories East) Promotion /
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Manager (New Territories East) Marketing and

District Activities / Leisure and Cultural Services Department
School Development Officer (Sha Tin) 11 / Education Bureau

Chief Liaison Officer / Sha Tin District Office

Senior Liaison Officer (West) / Sha Tin District Office

Senior Executive Officer (District Council) /

Sha Tin District Office

In Attendance by Invitation

Ms CHEUNG Yuk-shan, Linda

Ms LEUNG So-ping, Selina

Mr CHEUNG Hang-yiu, Galax

Ms LO Lai-fong, Jackie

Miss CHAU Po-chu, Sharon

Ms AU Wai-ha

Mr WONG Chi-wai

Ms CHENG Yuen-yi, Janny

Mr LUI Kan-man, Raymond

Mr CHAN Siu-tai, Andrew

Miss LAW Wai-yee, Amy

Miss SHEK Nga-wing, Irene

Mr CHAN Ka-cheung, Vincent

Mr KOO Siu-lung, Roy

Ms OR Man, Flicka

Miss CHEUNG Sau-ki, Jessica

Mr CHAN Sheung, Sam

Mr LEUNG Lung-kei

Title

Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 2 /

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 1 /

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Executive Officer (Planning) 1/2 /

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

District Leisure Manager (Sha Tin) /

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Senior Librarian (Planning and Development) /

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Chief Health Inspector 1 /

Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Senior Health Inspector (Environmental Hygiene) 1 /

Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Senior Executive Officer (District Management) /

Sha Tin District Office

Liaison Officer In-charge (West) 4 / Sha Tin District Office

Liaison Officer In-charge (Youth Programmes) /

Sha Tin District Office

Executive Assistant (District Council) 4 / Sha Tin District Office

Liaison Officer (West) 3a / Sha Tin District Office

Executive Assistant (District Council) 7 / Sha Tin District Office

Liaison Officer In-charge (East) 5 / Sha Tin District Office

Liaison Officer In-charge (East) 4 / Sha Tin District Office

Liaison Officer (East) 4a / Sha Tin District Office

Liaison Officer (East) 4b / Sha Tin District Office

Acting Divisional Commander (New Territories East) /

Fire Services Department

<u>Absent</u>	<u>Title</u>	
Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS	DC Member	(Application for leave of absence received)
Ms WONG Ping-fan, Iris	”	(”)
Mr YIP Wing	”	(”)
Ms YUE Shin-man	”	(”)

Action

The Chairman welcomed Members, representatives of government departments and organisations to the meeting.

Applications for Leave of Absence

2. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had received the applications for leave of absence in writing from the following members:

Mr MOK Kam-kwai	Official commitment
Ms Iris WONG	”
Mr YIP Wing	”
Ms YUE Shin-man	”

3. Members unanimously approved the applications for leave of absence submitted by the members above.

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 26 April 2018 (CSCDC Minutes 2/2018)

4. Members unanimously confirmed the above minutes of the meeting.

Matters Arising

Responses of Government Departments to Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting (Paper No. CSCD 34/2018)

5. Mr Thomas PANG said that his provisional motion jointly moved with Ms Scarlett PONG at the previous meeting had mentioned that it was hoped that the complex building in Fo Tan area would be listed as a priority project, while the proposed facilities for the project “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103” would be discussed this day for potential endorsement. He opined that after completing the project of “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103”, preparatory work should commence for the complex building in Fo Tan, in order to address actual needs.

6. The views of Mr YAU Man-chun were summarised below:

- (a) the second item in the paper involved the response of the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) to the allegation of its inadequate enforcement against noise nuisance along Shing Mun River. He hoped that the Police would be asked to clearly state after the meeting when the last summon had been issued. As far as he was aware, the Police had told Mr WAI Hing-cheung that one summon had been issue in that regard this year. He would like to learn about the details of the said summon. He opined that the said summon could become a reference case. If relevant details were provided, the case could be cited as a warning to possible offenders when

members reported to residents or staff of the Sha Tin District Office (STDC) who carried out on-site work in future;

- (b) besides, the Police had responded that it would “deploy officers to handle each complaint on site”. He opined that the response was inconsistent with the facts. He cited the reference numbers mentioned in the minutes of the first meeting this year, saying that for several of those complaints, the Police did not send officers to the scene or take follow-up actions. He opined that inadequate enforcement was indeed a fact; and
- (c) he said that this response of the Police was more detailed than before, but he doubted whether the problem was caused by insufficient manpower. The Police always encouraged members of the public to come forward and become prosecution witnesses. He asked whether the Police had needed any members of the public to come forward for the said summon. He opined that if the Police were determined to enforce the law, the current situation would not have happened. Now, however, little improvement had been made for the issue. He hoped that the Police could strengthen law enforcement, so that the current situation would not become out of control.

7. Ms Scarlett PONG said that the provisional motion jointly moved with Mr Thomas PANG at the previous meeting mentioned the necessity of implementing the project of the complex building in Fo Tan as soon as possible. Over the past few years, public rental housing (PRH) and the Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) had been developing successfully in the area, where the residents were very supportive of the Government. The PRH units in Fo Tan would be completed in 2019, while the HOS ones would be completed and put up for sale in 2020. She said that there were not any supporting facilities in Fo Tan Industrial Estate for existing or future residents. As members of the public were starting to move into Fo Tan, She hoped that priority could be given to early completion of the complex in line with drainage greening and water body revitalisation.

8. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he said that during the discussion on the relevant provisional motion at the previous meeting, Members had understood that more time would be needed for preparation for the expansion works of Sha Tin Public Library. Therefore, the CSCDC had passed the motion, requesting that priority be given to the complex in Fo Tan area. Therefore, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) should place the project of “Redevelopment of Fo Tan Cooked Food Market, Sha Tin” before the expansion works of Sha Tin Public Library. In other words, preparatory work for the complex in Fo Tan should commence upon the completion of the project of “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103”. He urged the LCSD to follow up the matter; and
- (b) regarding the noise nuisance along Shing Mun River as mentioned by Mr YAU Man-chun, he said that the matter had been discussed at the District Facilities Management Committee (DFMC) of the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) the day before. It was planned to build planters at the relevant location with funds for district minor works, so as to prevent people from gathering at the location and to avoid causing noise nuisance. As for the

details of the summon mentioned in the response, he asked the Secretariat to contact the Police after the meeting and provide relevant information to Mr YAU Man-chun.

Discussion Items

Proposed Facilities of Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103 (Paper No. CSCD 46/2018)

9. Ms Selina LEUNG, Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 1 of the LCSD briefly introduced the contents of the paper.

10. The views of Mr TING Tsz-yuen were summarised below:

- (a) he thanked the LCSD for its efforts in response to members' comments, such as the addition of an indoor jogging track;
- (b) regarding the public car park under item F in the paper, he said that there were currently not less than 200 parking spaces available at the site. He hoped that the LCSD would provide not less than 200 parking spaces for nearby residents in future; and
- (c) he said that the pedestrian flow at On Luk Street would increase upon the completion of related facilities. At present, there was only one pedestrian crossing at Ma On Shan Road, located between Ma On Shan Police Station and Sunshine City. There were no exits at other sections, while one was available at more than 100 metres' walk to Sai Sha Road. He hoped that relevant government departments would consider providing more crossing facilities for public convenience. He moved a provisional motion in this regard.

