

**Sha Tin District Council**  
**Minutes of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of**  
**the Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee in 2019**

**Date** : 28 February 2019 (Thursday)  
**Time** : 10:00 am  
**Venue** : Sha Tin District Council Conference Room  
 4/F, Sha Tin Government Offices

<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Time of joining the meeting</u></b>	<b><u>Time of leaving the meeting</u></b>
Mr CHIU Man-leong (Chairman)	DC Member	10:00 am	12:47 pm
Ms CHAN Man-kuen (Vice-Chairman)	”	10:00 am	12:47 pm
Mr HO Hau-cheung, SBS, MH	DC Chairman	10:00 am	11:35 am
Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas, SBS, JP	DC Vice-Chairman	10:00 am	11:06 am
Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	DC Member	10:13 am	12:24 pm
Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, James	”	10:21 am	11:25 am
Mr CHAN Nok-hang	”	10:00 am	12:26 pm
Mr CHENG Tsuk-man	”	10:08 am	12:28 pm
Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	”	10:00 am	12:47 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Sunny	”	10:20 am	12:24 pm
Mr HUI Yui-yu, Rick	”	11:03 am	12:15 pm
Mr LAI Tsz-yan	”	10:43 am	12:24 pm
Ms LAM Chung-yan	”	10:00 am	11:37 am
Mr LEUNG Ka-fai, Victor	”	10:00 am	10:25 am
Mr LI Sai-hung	”	10:00 am	12:47 pm
Mr LI Sai-wing	”	10:00 am	11:40 am
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	”	10:10 am	11:06 am
Mr MAK Yun-pui	”	10:15 am	10:49 am
Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS	”	10:00 am	11:28 am
Mr NG Kam-hung	”	10:21 am	12:47 pm
Mr PUN Kwok-shan, MH, JP	”	10:00 am	11:40 am
Mr TING Tsz-yuen	”	10:00 am	12:47 pm
Mr TONG Hok-leung	”	10:00 am	12:47 pm
Ms TSANG So-lai	”	10:00 am	10:49 am
Ms TUNG Kin-lei	”	10:00 am	12:47 pm
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	”	10:00 am	11:40 am
Mr WONG Fu-sang, Tiger	”	10:00 am	12:47 pm
Mr WONG Hok-lai	”	10:29 am	11:10 am
Mr WONG Ka-wing, MH	”	10:07 am	12:47 pm
Ms WONG Ping-fan, Iris	”	10:06 am	12:47 pm
Mr WONG Yue-hon	”	10:00 am	12:47 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun	”	10:25 am	12:23 pm
Mr YIP Wing	”	10:00 am	12:47 pm
Mr YIU Ka-chun, MH	”	10:00 am	12:32 pm
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael	”	10:10 am	12:47 pm
Mr HO Kin-nam, David (Acting Secretary)	Executive Officer I (District Council)1 Sha Tin District Office		

**In Attendance**

Ms LI Po-yi, Jan

Ms CHAN Yee-chi, Elaine

Ms LEE Mei-yee

Ms CHAN Siu-kin, Ester

Mr LEUNG Cheuk-ming, Rico

Ms TSANG Suet-man

Ms NG Suk-min

Ms LEUNG Wai-shan, Cecilia

Mr YUEN Chun-kit, Derek

**Title**

Senior Community Relations Officer /

Regional Office (New Territories East) /

Independent Commission Against Corruption

Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Shatin)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 Department

Senior Manager (New Territories East) Promotion /

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Senior School Development Officer (Sha Tin)1 / Education Bureau

Acting 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 LO Lai-fong, Jackie

Ms SAM Fung-mei, Esther

Ms LO Sze-man

Mr LAM Yam-fung

Mr HO Yiu-chung

Mr CHEUNG Chi-lun

Mr KOO Siu-lung, Roy

Ms CHUNG June

Mr KWAN Ambrose

**Title**

District Leisure Manager (Sha Tin) /

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Manager (New Territories East) Marketing and District Activities /

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Chief Health Inspector (2) /

Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Assistant Housing Manager /S(TNS)1 / Housing Department

Housing Officer / S(TNS)1 / Housing Department

Registered Social Worker /

H.K.S.K.H. Ma On Shan (South) Children &amp;

Youth Integrated Service Centre

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

Executive Secretary / Sha Tin Sports Association

Project Organizer / Sha Tin Sports Association

**Absent**

Mr SIU Hin-hong

**Title**

DC Member (Application for leave of absence received)

**Action**

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

**Application for Leave of Absence**

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

Mr SIU Hin-hong

Out of town

3. Members unanimously endorsed the application for leave of absence submitted by the member above.

**Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 3 January 2019**  
(CSCDC Minutes 1/2019)

4. Members unanimously confirmed the above meeting minutes.

**Matters Arising**

**Responses of Government Departments to Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting**  
(Paper No. CSCD 9/2019)

5. Members noted the above paper.

**Discussion Items**

**M.O.S. Bazaar Project**  
(Paper No. CSCD 10/2019)

6. Ms LO Sze-man, Chief Health Inspector (2) of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) briefly introduced the contents of the paper.
7. Mr LAM Yam-fung, Assistant Housing Manager / S (TNS) 1 of the Housing Department (HD) added that the Department had consulted the Estate Management Advisory Committee (EMAC) in January this year and its members indicated that there were no objections. Further, Link Asset Management Limited (the Link) also indicated that there were no objections.
8. The views of Mr WAI Hing-cheung were summarised below:
- (a) he asked whether the organiser had applied for funding from the Sha Tin District Council (STDC);
  - (b) he asked since the organiser or the Department was aware that the activity required the support of the STDC, why it had not submitted the project to the STDC for discussion earlier. If the support from the STDC was not obtained at this stage, efforts for the previous preparations would be wasted;
  - (c) he said if the organiser considered that the activity was worth implementing, why the duration of the activity was not extended; and
  - (d) he said the paper indicated that there would be 20 stalls, which were different from the original target of 40 stalls. He asked the organiser about the reasons.
9. The views of Mr Tiger WONG were summarised below:
- (a) he asked the HD whether the proposed venue for the activity was for residential purpose. He said that it was necessary to clarify the feasibility of holding the activity at the venue before discussing the details. If the venue was for non-residential purpose, whether activities with monetary transactions would be allowed;