11. The views of Mr SIU Hin-hong were summarised below:

- (a) he wondered whether the LCSD had related data to support the number of the relevant proposed facilities. The paper showed that there would be a table tennis room. He asked whether the LCSD was aware of the community needs in this regard. He opined that only one such room would be inadequate, since many elderly persons or retirees learned to play table tennis. He suggested that the number of facilities be determined based on the demographic distribution in the community and the necessity for related facilities; and
- (b) he said that all the facilities were currently located indoor. He opined that outdoor facilities such as outdoor sports climbing walls could be installed. He opined that from the environmental point of view, the rooftop could be used as a ball court, such as a pitch for five-a-side football or handball, so that users could bathe in the sun and become healthier.

12. The views of Ms Scarlett PONG were summarised below:

- (a) she expressed support for the construction of the proposed facilities,

including a new indoor jogging track, an outdoor sports climbing wall and a multi-purpose room for book display and educational activities;

- (b) she asked whether there would be separate breastfeeding cubicles in the proposed baby-sitting room; and
- (c) she wondered whether an elderly reading zone could be provided as well, with seats and materials suitable for senior citizens, so that they could read comfortably in the zone.

13. The views of Mr Tiger WONG were summarised below:

- (a) he asked whether the LCSD considered accepting applications by organisations for using two multi-purpose activity rooms or ball courts as balance bike courses, since children aged between three and six needed to ride their balance bikes in a safe environment. He opined that the LCSD should make the venues open for hiring by relevant organisations or individuals, in accordance with the request of local residents; and
- (b) he hoped that the LCSD would learn a lesson from the problem of Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre and avoid repeating such mistakes as insufficient water pressure, inadequate partitions, poor reception of Wi-Fi or mobile phone signals, etc.

14. The views of Mr YIU Ka-chun were summarised below:

- (a) he welcomed the LCSD's decision to install more facilities, including an indoor jogging track, after the discussion at the previous meeting. He said that the proportion of toilets and shower facilities at Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre and district libraries were very inadequate. He hoped that the LCSD would build facilities in a more appropriate proportion;
- (b) he hoped that the poor reception of mobile phone and Wi-Fi could be resolved before the opening;
- (c) he said that LCSD venues such as Sha Tin Park or Sports Ground were all equipped with tuck shops. He asked whether the proposed Sports Centre would be equipped with similar shops, such as those jointly operated with social enterprises. If there was no plan for such tuck shops at the moment, he asked the LCSD to consider the option in order to serve users of the facilities;
- (d) he cited Yuen Chau Kok Community Hall as an example, saying that the venue was satisfactory as a whole, but some performers complained about inadequate depth and width of the stage. He hoped that such views could be taken into account in design of the proposed community hall;
- (e) he asked whether the LCSD had considered providing a study room for students and other people in need so that they could have a proper place for studying and reading;

- (f) he asked whether partitioning arrangement would be considered for the auditorium and the conference rooms of the community hall. If yes, he hoped that the LCSD would learn a lesson from previous experiences, with suitable measures and arrangements of acoustic insulation to users' satisfaction; and
- (g) regarding the public car park, he said that there were a large number of temporary parking spaces at the construction site. He enquired about the proportion of spaces among private cars, minibuses/school buses and other vehicles. In addition, he said that members of the public might go to the venue by bicycle. He asked whether a bicycle parking area would be designated.

15. The views of Mr Alvin LEE were summarised below:

- (a) he welcomed the LCSD's submission of the revised proposal to optimise the relevant facilities. He hoped that members would support the revised proposal, since no works had been carried out at the site for many years. Most importantly, the heated swimming pool had been a request by local residents for many years. Therefore, he hoped that related works could commence as soon as possible;
- (b) he hoped that the LCSD could reserve space in the design for building footbridges connecting to different places, including Sunshine City Plaza and the sports centre. He pointed out that many residents would use the sports centre. It would be very circuitous to go to the venue via the pedestrian subway or the road. He wondered whether the relevant proposal was feasible. He hoped that the LCSD would explore ways to facilitate public access to the sports centre so as to boost the utilisation rate;
- (c) he hoped that the LCSD would reserve space in the sports centre for services to be provided by other government departments, such as the Transport Department (TD) and the Social Welfare Department (SWD); and
- (d) he said that it would be difficult for the LCSD to manage more than 200 parking spaces, whether in terms of design, operation or management. He wondered whether the car park could be relocated, provided that the total number of parking spaces remained unchanged in the design of the sports centre. By so doing, the number of parking spaces in the building would be reduced, in order to save public money, streamline the building design and vacate more room for other services. He pointed out that there was plenty of room for parking spaces under the footbridges along the Ma On Shan Line.

16. The views of Mr Wilson LI were summarised below:

- (a) he welcomed the LCSD's decision to take public opinion into account by adding a heated swimming pool, a car park, a jogging track, a sports climbing wall and a multi-functional room for book display and educational activities. He suggested that the LCSD make more efforts to

enhance publicity of the climbing wall and the multi-purpose room so as to boost their utilisation rates;

- (b) he hoped that the LCSD would consider increasing the number of parking spaces in the target car park to more than 200, for the sake of public convenience. As for the types of vehicles, he suggested that consideration be given to both space and safety, such as the safety at entrances and exits, while taking into account the needs of large vehicles as well;
- (c) he said that residents in different areas had a keen demand for sports centres. He hoped that the project “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103” would be implemented as soon as possible, and that the one in Area 111 would be promptly carried out upon completion of “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103”;
- (d) he hoped that the LCSD would pay attention to the height of the outdoor sports climbing wall and the volume of sound produced;
- (e) he said that the rooftop could be converted into an enclosed football pitch or basketball courts if there was room for optimisation; and
- (f) he hoped that the LCSD would consider a more aesthetic and environmentally friendly design, such as integrating local elements or installing solar panels.

17. The views of Mr Michael YUNG were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the LCSD had responded to some of members’ requests. He asked whether the indoor jogging track would be open on a 24/7 basis and whether it would be closed during major events;
- (b) he enquired about the location of the outdoor sports climbing wall, saying that an inappropriate location might lead to infringement on the privacy of residents nearby;
- (c) he would like to learn about the multi-purpose room for book display and educational activities to be located within the Hong Kong Public Libraries New Book Central Processing Centre (New Book Centre), where diversified cultural exhibitions themed with reading would be held. He asked whether the LCSD would consider organising thematic events concurrently with such exhibitions in order to promote reading and to remind borrowers to take good care of books;
- (d) he said that some residents had earlier taken actions in response to the Housing Department’s decision to resume the public car park for goods vehicles on Hang Chi Street. He said that parking spaces for goods vehicles were insufficient in Sha Tin and Ma On Shan areas. When meeting with Legislative Council Members last year, he had also requested the provision of more parking spaces for goods vehicles in the district. He asked whether the relevant public car park would be equipped with a loading/unloading area for heavy vehicles for parking of such vehicles at night, so as to solve

the problem of insufficient parking spaces in the district;

- (e) he did not agree to reducing the size of the car park. He said that parking spaces for all kinds of vehicles were currently insufficient in Ma On Shan. He pointed out that resuming the land to build a sports centre would result in tight supply of parking spaces in the area. He opined that it was only reasonable to provide parking spaces of the same number as the existing temporary ones;
- (f) he said that what Mr CHENG Tsuk-man had mentioned should be the partitioning arrangement for the conference rooms in Yuen Chau Kok Community Hall on Fridays. It was a fact that the acoustic insulation there was unsatisfactory. As far as he was aware, the DFMC had cancelled the partitioning arrangement for the said conference rooms on 28 June this year, because during its inspection, the related working group had pointed out to the LCSD that the partitioning materials and arrangement failed to block the noises of dynamic activities. If the partitioning arrangement should continue, he asked how the LCSD would improve the design; and
- (g) he said that the LCSD would apply to the Legislative Council for funding, despite the fact that the paper under discussion this day did not provide details about the final provision of parking spaces or about the implementation of other facilities. He wondered whether the LCSD would further consult the CSCDC on the detailed design in future.

18. The views of Mr Billy CHAN were summarised below:

- (a) he enquired about the length and opening hours of the indoor jogging track, and the height of the outdoor sports climbing wall. He also asked whether there would be resident coaches to help users;
- (b) he said that the fitness room in Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre was very popular. He opined that the fitness room in Ma On Shan still could not meet the demand, despite the availability of franchised fitness centres in the market. Members of the public preferred fitness rooms under the LCSD because they were more affordable. He asked how many fitness facilities the LCSD would set up in the proposed fitness room and how much space they would occupy;
- (c) he asked how many table tennis tables could be accommodated in a table tennis room; and
- (d) he said that the Wi-Fi facilities provided by the LCSD were not satisfactory. Despite the advanced technologies in Hong Kong, Internet access was very slow at government sites. He hoped that the Internet access could be improved at the proposed sports centre.

19. The views of Mr CHENG Tsuk-man were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the sports centre could be used as a handball pitch, a five-a-side football pitch, two basketball courts, two volleyball courts or

eight badminton courts. If the venue was not enclosed or equipped with acoustic insulation, the noise during matches could become a nuisance to nearby residents. He cited Heng On Sports Centre as an example and asked whether similar problems would exist at the proposed sports centre;

- (b) he said that there were often matches and spectators at Heng On Sports Centre. The matches normally lasted until 11:00 pm, with noise going through the windows and affecting nearby residents. He said that there was similar sports venue under the project “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103”. He wondered whether related facilities could be relocated from Heng On Sports Centre to the “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103”; and
- (c) he cited the comments on Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre, which said that the two conference rooms were close to each other. Therefore, the sound from singing activities in one conference room would affect the meeting in the other. He asked whether the acoustic insulation in the two conference rooms in the proposed sports centre would be adequate to block noise and to prevent mutual influence.

20. The views of Mr PUN Kwok-shan were summarised below:

- (a) he said that it was good for the LCSD to have modified the proposed facilities in line with members’ recommendations and motions, in particular adding a multi-purpose room for book display and educational activities in the New Book Centre. He pointed out that in respect of the reading culture, even the Central Library had never organised any guided tours in the past. He opined that it was worthwhile to organise guided tours for many local trades featuring the entire production process. He asked whether the LCSD would consider designing routes of guided tours on this basis, so that members of the public could become more informed on book production, contents of books and cultural promotion; and
- (b) he asked whether there would be a designated pick-up/drop-off point in the loading/unloading area for visitors in future.

21. The views of Ms TSANG So-lai were summarised below:

- (a) she thanked the LCSD for taking members’ advice by adding an indoor jogging track and an outdoor sports climbing wall, so as to further diversify the facilities and meet the needs of residents. She hoped that the relevant works could start as soon as possible, so as to serve local residents as soon as possible;
- (b) as for the multi-purpose room for book display and educational activities, she asked whether there were any similar facilities in other districts and how well they were used. She pointed out that the facility would be intended for use mainly by schools and organisations. She wondered whether the LCSD would accept applications by individual residents or informal groups, such as reading clubs set up on parents’ own initiative; and

- (c) she asked whether the LCSD had invited non-profit-making organisations to set up service centres or offices in the proposed sports centre. She said that youth services were inadequate in the area, with the nearest youth centres located in Heng On Estate and Lee On Estate. As a result, many youngsters just wandered on the streets. She hoped that the LCSD could invite groups to provide services in the proposed sports centre.

22. The views of Ms CHAN Man-kuen were summarised below:

- (a) she looked forward to the completion of the “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103”, as well as the early availability of relevant facilities in Fo Tan and Tai Wai. She also hoped that improvements could be made to the “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103”, in view of the inadequacies of recreational facilities recently completed, such as the lack of toilets and bad reception of Wi-Fi and mobile phone signals at Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre;
- (b) she asked whether the outdoor sports climbing wall was close to residential areas. She said that users and their parents might make some noise during their use. She hoped that the LCSD would pay attention to the design; and
- (c) she said that previous sports centres were mostly square concrete buildings without any special design. She suggested that the LCSD consider adding features of Ma On Shan to the “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103” design, such as azaleas, Ma On Shan Mine and other regional symbols.

23. The views of Mr NG Kam-hung were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the humid weather in Ma On Shan might result in water or moss on the holds of the outdoor sports climbing wall, making it difficult for users to grasp the holds. He asked whether the holds would be difficult to clean and whether there would be any measures to make the climbing wall work better; and
- (b) he had received suggestions from some rock-climbing coaches, who said that the outdoor climbing wall would have to be temporarily closed on rainy days. He suggested that the climbing wall be relocated to indoor area. He also asked how many ropes could be placed at the outdoor sports climbing wall at the same time. He said that related training and activities would be more fun and effective if ten or more ropes could be provided. He hoped that the LCSD would consider it.

24. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he thanked the LCSD for its previous efforts and hoped that the project of “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103” could start as soon as possible;
- (b) owing to the serious shortage of parking spaces in Ma On Shan, he hoped that the number of parking spaces would be not less than that of the existing temporary car park as far as possible;

- (c) he said that some residents complained about the dazzling light from the main arena of Ma On Shan Sports Centre, which affected people playing badminton at the venue. He hoped that the LCSD could improve the lighting;
- (d) he asked the LCSD to provide further information upon finalisation of specific facilities in future if the paper was endorsed. He also hoped that the LCSD could respond to members' views and requests; and
- (e) in response to members' wish that the rooftop space could be opened for use, the LCSD said that the idea might be difficult to implement since there was a cooling system at the site. However, it would study the suggestion. He suggested that the example of Yuen Chau Kok Complex be followed, with a footbridge connecting the podium of the sports centre to the library, so that the rooftop would be alternatively equipped with public space for public use.