- (b) he asked how the FEHD consulted the Lands Department (LandsD) for its comments about the bazaar. He pointed out that if the venue changed the land use and involved monetary transactions, whether the LandsD knew that the activity involved trading, and whether it was exempted by the LandsD. He said that if the activity was illegal, it was impossible to discuss the details of the activity. He welcomed the organiser to set up a platform in the community, but asked whether engaging trading in the activity would violate other ordinances;
- (c) he asked the HD whether converting residential use to a use that allowed monetary transactions had violated the laws of Hong Kong; and
- (d) he asked whether the organiser had submitted applications through agents when recruiting stall operators.

10. The views of Ms Iris WONG were summarised below:

- (a) she said that the activity was held in the area of the housing estate under the management of the FEHD and the HD. She did not see why the STDC had to be consulted;
- (b) she asked about the FEHD's conditions for approval of bazaars in the past. If there was no need to consult the STDC in the past for granting a licence, why this application must be submitted to the STDC for discussion;
- (c) she opined that bazaar was a relatively new topic for the STDC and the role of the STDC in the bazaar policy had not yet been clarified. She said she would certainly support projects that facilitate the public, but did not know what impact there be would in the future when making judgement in an unclear situation; and
- (d) she said the lunar new year fair was similar to bazaar in nature. The FEHD using the venues of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to hold the lunar new year fair needed to go through the tendering procedures. She asked if using the venues of the HD, whether the same procedures were required. She pointed out that bidding for tenders involved departmental fees and allowed commercial transactions to be conducted in the venues under its management. She said that regardless of whether the bazaar involved monetary transactions, the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA) would determine the venue fees on a preferential basis. She said the Department did not mention monetary transactions when it responded. She also wanted to know whether its nature was similar to that of the lunar new year fair, i.e. whether the government department approved the use of the venue at a fee or at a rental.

11. The views of Mr YIP Wing were summarised below:

- (a) he said that it would be a rare occasion for Chung On Estate to hold the M.O.S. Bazaar, and hoped that members would support the activity; and

- (b) he said if the FEHD had not submitted the bazaar project to the STDC for consultation, the organiser could not continue to hold the activity at Chung On Estate. He pointed out that since the Government supported the holding of bazaars, it should not set a range of constraints and obstacles. If smoothly held, the project could be a successful example to reduce the obstacles for organisers from holding bazaars in the future. He said that bazaars could help balance the long-term rent increase of the Link, which would increase the burden on residents.

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

- (a) the paper did not indicate that the bazaar had cooked food stalls and he wanted to confirm whether the bazaar had cooked food arrangements. If there were cooked food stalls, a temporary food factory licence must be applied for. If it involved open fire cooking, he would like to know if the HD could provide enough electricity power for 40 stalls and related safety measures;
- (b) he said it was too early to say whether the bazaar could counter balance the Link. He asked whether the organiser charged a nominal fee to the stall owners. If there was no charge, he asked what the organiser's approval criteria were, and whether it allowed the grassroots citizens to show their arts and talents for other members of the public to purchase;
- (c) regarding crowd control arrangements, he pointed out that the layout plan in the paper indicated several entrances and asked which locations were specified as entrances and exits. In addition, he asked whether the Fire Services Department had been consulted, and when the flow of people was high, whether the escape route was sufficient;
- (d) he said the proponent intended to apply for a temporary place of public entertainment licence from the FEHD and asked under what circumstances application for such licence was required. He asked whether there would be performances in the activity, and whether it would consider that the volume of the loudspeakers might cause nuisance to the residents living on the lower floors;
- (e) he expressed his understanding that the EMAC supported the activity, but he still hoped that the FEHD and the HD would provide more information;
- (f) he said the Application Guidelines for Setting Up Bazaars (the Guidelines) of the bazaar policy was implemented by the Food and Health Bureau and coordinated by the FEHD. He said that the meeting documents did not explain the background and reasons. Although the Guidelines explained the steps in the preparation phase, the FEHD made various preparations simultaneously. He asked whether there should have a causal relationship and prioritisation during the preparation phase;
- (g) he said if consultation with the STDC was required, how the bazaar application would be dealt with during the STDC's recess. He hoped that the FEHD would explain the relevant processes, otherwise it would be difficult to discuss the issue; and

- (h) he said the FEHD had not mentioned the bazaar policy in the paper, and members did not know much about this policy and hence it took a long time for discussion. He said members could express support and express their views on the activity, and said that there were other activities in HD's venues that involved monetary transactions.

13. The views of Mr CHING Cheung-ying were summarised below:

- (a) he said the concept of the organiser was well worthy of recognition and support. The organiser had made a lot of efforts to organise one day's activity. As the activity fell within the Easter holiday, he hoped that the period of the activity could be extended on condition that no nuisance would be caused to residents and the recreational and sports venues that usually used by residents would not be occupied;
- (b) he hoped that the Department would not put too many regulations on such activity so as not to hinder applications by other organisations;
- (c) he said he agreed with members that the HD could decide whether approve to a few hours' activity to be held in the estate would be approved. Moreover, the activity had been approved by the EMAC. He enquired which parties suggested submitting the proposal to the STDC for discussion and what the significance of the discussion was;
- (d) he hoped that the activity would not be controlled by commercial organisations, so as not to stifle the opportunities for the self-employed to unleash their potential on the event day; and
- (e) he opined that the FEHD and the HD handled the matters unnecessarily. He said the bazaar policy was aimed at the longer-term commercial activities or hawking related to people's livelihood which were then necessary to be seriously discussed in the estate and the STDC. As the few hours' bazaar was about ordinary creative cultural activities, he opined that the two departments had not correctly interpreted and understood the relevant policies, and thus triggering unnecessary debate at the STDC.