25. Ms Selina LEUNG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she thanked members for their comments on and support for the proposed facilities. With regard to the accessibility of the "Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103", upon the determination of proposed facilities for the entire project, the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) would review relevant facility issues concurrently with the technical feasibility study, including the number and types of spaces at the public car park, the accessibility of the sports centre, etc. By then, the results of the study would also be referred to the TD for consideration and advice. If further research was carried out on the construction of a footbridge and crossing facilities, then it might be required to have discussion with different departments, which would prolong the planning period. The LCSD would like to have discussion with the ArchSD during the technical feasibility study, and refer the matter to professionals for assessment;
- (b) regarding the number of spaces at the public car park, she said that the temporary fee-charging public car park at the relevant construction site was currently equipped with spaces for different types of vehicles. And as mentioned in the previous consultation with the CSCDC, the number of spaces at the proposed public car park would be not less than that at the existing one. As for the types and numbers of different parking spaces, the LCSD would conduct further studies when inviting the ArchSD for the preliminary layout after the proposed facilities were determined. The proposed car park under discussion with the TD would include parking spaces for private cars, minibuses/school buses, LGVs and motorcycles. The LCSD and the TD would actively consider the provision of parking spaces for bicycles as well. As for parking spaces for goods vehicles, the LCSD would further consult the TD and the ArchSD. It would be impossible to determine whether any or what types of additional spaces could be provided until the detailed layout was completed;
- (c) she said that once the proposed facilities under the project were endorsed by the CSCDC, the LCSD would promptly work with relevant bureaux to

determine the development scope of the project and to draft the project definition statement, before inviting the ArchSD to carry out the feasibility study as soon as possible. If all went well, the ArchSD would arrange for conceptual design to be carried out for the project. The LCSD and the ArchSD would jointly consult the CSCDC again on the project design;

- (d) regarding the provision of separate breastfeeding cubicles in the baby-sitting room, she noted similar demands from users of other venues. She promised to convey such a request to the ArchSD as regards the design of the “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103”;
- (e) she said that the LCSD was gradually making improvements to Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre, in terms of the toilet ratio, the shower facilities, the reception of mobile phone and Wi-Fi signals, etc. She said that the LCSD would draw on the experience of Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre and convey relevant suggestions to the ArchSD, so as to improve the design of the “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103”;
- (f) she said that the current proposal did not include tuck shops in the sports centre, but there were shopping malls and food premises near the proposed construction site. She also said that the LCSD would consider installing soft drink and snack vending machines for members of the public based on the actual circumstances of the sports centre after its opening;
- (g) regarding the noise from Heng On Sports Centre, nowadays most sports centres were not supposed to cause noise nuisance since they were equipped with air-conditioning facilities and the enclosed design. The LCSD would also put forward its opinions to the ArchSD regarding the acoustic insulation of the “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103”;
- (h) as for whether Heng On Sports Centre could be relocated to the “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103”, she said that the latter was a project initiated by the former Regional Council. The LCSD believed that local residents would welcome an additional sports centre. As far as she was aware, improvement works were being carried out to enhance the existing facilities of Heng On Sports Centre; and
- (i) regarding members’ comments on the overall design and general approach, she promised to take follow-up action together with the ArchSD and relevant government departments.

26. Ms Jackie LO, District Leisure Manager (Sha Tin) of the LCSD gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that the indoor jogging track would be 140 metres long and 3.22 metres wide. It was preliminarily proposed to be located at the same level as the spectator stands of the main arena, based on the design of other sports centres. The actual location would be subject to the ArchSD’s layout plan. She said that the indoor jogging track would be accessible to the public during the opening hours of the sports centre. However, like other facilities in the sports centre, the jogging track would be closed to the

public when major games were held on the main arena;

- (b) she said that the LCSD stipulated that the relevant table tennis room should be about 450 square metres in size. Subject to the building plan to be finalised, the room would be able to accommodate six to eight table tennis tables, if there were no columns inside. The multi-purpose activity room could be used if necessary. Alternatively, table tennis tables could be placed in the badminton courts during off-peak hours. The LCSD would review the utilisation rates of relevant facilities from time to time, before making any deployments or taking any follow-up actions as appropriate;
- (c) she said that the outdoor climbing wall would be 12 to 15 metres high and 3 metres wide. The LCSD would arrange for the relevant national sports association (NSA) to clean, repair or replace the holds. The LCSD had always attached great importance to the safety of users, who were not allowed to use the outdoor climbing wall unless under the guidance of a qualified coach. Besides, the LCSD would draw on the experience of Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre to avoid affecting nearby residential areas or residents' privacy. The LCSD would advise the ArchSD to keep the climbing wall away from nearby residential areas when drafting the layout plan;
- (d) she said that in order to improve the design of the climbing wall, the LCSD would contact the relevant NSA and provide updated information, with a suggestion of adding a canopy for the outdoor climbing wall, so that it could be open for public use even on drizzling days. Besides, a platform would be added on top of the climbing wall to facilitate the organisation of tournaments;
- (e) she said that similar buildings were generally equipped with a large-scale cooling system on the rooftop. If there was still potential public space based on the finalised design, the LCSD could install greening and seating facilities for public use;
- (f) she said that the LCSD had always paid attention to the development of balance biking, although it was not a mainstream sport. To meet relevant needs, the LCSD was studying the possibility of opening some gardens for children to ride balance bikes. Besides, members of the public could apply for hiring recreational venues such as ball courts under the LCSD for non-designated use such as balance bike competitions;
- (g) she said that drawing on the experience of Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre, the LCSD would advise the ArchSD to provide sufficient toilets and shower facilities on each floor of the proposed sports centre in line with the number of users. For example, the changing rooms of the main arena should allow at least two teams to use the toilets and shower facilities at the same time;
- (h) she said that Wi-Fi services were only available in the waiting areas at LCSD venues. Wi-Fi services were unavailable at many locations at Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre, not only because of the weak signals, but also

because those locations were not waiting areas. In view of that, the LCSD would designate more locations as waiting areas in future;

- (i) she said that the fitness room should be at least 300 square metres in size based on the preliminary design. The number of fitness facilities would be determined based on the layout of the fitness room upon its completion. She said that the fitness room of Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre was 278 square metres in size, with 38 sets of fitness equipment inside. The LCSD would refer to the options of fitness facilities in Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre as a reference;
- (j) regarding noise nuisance from Heng On Sports Centre, she promised to review hiring by organisations in order to reduce nuisance to residents at night. Advice would be given to users if they made noise;
- (k) she said that some sports centre under the LCSD would be used as temporary study rooms during the examination season. Such an arrangement could apply to the proposed sports centre upon its completion, if necessary; and
- (l) she said that what Mr CHENG Tsuk-man had mentioned should be the conference rooms of the community hall. But she added that the proposed sports centre would also include conference facilities for pre-game preparations or post-game reviews by sports teams.