14. The views of Mr WONG Yue-hon were summarised below:

- (a) he was aware that the activity would have certain expenses and noted that the activity would charge a fee. The organiser seemed to borrow a public venue and then sublet it to the stall operators. He hoped that the organiser could explain this in detail;
- (b) he said that the application for the activity had been completed, which meant it was expected to be held certainly, and hence he asked why it was submitted to the STDC for discussion. He said the Department submitted the activity to the STDC. He wondered whether it meant that the STDC supported the activity, and if there was a similar application in the future, whether it would be approved so to make the application easier to handle. He asked if there were other organisations applying for similar projects in the future, what

arrangements would be made, and whether it would also be submitted to the STDC;

- (c) he said the activity involved two government departments and asked whether the HD or the FEHD considered that it should be submitted to the STDC. He hoped the departments would respond to this issue;
- (d) he said that according to the Guidelines, the FEHD should consult the STDC and the local community before applying to the relevant department. He asked the Department whether the applicant organisation had obtained the relevant licence before consulting the STDC and whether the Guidelines had been updated; and
- (e) he asked in the future, if the departments knew that the applicant organisation had completed the consultation with the STDC and the local community, whether the departments could issue the relevant licences in a coordinated manner, so that the applicant organisation would not need to go through various departments. Otherwise, the arrangements would only hinder the organisations from hosting the bazaars rather than supporting it. He asked whether the Department would like to use this consultation as a model to simplify the arrangements so that the organisations could complete the application in a short period of time in future with streamlined procedures.

15. The views of Mr MAK Yun-pui were summarised below:

- (a) he said the Hong Kong Social Workers' General Union and he himself fully supported the bazaar policy. He cited North District as an example, saying that bazaars held by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) were also supported by the EMAC and were finally continued to be held. He said that different districts had their own EMAC, but their ways of handling the issue were different. It was no wonder that there were criticisms that the Government was ineffective in promoting the bazaars in the housing estates and the application procedures were complicated, which had made the development of housing estate bazaars indefinite. Since the activity had the support of the EMAC in the concerned district and the government departments had approved the application, he did not see why it had to be submitted to the STDC for discussion again;
- (b) he asked if the activity was submitted to the STDC for discussion, whether it would become a pilot scheme, and wondered if bazaars were held in other districts, whether the same formalities were required. He also asked whether the EMAC had the authority to approve such activities, and if so, it would not be necessary to submit to the STDC. He asked whether submitting to the STDC would become an application benchmark which would then be applicable to all bazaar applications in the future; and
- (c) he hoped that the Government could allow the NGOs to have more freedom. After they had negotiated with district stakeholders, the matter should be dealt with by the district if district needs were confirmed. He was worried that the bazaars would have trading undertaken by small organisations under the large enterprises, and opined that the STDC played a very important role in

supervision. He hoped that the Government could streamline the application procedures and make the community life more colourful.

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

- (a) he expressed his full support for the M.O.S. Bazaar Project at Chung On Estate. He welcomed consultation with the STDC, but would to know about the purpose of consulting the STDC first. He opined that the bazaar project was a good attempt, and would be a good thing if it became a pilot scheme. He hoped that there would be a more comprehensive bazaar policy to give the public a better choice; and
- (b) he said he had communicated with the Legislative Council Members earlier. Everyone agreed that it was very difficult now to regulate the Link REIT. When it was first listed more than a decade ago, there was a high vacancy rate at the HD's shopping malls, which caused the malls to be unwelcomed. Although he objected at that time, the Link REIT was eventually successfully listed. He said there were many aftermaths of the listing, including continuing rising rents that the public could not afford. In recent years, the Link REIT had divested and sold to the highest bidder. He learned that it was difficult for members to express their opinions to the merchants after the divestment. He opined that the financial burden of the nearby residents was very high. He said that the HA could use the bazaar project to bring order out of chaos and let members of the public have a good choice.

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

- (a) he said he had always supported the bazaars and the operation of individual merchants, but the paper indicated that stall merchants had been recruited from January to February this year before submitting to the STDC. He asked if the STDC disagreed or did not approve the fund application, whether it would affect the activity and whether there was a backup plan;
- (b) he asked whether the effectiveness could be evaluated if the bazaar was only held for one day during a few days' Easter holiday;
- (c) he asked whether the organiser forecasted that the bazaar project would have a surplus or a loss, and asked how the surplus or loss would be dealt with because the paper had not accounted for the relevant issue; and
- (d) regarding law enforcement issue, he asked if offences were found, which parties would be responsible for enforcement. He asked whether communication had been made with the law enforcement departments.

18. The views of Ms LAM Chung-yan were summarised below:

- (a) she personally opined that bazaars would make the community more diverse. As the concerned paper stated that there was a funding application submitted to the STDC, she asked the Secretariat whether the application had been approved, or whether it had been approved by the Culture, Sports & Community Development Committee (CSCDC);



- (b) she asked how the organiser would monitor the activity and deal with complaints during and after the activity, such as noise and quality of goods. She asked whether there was a channel for members of the public to reflect their opinions after the activity;
- (c) she said it was not a bad thing to consult the STDC about the activity. Members could understand about new thinking in the district, for example to understand the results of the activity, whether the district's response to the activity would be studied, so that members could consider whether it was worth promoting the entire bazaar project in the future; and
- (d) she wanted to understand the idea of the organiser. She asked whether there was any hope to knock down the Link, and said if the bazaar was only held once, it might not achieve that result. She asked whether the organiser had plans to promote the activity in the entire Sha Tin District and even across the territory.