27. Miss Sharon CHAU, Senior Librarian (Planning and Development) of the LCSD gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that the LCSD also attached great importance to the reading needs of children and senior citizens. The LCSD would consider their needs for furniture setting and design when planning the reading area in the “New Book Express Station” in the New Book Centre;
- (b) she said that the LCSD would like to promote reading in a flexible manner. The “New Book Express Station” and the multi-purpose room for book display and educational activities were new concepts which had not been implemented in other areas. She understood that members of the public would be interested in the New Book Centre. The LCSD would consider arranging guided tours to promote reading and to encourage people to take good care of books. As regards the possibility of hiring the educational activity room for cultural promotion, she promised to review relevant needs during the detailed study;
- (c) regarding the provision of an independent pick-up/drop-off point for guided tour groups, she would put forward the idea to the ArchSD during planning for consideration; and
- (d) she said that the study room service was coordinated by the Education Bureau (EDB). Most of the major and district libraries under the LCSD, such as the public libraries in Sha Tin, Ma On Shan and Yuen Chau Kok, were equipped with student study rooms as auxiliary facilities. Members of

the public could use study rooms in those libraries if necessary. Therefore, there would be no self-study room in the New Book Centre.

28. Ms Janny CHENG, Senior Executive Officer (District Management) of the STDO gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that the STDO also noted the unsatisfactory depth of the stage in the multi-purpose hall of Yuen Chau Kok Community Hall. She said that the Home Affairs Department (HAD) always had established reference indicators for the layout and size of the stage in a community hall. More attention would be paid to the requirements in the ArchSD's sketch design of the community hall, for the sake of compliance; and
- (b) she understood that the acoustic insulation effects would be subject to the configuration, design and operation of partitions, which were of the manual type in the multi-purpose hall and the conference rooms of Yuen Chau Kok Community Hall. Partitions might fail to be closely connected with each other, if they were opened manually or else of the folding type with fixed locks. Besides, they did not extend from the floor all the way to the ceiling, thus failing to separate the two spaces completely, which might result in poor acoustic insulation results. The future configuration of the "Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103" would include a more updated design with reference to other local community halls. To be specific, the LCSD would actively advise the ArchSD to consider introducing appropriate facilities, such as foldable partitions which were electrically operated, as well as separate air-conditioning systems for partitioned spaces, so as to optimise the situation.

29. The Chairman asked members whether they agreed to handle the provisional motion moved by Mr TING Tsz-yuen.

30. Members agreed to discuss the provisional motion moved by Mr TING Tsz-yuen.

31. Mr TING Tsz-yuen moved a provisional motion as follows:

"The Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee of the Sha Tin District Council urges that the Government, when writing the traffic assessment report on the Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103, be required to consider the growth in the pedestrian and traffic flow upon the establishment of the sports centre. Hence, road-crossing facilities, including pedestrian crossings, footbridges and elevators, etc., will have to be built for residents' easy access and for the safety of road users."

Ms TSANG So-lai seconded the motion.

32. Mr Alvin LEE said that he basically supported the provisional motion. He reiterated his hope that space would be reserved at the sports centre for a new footbridge connecting to the swimming pool building and the existing footbridge nearby, for the convenience of the public. He hoped that Mr TING Tsz-yuen would add "and to study the construction of a footbridge connecting the main building of the swimming pool and the nearby footbridges for the convenience of the public".

33. Mr LI Sai-wing said that he had always been lobbying for more crossing facilities in Ma On Shan, on which he agreed with Mr TING Tsz-yuen. He also agreed with Mr Alvin LEE on the proposed footbridge, among others. However, he said that the content of the provisional motion seemed to be optional. He suggested that Mr TING Tsz-yuen use such an expression as “urges the Administration to conduct a feasibility study on crossing facilities immediately”, which, in his opinion, might be more effective.

34. Mr Thomas PANG suggested that Mr TING Tsz-yuen include “The Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee supports the construction of the Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103, as well as the study on the possible provision of the following facilities”, which would express the idea more clearly.

35. Mr TING Tsz-yuen said that the original motion basically contained the elements mentioned by members. He promised to revise the motion based on their comments to include the demand for a footbridge connecting with the sports centre and the installation of lifts.

36. The Chairman said that the meeting would be adjourned for three minutes.

(Meeting adjourned for three minutes)

37. Mr TING Tsz-yuen amended his provisional motion as follows:

“The Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee of the Sha Tin District Council urges that the Government, when writing the traffic assessment report on the Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103, be required to consider the growth in the pedestrian and traffic flow upon the establishment of the sports centre. Hence, road-crossing facilities, including pedestrian crossings, neighbouring footbridges connected to the sports centre, elevators, etc., will have to be built for residents’ easy access and for the safety of road users.”

Ms TSANG So-lai seconded the motion.

38. The Chairman asked Mr TING Tsz-yuen whether he would consider adding such expression as “support the construction of the Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103” as Mr Thomas PANG had suggested.

39. Mr TING Tsz-yuen said that he supported the construction of the “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103”. The statement could be included into the paper, which would be put to vote after the provisional motion was handled. He pointed out that the said provisional motion was to express the residents’ request, and that members could express their support for or opposition to the project at the next stage of voting. He said that he would like to maintain the previous consensus with Mr Alvin LEE.

40. Mr Michael YUNG asked the Chairman whether the relevant paper needed to be put to vote and whether it should be voted upon before or after the provisional motion was handled.

41. The Chairman said that the relevant paper needed to be put to vote after the provisional motion was handled.

42. Mr Michael YUNG agreed with Mr TING Tsz-yuen that there were no conflicts between the two.

43. The Chairman asked members whether they agreed to endorse the provisional motion in paragraph 37.

44. Members unanimously endorsed the provisional motion mentioned in paragraph 37.

45. The Chairman asked members whether they agreed to endorse the LCSD paper on proposed facilities of the project “Sports Centre at Ma On Shan Area 103”.

46. Members unanimously endorsed the above paper.

47. The Chairman urges the LCSD to commence designing and other related works as soon as possible.

2018-2019 Revised Work Plans and Funding Applications of Working Groups under the Committee

(Paper No. CSCD 35/2018)

48. Members unanimously endorsed the above work plans and funding applications.

Funding Application of the Sha Tin Arts and Culture Promotion Committee

(Paper No. CSCD 36/2018)

49. Mr CHIU Man-leong and Ms CHAN Man-kuen declared their interests as members of the Sha Tin Arts and Culture Promotion Committee, the applicant organisation. The Chairman said that they were allowed to attend the meeting but had no right to vote in respect of the relevant funding application.

50. Members unanimously endorsed the above funding application.

Funding Application of the Planning Committee on Festive Lighting in Sha Tin

(Paper No. CSCD 37/2018)

51. Mr CHING Cheung-ying, Mr WAI Hing-cheung, Ms TSANG So-lai, Mr Alvin LEE, Ms CHAN Man-kuen and Ms LAM Chung-yan declared their interests as members of the applicant organisation or co-organisier. The Chairman said that they were allowed to attend the meeting but had no right to vote in respect of the relevant funding application.