19. The views of Mr James CHAN were summarised below:

- (a) he hoped that members would fully support the bazaar project and said that there were no perfect, flawless proposals, including noise, counterfeit goods or cleanliness issues. For example, he said the "poon choi" banquet at Chung On Estate did not receive complaints and there was no need to submit a report after the event. He said the organiser was an NGO with limited manpower, and opined that the activity should be outright approved to give it an opportunity; and
- (b) he did not understand why the EMAC of Chung On Estate had such a great power. The entire land lot consisted of a few buildings of Chung On Estate. Kam Fung Court had 9 residential buildings; the number of residents was double that of Chung On Estate, and the shopping mall, the market and entertainment facilities were shared by the entire land lot. If there was the need to consult the most affected residents, why not consult Kam Fung Court and the concerned shopping mall. He said it was rare for the organiser to hold the bazaar to provide opportunities for the young people, and opined that after the bazaar was held in Sha Tin, housing estates in other districts should follow suit and learn from it. He hoped that the HD would approve similar small activities, and the STDC would approve the funding application.

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

- (a) he said he agreed with the M.O.S. Bazaar Project and pointed out that Sha Kok Estate had also set up a EMAC, which would allocate funds to the NGOs each year. He asked about the reasons for the HD to submit the project to the STDC; and
- (b) he asked whether the activity would continue to be held in the future if it met the expectations of the organiser in this occasion, or whether it was a one-time activity. He said that the bazaar was an innovative activity for Sha Tin District, as organisations in the past mostly organised carnivals. If this activity

could achieve the said results, it would provide opportunities for the young people, residents and the public. He expressed his agreement to hold the activity and hoped that the organiser would explain the relevant follow-up arrangements.

21. Mr NG Kam-hung said young people should be encouraged to participate in the project. We often said that we must cultivate the minds of the young people to contribute to society. Now it was rare that they were willing to participate, and support should be given to them. He said that if there was already plan to hold the activity, it should be submitted to the STDC for discussion as early as possible, the corresponding response would not be so big. He said that the items sold in the bazaar were not complicated and would not need to use open flame. He opined that they should be given an opportunity to try. He said that the bazaar would allow young people to apply what they have learned, and he hoped that members would give their consent to the activity.

22. The views of Ms TUNG Kin-lei were summarised below:

- (a) she said that the project was scheduled to close its recruitment of stall merchants on 3 February and announce the bidding results of the merchants on 17 February. The date of this meeting was 28 February, and since the FEHD knew that there would be an activity held in Chung On Estate, she asked why it was only submitted to the STDC for consultation on this day. She asked what the role of the STDC was in the application, and why should it approve the application for venue under the HD. She said for a charity organisation to hold activity in the estate, if the STDC disagreed, whether the 40 stalls could not continue to participate in the activity, whether it would cause inconvenience to the organiser and the merchants; and
- (b) she supported the project which would involve more young people in the community and allow them to learn doing business. She said that apart from the 40 stalls, there were booth games, performances and 5 workshops. She was concerned that the 7-a-side soccer pitches was small and whether it could accommodate the equipment and a large number of participants. She asked whether the crowded environment was good for business. She referred to the wet goods stalls at Yuen Wo Road that the stalls were not so dense. As there were performances and booth games with members of the public queuing up in line, she asked whether it could really accommodate so many booths while ensuring smooth crowd flow.

23. The views of Mr LI Sai-wing were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the STDC was not consulted on other matters in the estate, and asked why the FEHD suddenly consulted the STDC on this matter;
- (b) he said if the Government wanted to implement or the FEHD wanted to launch policies that assisted NGOs to support and inspire young people, he urged the Government to provide more resources. He said that the activity was held at HD's venue which payment of rent was required, he proposed that the FEHD should pay the rent on behalf in order to help the young people;

- (c) he said that everyone wanted to help the young people to unleash their potential and asked whether the FEHD would regularly hold the bazaar or whether there was a sustainable development plan;
- (d) while he expressed his hope that the activity would be successfully held, the DC Members of the Sha Tin District should also be invited to attend the event to show their support; and
- (e) he said the FEHD had not explained whether there was any violation of the ordinances for the organisation to rent the venue to hold the bazaar, including whether monetary transactions were allowed. He opined that the FEHD should have a detailed plan before implementing it, and the HD should respond to the question whether monetary transactions were allowed in the ball court of Chung On Estate. He said that if the above activity involving monetary transactions was breaching the rules, and the CSCDC later approved the funding application to subsidise its activity, it would seem to have an impact on the STDC. Therefore, before the departments that implemented the relevant policy and the HD could respond clearly, he opined that it would be difficult for members to put the matter to the vote.

24. The views of Mr HO Hau-cheung were summarised below:

- (a) he opined that the discussion of members was a bit out of focus. He said that the contents of the discussion included giving opinions on the activity and enquiring the reasons for submitting the activity to the STDC for discussion, for which he was more concerned about the latter. He said that representatives of the FEHD and the HD were evasive in responding to the enquiries of members, and then the NGO representatives voiced out the reason that it was the conclusion of the Legislative Council discussion that its application required the support of the STDC. He said that the STDC had not received any notice from the Bureau about the policy arrangements; and
- (b) although members overall had no objections, the discussion at this meeting seemed to be a rubber stamp. He was concerned about the responsibility of the STDC in this consultation role, and opined that this bazaar was small in size among the large number of community activities. He said that if holding similar activities or various other kinds of activities every time must go through the lengthy discussion of the STDC, he asked whether the STDC could cope with it. He opined that with regard to the discussion items submitted by the departments, the STDC Secretariat, the Sha Tin District Office (STDO) and the CSCDC Chairman all had the responsibility to keep a close check on.

25. The views of Mr Rick HUI were summarised below:

- (a) he said that bazaars generally aimed at engaging the participation of young people who had no experience in business operation. However, if the activity was held only for 1 day and the participating stall owners were mostly those with business experience, he opined that it would not be much helpful to those young people who were interested in starting a business but lacked operational experience and resources;

- (b) he suggested that the Government should organise bazaars in public spaces for a longer period of time so that young people could understand the entire process of starting a business. In this regard, he hoped that the FEHD, the LCSD and the HD would consider opening up their venues to allow young people to have longer periods of time to operate the stalls; and
- (c) he said he did not want the agenda item to end without any responses by the department representatives after 2 rounds of speaking by members. He said that the HD was the closest to members of the public and had many open spaces. He urged the HD to study carefully, apart from application to the Social Welfare Department (SWD) for funding raising by selling flags, whether it was generally an offence for the venue renters to collect money at the stalls, and whether the Link had any objections. He hoped that the departments would give a concrete response to this.

26. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he said that at the meeting of the Working Group on Screening of Funding Application (Ad Hoc) (WGSFA) held earlier, the proposed funding amount of \$11,759 for the concerned activity had been approved and endorsed. The proposed funding amount, together with the meeting paper “Proposed Estimates and Funding Applications from Local Organisations under Expenditure Head 10 (Community Development) of 2019/2020” were submitted to the CSCDC and would be discussed and considered for endorsement during the later agenda. Details of the funding amount of the activity were set out in item 31 of Annex II to the paper; and
- (b) he said that the HD held a variety of activities from time to time in the housing estates, and it was not possible for each activity to be submitted to the STDC for discussion. He said that bazaars might be relatively new, hence the Department hoped that members would give more opinions so that the activity could be held successfully. He said that the CSCDC would not indicate support or objection to the activity, but would provide comments to allow the HD and the EMAC to approve the activity themselves. If there were several bazaar applications in the future, members would not approve one by one.

27. Ms LO Sze-man gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that the organisation’s application for holding the bazaar was a bottom-up proposal. If the concerned organisation had found a suitable location and had sought the permission of the venue owner, whether inside or outside the scope of the HD or in a public place, the Department would consult whether the LD would approve if the bazaar would be set up in a public place. If there would be entertainment performances, a temporary place of public entertainment licence must be applied. The Department would consult relevant departments, such as the LD, the Fire Services Department (FSD) and the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), whether they had any objection to the activity or had any comments. The Department would convey the guidelines to be followed to the relevant organisation. The

departments would conduct on-site inspections in respect of their roles to see whether the activity had fulfilled the set conditions;

- (b) she said that the application for the concerned activity had no arrangement for cooked food stalls. Therefore, the organisation had not applied for a temporary food factory licence. The organisation had submitted an application for a temporary place of public entertainment licence and the Department had forwarded it to the relevant departments. The HD, the FSD, the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) and the EPD had provided their comments and had no objections;
- (c) she said that if the location of the activity was in a public place, i.e. not in the area of the housing estate or a ball court, and if the organisation applied for a temporary place of public entertainment licence for performances, the LD had to be consulted for comments. The M.O.S. Bazaar was located within the scope of the venue under the HD, hence there was no need to consult the LD;
- (d) she said that the temporary place of public entertainment licence for the activity was still pending approval, as different departments were still being consulted at this stage. The HKPF, the FSD and the EPD expressed no objection, while the HD said that the STDC had to be consulted for the bazaar application, hence the result was pending the official response from the HD;
- (e) she said that the bazaar policy had been discussed at the Legislative Council which she also heard about it, but she had not yet received an official document dealing with the bazaar policy; and
- (f) she thanked and noted members' views. The bazaar policy would be included in the next discussion. She herself would also study the policy in depth.

28. Mr LAM Yam-fung gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he said that the organisation renting the venue would be responsible for the management of the activity venue while the estate management would be responsible for the surrounding areas of the activity venue;
- (b) regarding land use, he said that because the lease was of a short-term nature, it was available for holding bazaars. In addition, he said that after receiving the applicant's proposal, it was reviewed by the Department's Land Administration Section. Since the bazaar was of a short-term nature, there was no need to submit to the LD for approval;
- (c) with regard to electricity, it would be arranged by the venue leaseholder;
- (d) he said that the Department had not stipulated that there should not be any monetary transactions in bazaar activities. Moreover, he said that there was no information indicating that the activity was illegal and the Department also considered that the activity was not illegal;
- (e) he said that according to government policy, the activity must have the support of the concerned district council;

- (f) he said that the applicant organisation had to pay the rent. Since the applicant organisation was a non-profit-making organisation, the venue was leased out at a preferential price in principle, roughly recovering the administrative cost; and
- (g) he thanked members for their views which would be forwarded to the Department for study.

29. Mr HO Yiu-chung, Housing Officer / S(TNS) 1 of the HD responded that the venue approval letter did not mention that monetary transactions were not allowed. As to whether monetary transactions would violate the law would depend on the content of the transactions. For example, if selling and buying of lottery tickets were involved, a licence had to be applied from the SWD, and the organiser should be aware of the relevant requirements.