52. Members unanimously endorsed the above funding application.

Funding Application of the Sha Tin Festival Committee 2018

(Paper No. CSCD 38/2018)

53. Ms CHAN Man-kuen, Mr Alvin LEE, Mr Tiger WONG, Mr WONG Ka-wing, Mr LI Sai-wing, Mr PUN Kwok-shan, Mr Michael YUNG, Mr CHING Cheung-ying, Mr Wilson LI, Mr WONG Hok-lai and Mr YIU Ka-chun declared their interests as members of the applicant organisation or co-organisier. The Chairman said that they were allowed to attend the meeting but had no right to vote in respect of the relevant funding application.

54. Members unanimously endorsed the above funding application.

Questions

Question to be Raised by Mr SIU Hin-hong on Safety in Swimming Pools
(Paper No. CSCD 39/2018)

55. The views of Mr SIU Hin-hong were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the number of private housing estates was on the rise, and each was equipped with a swimming pool. Accordingly, risks related to swimming had become greater. Lifeguards were in short supply and even the adequacy of their training was under question. This did not comply with the common motto of the Hong Kong Life Saving Society (HKLSS), that is, “Whomsoever you see in distress, recognize in him a fellow man”. He enquired of the LCSD about the procedures of rescuing drowning swimmers, and about the criteria for attributing any related death to accident or human negligence;
- (b) he said that while it was easier to handle the “hardware” of safety in swimming pools, supervision was inadequate as regards the “software” part, such as lifeguard management and rescue procedures. Security guards found to be in violation of the Security and Guarding Services Ordinance could be dismissed or even held criminally liable. Lifeguards were responsible for protecting the lives of swimmers, but they were subject to no ordinance monitoring their work performance. The Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) only monitored the water quality according to the relevant ordinance. He wondered whether there was any ordinance monitoring the performance of lifeguards at work. He asked which government department monitored violations of the Lifeguard Code of Conduct; and
- (c) he said that there had been a case of a lifeguard being negligent and causing the death of a swimmer. But the relevant parties preferred to “keep the skeleton in the closet” and the incident was not publicised any way. Besides, the operator of the swimming pool managed to shy away from that responsibility because there was no declaration mechanism. This, however, seriously compromised the safety of swimmers. He said that a provisional motion would be moved later, and he presented two letters from residents for members’ reference.

56. The views of Mr Michael YUNG were summarised below:

- (a) he opined that private housing estates were facing similar problems as the LCSD. In its response, the LCSD said that if there were not enough lifeguards on duty at a swimming pool, the venue supervisor would arrange off-duty lifeguards to come back to work. He wondered whether lifeguards were virtually required to work overtime with such a practice and whether their on-duty performance would be affected the following day. He also enquired about the criteria for deploying other swimming pool lifeguards in the same area;

- (b) he asked how to arrange volunteer lifeguards to work on duty, and whether this could not be handled until the next opening session of a swimming pool;
- (c) he asked whether the number of swimmers would be reduced accordingly if some facilities with a low utilisation rate were temporarily closed;
- (d) he said that the waterproof lights at swimming pools came off from time to time due to design problem or wear and tear. He wondered whether relevant government departments had certain standards and requirements for the power and voltage of the lighting system;
- (e) as the FEHD was responsible for enforcing the Swimming Pools Regulation, he wondered whether more water tests could be conducted. He said that swimming pool operators required lifeguards to help control water quality or use chlorine pills. But lifeguards might not be familiar with chemical materials. He asked whether the FEHD would also test the pH value apart from the water quality and the bacteria content;
- (f) he asked whether the FEHD would consider developing pH standards in line with the relevant ordinance on water quality. He also opined that excessive use of bleaching materials might cause discomfort to swimmers; and
- (g) he enquired about the binding effect of the Lifeguard Code of Conduct and wondered whether it was nominal if it had no binding effect. He said that he had seen on-duty lifeguards using mobile phones, eating or chatting with swimmers. Such acts were complete breaches of the Code of Conduct. He wondered how offenders would be punished and whether their licences would be renewed.

57. Mr SIU Hin-hong briefly introduced two letters and hoped that members would support his provisional motion.

58. The Chairman said that he had seen the lifeguards of a private housing estate wearing dark sunglasses. He did not know whether they were dozing off. But he opined that there was potential danger since there were many swimmers in the pool. He asked whether there was a complaint mechanism and how members of the public should file complaints if they found lifeguards violating the Code of Conduct. He would also like to know how lifeguards would be punished if they have violated the Code of Conduct. In addition, he enquired about the FEHD's licensing arrangements.

59. Ms Jackie LO gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that when a swimmer was unfortunately drowned, the LCSD would initiate a rescue operation led by a senior lifeguard. The closest lifeguard would bring the victim back to the pool surface, while other lifeguards would help each other in the operation as necessary;

- (b) as far as she was aware, if a swimmer was unfortunately drowned to death, a forensic autopsy would be conducted for investigation if necessary. Next, a report would be submitted to law enforcement agencies, and a coroner's inquest would be conducted as needed to determine the cause of death;
- (c) she said that sufficient lifeguards were normally arranged to be on duty as per the duty roster. Meanwhile, off-duty lifeguards were divided into two types, including those on annual leave and those on vacation leave. The LCSD would contact off-duty lifeguards and ask them to stand in for those who took unscheduled leave;
- (d) as for the deployment of other swimming pool lifeguards, she cited the example of Ma On Shan Swimming Pool, saying that if 13 lifeguards were required for the pool and 15 lifeguards went to work on a day, then two of them could be redeployed to help at the understaffed Sha Tin Jockey Club Swimming Pool;
- (e) as for the arrangement for volunteer lifeguards to be duty, if a lifeguard on an afternoon shift called in absent in the morning, then a volunteer lifeguard would be contacted in the morning and arranged to be on the afternoon shift. However, if a lifeguard on a morning shift called in absent, the arrangement would be hasty. The volunteer lifeguard would be immediately arranged to be on duty whenever he or she arrived;
- (f) in case of shortage of lifeguards, the LCSD would temporarily close some underused facilities during off-peak hours, according to the utilisation of swimming pools and the usual practice of swimmers in using the facilities. The patronage would be accordingly lowered during the suspension of related facilities;
- (g) she said that the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) had established standards for lighting systems. The LCSD would also consider whether lighting devices would affect lifeguards' implementation of duty at the pool;
- (h) she said that the machine room staff of a swimming pool would test the water on an hourly basis, in order to check compliance in terms of the chlorine residue and the pH value. The LCSD also provide water samples for FEHD contractors to test the E. coli content and other information on a monthly basis; and
- (i) she said that the safety of swimmers was a top priority for the LCSD in the management of swimming pools. Therefore, the LCSD always attached importance to performance of lifeguards on duty and ensured the quality of life-saving services. Lifeguards would be subject to disciplinary actions if they had any misconduct while on duty, such as using mobile phones or dozing off. In 2018, a total of four complaints were received in the district about lifeguards in dozing off. Upon verification, the LCSD issued three verbal warnings and one written warning.

60. Ms AU Wai-ha, Chief Health Inspector 1 of the FEHD gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that the FEHD tested water samples once a month during the opening season of swimming pools, based on the requirement that no E. coli should be detected per 100 cubic centimetre of pool water, and that the total bacterial count should not exceed 200 per millilitre of pool water, among others;
- (b) with regard to lighting facilities, the LCSD would review whether relevant applicants complied with the requirement of providing 200 lux lighting system, in order to guarantee the safety of users of covered pools or outdoor pools after sunset. The licensing conditions also included the requirements that all underwater lights should be supplied at a voltage not exceeding 25. The LCSD also monitored low voltage supply according to the relevant ordinance, which licensees were required to comply with; and
- (c) she said that the law did not regulate the lifeguards' behaviour on duty, but estate management companies could monitor lifeguards' behaviour with employment contracts in line with the relevant Code of Conduct. The FEHD would impose relevant penalties if relevant legislation or licensing conditions were violated.

61. The Chairman asked members whether they agreed to handle the provisional motion moved by Mr SIU Hin-hong.

62. Members agreed to discuss the provisional motion moved by Mr SIU Hin-hong.

63. Mr SIU Hin-hong moved a provisional motion as follows:

“Background:

The duty of security guards is to protect residents' property and it is currently clearly regulated by the Government. Security guards identified to have violated the Security and Guarding Services Ordinance, Cap. 460, may be liable to dismissal or criminal prosecution. However, when it is compared to the duty of lifeguards which is to safeguard the safety of swimmers, the regulation of the government is indeed lacking / unsatisfactory.

Undoubtedly, every second counts when it comes to the job of saving those drowning. As the saying of the Hong Kong Life Saving Society goes, “As if all those who are drowning were drown by me”, lifeguards should uphold the solemn attitude of “every life matters”. However, since it currently lacks a transparent report mechanism, the public have no way to find out the numbers of people drown and casualties so as to enhance their awareness. Consequently, the management quality of swimming pools and safety issues are questionable. I therefore vehemently request the Government to draft regulations for 44 public swimming pools, 41 beaches and 1 246 swimming pools in private housing estates in the whole territory in order to safeguard the safety of swimmers. The details are as follows:

Provisional motion:

The Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee of the Sha Tin District Council vehemently requests the following:

- (1) set up a declaration mechanism regarding the drown with updated information for public access online so as to improve the regulation at swimming pools and beaches. In particular, the 1 246 swimming pools in private housing estates are in dire need of a report mechanism.
- (2) set up a ‘management committee on lifeguard governance’ to impose swimming pool governing regulations and regulate the code of practice of lifeguards, with an ultimate aim to enforce the Lifeguard Code of Conduct Ordinance so as to ensure the safety of swimmers in public swimming pools, beaches and swimming pools in private housing estates. Lifeguards proved to have breached their code of conduct or be guilty of negligence are liable to criminal prosecution.”

Mr Alvin LEE seconded the motion.

64. Ms LAM Chung-yan said that the CSCDC strongly requests the establishment of a relevant mechanism. Therefore, she suggested that last sentence starting with “in particular, the 1 246” in paragraph (1) of the provisional motion be placed in the “Background” part instead for the sake of clarity.

65. The views of Mr WONG Ka-wing were summarised below:

- (a) as Chairman of the HKLSS, he started teaching life-saving courses and training life-saving instructors for the Education Department in the 1980s. He said that the HKLSS, with a long history, was one of the NSAs in the territory and awarded lifeguard qualifications. Persons could become qualified lifeguards after taking related course, passing related examination and obtaining the bronze medallion for basic training. He opined that the Government needed to set up a regulatory agency to monitor lifeguards as professionals in accordance with the law. He agreed with Mr SIU Hin-hong in that regard. However, there was no agency or mechanism to regulate lifeguards’ behaviour or performance. Therefore, the relevant motion might fail to achieve the desired results. He hoped that Mr SIU Hin-hong could consider further refining his motion; and
- (b) he agreed that there were problems with the monitoring, qualifications and personal conduct of lifeguards. He pointed out that LCSD was the largest employer of lifeguards, while the FEHD was only responsible for monitoring the water quality of swimming pools. He suggested that Mr SIU Hin-hong consider adding in paragraph (2) that relevant government departments, such as the LCSD, would be able to explore a disciplinary mechanism involving legislation, lifeguard monitoring or licensing. He opined that the content of the provisional motion should be as simple as possible.

66. The views of Mr Michael YUNG were summarised below:

- (a) he asked how a drowning case declaration mechanism should work and which party or parties would be responsible for the declaration. He pointed out that the mechanism might be abused if declarations were to be made by drowning victims, since people might file complaints simply because they were dissatisfied with pool operators. If declarations were to be made by the Fire Services Department (FSD), cases would not be recorded unless the FSD was notified and the pool operators would prefer not to make declarations. He said that what was proposed in the relevant motion would be easier said than done;
- (b) regarding the proposed establishment of a “management committee on lifeguard governance”, he enquired what kind of organisation it was, what functions it would perform, and also asked about its membership and the government department it was affiliated with. He suggested that more details should be provided if the motion was to be specific;
- (c) regarding the “Lifeguard Code of Conduct Ordinance”, he said that an “ordinance” would be part of the legislation. He pointed out that there was not such an ordinance in Hong Kong, and asked whether related legislation would be introduced. The enacted ordinance might have a different name from that in the provisional motion. He enquired about the solution;
- (d) he did not quite understand the content of the current provisional motion. He opined that simpler words could be used if it was to make a request for regulating the conduct of lifeguards by a regulatory body, a notification mechanism or legislation. He hoped that the original mover could clarify the issues so that he could make a decision before voting; and
- (e) he said that Mr SIU Hin-hong’s request actually included three points: training of, licensing to and monitoring of lifeguards. He opined that the CSCDC could not determine the degree of involvement of each government department. Therefore, it was not necessary to specify the department in charge. He opined that it would be easier to accept and understand that the motion was intended to draw attention to the service quality of lifeguards, if it was written in a broad framework. He suggested that Mr SIU Hin-hong consider modifying the provisional motion to state his request in a simpler way if he wished to draw on the Security and Guarding Services Ordinance.

67. Mr LI Sai-hung asked whether declarations to external parties had to be made for private housing estates. Besides, he asked whether the existing legislation monitored irregularities or negligence. Relevant legislation should be enacted if there was no related ordinance. He wondered whether the legislation work should be handled at the committee level.