30. Mr CHEUNG Chi-lun, Registered Social Worker of H.K.S.K.H. Ma On Shan (South) Children & Youth Integrated Service Centre gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he was grateful to many members for supporting the activity. He said funding application to the STDC had been made earlier, hoping to receive subsidies for materials, volunteers, meals, renting booths, audio, etc.;
- (b) he said that the stall owners had been charged a fee of \$500. After the stall participated the 2-day activity, a deposit of \$200 would be refunded. The organiser would use the remaining \$300 to purchase water, decorate the stalls and make banners for the stall owners. If the application amount was not fully funded, it would still be used for financing the expenses. All income would be used for covering the activity expenses, such as a large number of leaflets and pull-up stands, hence all income would be used up;
- (c) he said that the profits earned by the stalls would be managed by the stall owners themselves;
- (d) he said that the bazaar would only sell dry goods, hoping to sell handmade products by members of the public, such as environmental handmade soap and handmade leather products. He said that the first bazaar was held at the LCSD's venue last year and was very popular with the participation of persons with intellectual disabilities, the elderly and young people. They wanted more people in the community to understand the disadvantaged. They would participate again this year, with stalls selling pottery, pictures, bags and other products. The diversity of the bazaar allowed them to reach out to different people;
- (e) regarding crowd control, he said that 20 volunteers would be recruited from the community. Together with the organiser's staff, a total of 40 people would maintain order in the venue. 1 volunteer would be on duty at each entrance and signs would be placed at the entrances and exits and between the stalls. In addition, signs would be placed in the estate to inform residents that the bazaar was being held at the ball court;

- (f) regarding environmental health and noise, he said that environmental recycling bins would be placed for the collection of plastic bottles and waste paper during the activity, and large garbage collection bins would also be borrowed from the FEHD. In addition, he said that he would pay attention to the noise problem and would record the noise volume in decibels according to the EPD guidelines;
- (g) he said that application had been made last year for the same venue but was not approved because the HD indicated that according to the Guidelines issued by the Legislative Council in November 2017, support from the district council must be obtained for holding a bazaar in housing estates. As for the order of consulting the EMAC and the STDC, he said that as the application procedures were complicated, he hoped to know how long it would need to apply in advance and hoped that the STDC or the Government would coordinate;
- (h) he said that last year's bazaar was welcomed by the public. The organiser intended to hold the bazaars for a long term, and planned to communicate with the volunteers, stall owners and residents in the area this year to examine the feasibility of setting up a working group in order to hold relevant activities on a regular basis; and
- (i) regarding the number of stalls, he said that more than 80 applications were received this year with a total of 38 stalls being selected. The documents of more than a dozen selected stalls had not been fully submitted, and hence not shown in the paper.

31. Ms CHAN Man-kuen said that members generally expressed their welcome and support to the bazaar project. Unfortunately, the representatives of the departments present at the meeting failed to respond to the questions of members. She believed that there would not be satisfactory reply by spending further time on the discussion. She opined that the departments should respond to members' questions as soon as possible after the meeting. She said that if the matter was left for discussion at the next meeting, the activity had already finished. She suggested that the relevant departments and organisation should submit the relevant report after the activity had finished, so that members could grasp the situation of the activity. In addition, the departments must also consider and study members' comments as soon as possible because the department representatives failed to answer members' questions at the meeting. She suggested ending the agenda item.

32. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the FEHD had no reason for not understanding the bazaar policy and requested the representatives of the Department to learn whether there were documents in place related to managing the bazaar policy after the meeting;
- (b) he said that the Department had not responded to members' questions, including if the departments needed to consult the STDC, why the views of the departments were sought first. Moreover, the arrangements during the recess remained unresolved; and

- (c) he opined that the department representatives' responses were rash and the preparation of the meeting documents was insufficient. The FEHD did not understand the bazaar policy, and the HD failed to respond to questions such as whether it was illegal to have monetary transactions. He requested the departments to clarify the questions and concerns of members and report to the Department. In addition, he requested that the departments must convey this issue to the EMAC of Chung On Estate, since there were still many questions that remained unclarified, and the EMAC needed to know the STDC's comments before making a decision.

33. The Chairman announced the end of the agenda item.

Proposed Estimates and Funding Applications from Local Organisations under Expenditure Head 1 (Cultural Affairs) of 2019/2020  
(Paper No. CSCD 11/2019)

34. The following members declared their interest in relation to the above paper:

Ms CHAN Man-kuen	Director, Sha Tin Arts Association
Mr CHING Cheung-ying	”
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	”
Mr Tiger WONG	”
Ms Iris WONG	”

35. Members unanimously endorsed the proposed estimates set out in the paper above.

36. Members unanimously endorsed the funding applications submitted by local organisations under Expenditure Head 1 of 2019/2020 as recommended by the WGSFA.

Proposed Estimates and Funding Applications from Local Organisations under Expenditure Head 6 (Recreation and Sports) of 2019/2020  
(Paper No. CSCD 12/2019)

37. The following member declared his interest in relation to the above paper:

Mr CHING Cheung-ying	Director, Sha Tin Sports Association
----------------------	--------------------------------------

38. Members unanimously endorsed the proposed estimates set out in the paper above.

39. Members unanimously endorsed the funding applications submitted by local organisations under Expenditure Head 6 of 2019/2020 as recommended by the WGSFA.