68. The views of Mr SIU Hin-hong were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the word “declaration” should be “report” in point (1) of the provisional motion;

- (b) he said that the provisional motion was intended for a report mechanism to be established to monitor lifeguards;
- (c) he said that it might be more advisable to delete “Ordinance” from the “Lifeguard Code of Conduct Ordinance”. He pointed out that the HKLSS had a “Lifeguard Code of Conduct”, which, however, was not enforced or monitored by anybody. He opined that the HKLSS should be responsible for enforcing and monitoring the Code of Conduct. It would be feasible for the HKLSS to be empowered by an ordinance. He said that security guards only protected the property of residents, while lifeguards protected lives. Therefore, lifeguards should be subject to more stringent regulation and their responsibilities should not be ignored; and
- (d) he said that the Police or the FSD would be contacted in case of serious accidents, so that relevant departments could jointly make declarations. Licensees would not dare to cover up accidents if their licences would not be renewed upon repeated failures to make declarations.

69. The views of Mr Thomas PANG were summarised below:

- (a) he said that life was precious and the role of lifeguards was very important. He opined that the provisional motion was commendable in essence. He suggested that “the Government” be added after “The Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee of the Sha Tin District Council vehemently requests”, requesting the Government to take actions as per points (1) and (2). Relevant details, such as the department to be in charge, would be considered by the Government instead of being handled at the committee level, if the Government thought that the motion was worth implementation; and
- (b) he pointed out that the FEHD was empowered under the relevant ordinance but no one inspected the performance of lifeguards accordingly. Under such circumstances, he opined that the Government should properly handle the whole matter, and the provisional motion was worth support.

70. Mr SIU Hin-hong said that description could be either simple or in detail. The point was to draw the attention of relevant departments to the severity of the matter, as long as everyone understood that the motion was about proposed legislation. He agreed to add the words “the Government”, while the other parts remained unchanged.

71. Mr SIU Hin-hong amended his provisional motion as follows:

“Background:

The duty of security guards is to protect residents’ property and it is currently clearly regulated by the Government. Security guards identified to have violated the Security and Guarding Services Ordinance, Cap. 460, may be liable to dismissal or criminal prosecution. However, when it is compared to the duty of lifeguards which is to safeguard the safety of swimmers, the regulation of the government is indeed lacking / unsatisfactory.

Undoubtedly, every second counts when it comes to the job of saving those drowning. As the saying of the Hong Kong Life Saving Society goes, “As if all those who are drowning were drown by me”, lifeguards should uphold the solemn attitude of “every life matters”. However, since it currently lacks a transparent report mechanism, the public have no way to find out the numbers of people drown and casualties so as to enhance their awareness. Consequently, the management quality of swimming pools and safety issues are questionable. I therefore vehemently request the Government to draft regulations for 44 public swimming pools, 41 beaches and 1 246 swimming pools in private housing estates in the whole territory in order to safeguard the safety of swimmers. The details are as follows:

Provisional motion:

The Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee of the Sha Tin District Council vehemently requests the Government to:

- (1) set up a report mechanism regarding the drown with updated information for public access online so as to improve the regulation at swimming pools and beaches. In particular, the 1 246 swimming pools in private housing estates are in dire need of a report mechanism.
- (2) set up a ‘management committee on lifeguard governance’ to impose swimming pool governing regulations and regulate the code of practice of lifeguards, with an ultimate aim to enforce the Lifeguard Code of Conduct so as to ensure the safety of swimmers in public swimming pools, beaches and swimming pools in private housing estates. Lifeguards proved to have breached their code of conduct or be guilty of negligence are liable to criminal prosecution.”

Mr Alvin LEE seconded the motion.

72. The Chairman asked members whether they agreed to endorse the provisional motion in paragraph 71.

73. Members endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 71 by 11 affirmative votes, 1 negative vote, 10 abstention votes and 1 member not opted to vote.

Information Item

Reports of Working Groups
(Paper No. CSCD 40/2018)

74. Members noted reports submitted to the meeting by the Working Group on Festive Celebrations and the Working Group on Recreation and Sports Development.

Information Papers

Report and Plan by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department on Organisation of Cultural Activities and Utilisation of Facilities in Sha Tin District (2nd and 3rd Quarters of 2018)
(Paper No. CSCD 41/2018)

75. Members noted the above information paper.

Report and Plan by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department on Organisation of Recreation and Sports Activities and Management of Facilities in Sha Tin District (2nd and 3rd Quarters of 2018)
(Paper No. CSCD 42/2018)

76. Ms Jackie LO added that members had expressed their views on naming of the said facilities at the DFMC meeting on 28 June this year. Information in the said paper had been updated accordingly, with “Chun Shek Sports Centre” renamed as “Che Kung Miu Sports Centre”, and “Shek Mun Riverside Garden” renamed as “Shek Mun Riviera Garden”.

77. The views of Mr WAI Hing-cheung were summarised below:

- (a) he said that some members of the public had spotted rats at the amphitheatre of Sha Tin Park and suspected that there was a rat’s hole in the metal cabinet on the right of the amphitheatre stage. He wondered whether the LCSD had followed up the matter; and
- (b) he said that according to the paper, floor tile renovation works were underway at the amphitheatre. He wondered whether it would aggravate the rodent problem at the site. He had spotted large rats at the amphitheatre at one end of Lek Yuen Bridge on the evening of 30 June. He hoped that the LCSD would pay attention to the problem.

78. Ms Jackie LO said that an anti-rodent operation had been carried out upon receipt of Mr WAI Hing-cheung’s comments. More rats would be spotted whenever works were carried out around facilities. The LCSD would carry on with the anti-rodent exercise. If the suspected rat’s hole was identified, related seal-off work would be arranged.

79. Members noted the above information paper.

Report and Plan on Public Libraries Promotion Activities Organised by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department in Sha Tin District (2nd and 3rd Quarters of 2018)
(Paper No. CSCD 43/2018)

80. Mr HO Hau-cheung said that the paper reported the utilisation of mobile library services in Sha Tin District in April and May. It showed that the number of visits and the number of books on loan were zero for a public housing estate and an HOS estate. Without related information in hand, he asked whether it meant related services were underused in the said housing estates and whether the LCSD had reviewed the causes. Some members had suggested that related services were in great demand at some locations. If the utilisation rates were low in Pok Hong Estate and Chevalier Garden, he wondered whether the LCSD would consider relocating the services so as to optimise the use of resources.

81. Miss LEE Mei-yee, Senior Librarian (Sha Tin) of the LCSD said that the concerned mobile library van had undergone routine maintenance in May. Since some mobile library stops provided services once every two weeks (such as every alternate Monday

morning/afternoon), the service of the stops were suspended during the said routine maintenance. Therefore, the number of books on loan and the number of visits was zero during that period. The LCSD would continue to monitor and review the utilisation of mobile library services.

82. Members noted the above information paper.

Progress Report of the Sha Tin Arts Association
(Paper No. CSCD 44/2018)

83. Members noted the above information paper.

Progress Report of the Sha Tin Sports Association
(Paper No. CSCD 45/2018)

84. Members noted the above information paper.

Date of Next Meeting

85. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 10:00 am on 6 September 2018 (Thursday).

86. The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 pm.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat
STDC 13/15/50

July 2018