Proposed Estimates under Expenditure Head 8 (Festival Celebration) of 2019/2020  
(Paper No. CSCD 13/2019)

40. Members unanimously endorsed the proposed estimates set out in the paper above.

Proposed Estimates and Funding Applications from Local Organisations under Expenditure Head 10 (Community Development) of 2019/2020  
(Paper No. CSCD 14/2019)



41. The following members declared their interest in relation to the above paper:

Ms CHAN Man-kuen	Chairman, Kwong Yuen Volunteer Group
Mr CHING Cheung-ying	Advisor, Sha Tin San Tin Wai Kaifong Association
Ms TUNG Kin-lei	Advisor, Shatin Youths Association; Advisor, Shatin Women's Association Limited and Community Leader, Sha Tin Rural Committee
Ms Iris WONG	Chairman, On King Street Residents' Association
Mr YIU Ka-chun	Chairman, Yuen Chau Kok Residents' Association

42. Mr CHAN Nok-hang asked how to deal with the proposed funding for Activity No. 31 "M.O.S. Bazaar Project" in Annex II.

43. Mr WONG Yue-hon asked whether activities funded by the STDC must be endorsed by the STDC first before relevant arrangements for the activities such as publicity could be made. He was worried that publicity for the M.O.S. Bazaar Project had begun before the funding was confirmed. He asked the Secretariat how this would affect the funding arrangement.

44. Mr Michael YUNG said that after the declaration of interest, the Chairman had not explained whether they had no voting rights.

45. Mr David HO, Executive Officer I (District Council)<sup>1</sup> of the STDO said that when the STDC had not yet endorsed the STDC funding application by the organisation for its proposed activity, the concerned activity was still not an activity subsidised by the STDC. Since the STDC logo could only be used for matters related to the STDC, in the above circumstances, the relevant organisation should not mention that the activity was subsidised by the STDC when promoting its proposed activity. If the STDC later endorsed the above STDC funding application, it would send a confirmation letter to the relevant organisation. Upon receipt of the above confirmation letter, the relevant organisation must in the preparation or holding of the funded activity include a public statement on the publicity materials stating that the activity was sponsored by the STDC.

46. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he said that when he was dealing with the paper just then, he asked whether members objected to adopting the no objection vote to make the meeting proceed more smoothly; and
- (b) he said that members could still consider endorsing the funding application of the M.O.S. Bazaar Project. If the venue that the organisation applied for use was not approved and a new venue had to be found, the organisation could apply to the Secretariat for changing the activity venue, and the funds would be received after the activity was completed according to the manual.

47. Mr TING Tsz-yuen objected to the funding application of Kam Ying Court Residents' Rights Committee (Activity No. 42 to 44). Having considered the way of handling matters by the local organisation, and that corruption might be involved, he opined that if funds were still allocated to the office bearers of that organisation, it would be against the wishes of the public. Hence, he objected to the fund allocation.

48. Members unanimously endorsed the proposed estimates set out in the paper above.
49. Members unanimously endorsed the funding applications submitted by local organisations for Activity Nos. 1 to 41 and 45 to 152 under Expenditure Head 10 of 2019/2000 as recommended by the WGSFA.
50. The Chairman said that the WGSFA did not recommend allocating funds for “Lei Yue Mun Day Tour” (Activity No. 44), and therefore would put “Hong Kong Wetland Park Day Tour” (Activity No. 42) and “Tuen Mun Day Tour” (Activity No. 43) to the vote.
51. Mr Michael YUNG asked that if members disagreed with individual funding applications in the future, whether the funding applications should be considered as a whole or individually. He opined that the funding applications should be voted on as a whole. If the funding applications were to be dealt with individually, each funding application should be voted on one by one. He said that the recommended funding applications submitted by the WGSFA should be respected.
52. Mr WONG Yue-hon opined that those activities that members objected to might be voted on individually. If after the Chairman’s enquiry, members had no objections but the funding applications still needed to be voted on one by one, it would be a waste of time.
53. The Chairman said that he considered the voting methods from the perspective of the efficiency of the meeting.
54. Members endorsed the funding application for “Hong Kong Wetland Park Day Tour” of Kam Ying Court Residents’ Rights Committee as recommended by the WGSFA by 11 affirmative votes, 4 negative votes, 5 abstention votes, and 2 members did not press the voting buttons.
55. Members endorsed the funding application for “Tuen Mun Day Tour” of Kam Ying Court Residents’ Rights Committee as recommended by the WGSFA by 9 affirmative votes, 7 negative votes, 3 abstention votes, and 2 members did not press the voting buttons.

Proposed Estimates and Funding Applications from Local Organisations under Expenditure Head 11 (Community Organisations) of 2019/2020  
(Paper No. CSCD 15/2019)

56. The following members declared their interest in relation to the above paper. The Chairman said that they were allowed to attend the meeting, but would not have voting rights on these funding applications.

57. The following members declared their interest in relation to the above paper:

Mr CHENG Tsuk-man	Chairman, Heng On Estate Owners’ Corporation
Mr Tiger WONG	Member, Kwong Lam Court Owners’ Corporation
Mr YIU Ka-chun	Advisor, Prima Villa Owners’ Committee

58. Mr TING Tsz-yuen objected to the funding applications of Kam Ying Court (Phase II) Owners’ Corporation (OC) (Activity No. 93 to 95). He pointed out that the OC should hold the owners’ meeting in January this year, but when it cancelled the owners’ meeting, it

claimed that there was a problem with the STDO venue. He therefore opined that the OC's integrity and ways of handling matters were problematic. If the funding applications were endorsed, it would not meet the expectations of residents.

59. Mr CHING Cheung-ying referred to the review of funding applications under Expenditure Head 10 and Expenditure Head 11 and thanked the Secretariat for facilitating the electronic application process so that the organisations could choose to submit the application form either in the conventional manner or electronically. He said that the applicant organisations under Head 10 were more inclined to use the spreadsheet format, while the applicant organisations under Head 11 were more likely to submit applications in the paper format. He said that encouraging the use of electronic application would reduce administrative work. He also hoped that the Secretariat could arrange manpower to convert the paper application forms into the spreadsheet format, so that the WGSFA could review the funding applications more effectively.

60. Ms Iris WONG said that owners' corporations in the district asked when they could apply for the STDC funds. She hoped that the Secretariat would notify all mutual aid committees and owners' corporations in Sha Tin when the funding application period commenced.

61. Mr WONG Yue-hon said that a large number of organisations submitted applications to the STDO or the STDC. He hoped that the STDO and the STDC would reflect to the Innovation and Technology Bureau to allocate funds to make the electronic application available for facilitating the public to apply online, and to simplify the procedures and data entry work.

62. Mr David HO responded that the Secretariat had noted the opinions on the publicity of the STDC funding application. In addition, he said that the Secretariat would assist the Working Group on Screening of Funding Application (Ad Hoc) to summarise the experiences of the STDC funding application electronic pilot scheme, hoping to make the scheme better.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat would send mail to all mutual aid committees/owners' committees/owners' corporations registered with the STDO at the beginning of the funding application period and upload the information about the application to the STDC website.)

63. Members unanimously endorsed the proposed estimates set out in the paper above.

64. Members unanimously endorsed the funding applications from local organisations for Activity No. 1 to 92 and 96 to 132 under Expenditure Head 11 of 2019/20 as recommended by the WGSFA.

65. Members endorsed the funding application for "Kam Tin Day Tour" (Activity No. 93) of Kam Ying Court (Phase II) Owners' Corporation as recommended by the WGSFA by 10 affirmative votes, 7 negative votes, 2 abstention votes, and 3 members did not press the voting buttons.

66. Members endorsed the funding application for "Tap Mun Day Tour" (Activity No. 94) of Kam Ying Court (Phase II) Owners' Corporation as recommended by the WGSFA by 9 affirmative votes, 8 negative votes, 2 abstention votes, and 3 members did not press the voting buttons.

67. Members rejected the funding application for “Kadoorie Farm Day Tour” (Activity No. 95) of Kam Ying Court (Phase II) Owners’ Corporation as recommended by the WGSFA by 9 affirmative votes, 10 negative votes, 2 abstention votes, and 1 member did not press the voting button.

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

- (a) he said that he was one of the conveners of the WGSFA for the past 4 years, reviewing the funding applications under Expenditure Head 1 and Expenditure Head 6. He thanked all staff of the Secretariat who helped process the funding applications;
- (b) he said that he tried to invite to meet with the 2 major organisations this year in Sha Tin that applied for the STDC funds, namely Sha Tin Arts Association and Sha Tin Sports Association (STSA). He said that before the review of the funding applications, the responsible persons for the funding applications of these 2 organisations, namely the executives and the chairmen, were invited to meet and exchange views before the application review meeting. He opined that the meeting had been effective, and hoped that the next convener of the WGSFA would closely liaise and communicate with the above 2 organisations to listen to their opinions on the application approval work;
- (c) regarding the electronic application procedures to facilitate the applicant organisations, he pointed out that when the WGSFA reviewed the funding this year, it used projection to view the applications in order to reduce the use of paper, such that the WGSFA members had to look up at the big screen, which made the review process more difficult. He suggested that we should keep up with the times and refer to the practice of the Youth Programme Committee to purchase iPad tablets to facilitate the WGSFA members to review the funding applications, which could not only help them clearly check the application details but also reduce the use of paper; and
- (d) regarding the response from the 2 major organisations, he said that certain activity expenditures were large, it was difficult to submit all reports and supporting documents within the required 1 month period. He suggested discussing setting a large fund limit in the next term of the STDC to require the activity organisations to submit the supporting documents.

69. Mr WONG Yue-hon asked what arrangement would be made to the funding applications that had not been endorsed just then. In addition, he said that the concerned activity was not endorsed probably because members had opinions on the integrity of certain organisation members. He said that there were a large number of people involved in each organisation. He was worried that members of the organisation would be subject to background check in the future because of the application for funding, and as such would affect whether the funding application would be endorsed, instead of looking at whether the activity would benefit the residents of the district.

70. Mr CHING Cheung-ying said that as a director of the STSA the organisation must submit the supporting documents for reimbursement for the 2018 Dragon Boat Race within 1 month. As the expenditures were large, the organisation had engaged a professional

auditor to conduct the audit which had not yet been completed in January this year. He suggested that the Secretariat communicate well with the organisations and simplify the fund reimbursement procedures.

71. The Chairman asked the Secretary to note the comments and announced to end of the above agenda.

### **Funding Applications**

Proposed District Free Entertainment Programmes from April 2019 to March 2020 Jointly Organised with the Leisure and Cultural Services Department  
(Paper No. CSCD 16/2019)

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

- (a) he said that the number of venues under the LCSD for holding free entertainment programmes in the district was increasing, but the number of sessions was not, which meant dispersing the rights of other districts in enjoying these programmes. He said that the STDC funds for this year were relatively abundant compared to previous years, but the Department had not actively increased the number of sessions in response to the increase in population in the district. He said that the number of sessions for both mobile library vans and recreational sports activities could be increased and asked why the number of sessions of the free entertainment programmes could not be increased;
- (b) he asked whether the resource allocation of the Entertainment Office referred to money or manpower. He was dissatisfied that the review was conducted only after 11 years and asked when the review would be completed. He asked the Department to supplement information after the meeting on whether the concerned Office had increased its manpower from 2008 to the present; and
- (c) he asked whether the maintenance of the Dragon Boat Pavilion canopies was responsible by the consulting firm or the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD). He opined that the dragon boat event held at the Dragon Boat Pavilion was a landmark event in Sha Tin. Therefore, he was dissatisfied with the slow progress of the rehabilitation which was not completed before the dragon boat event. He condemned the relevant responsible persons and requested a specific reply at the next meeting on the slow rehabilitation progress and how to ensure that the rehabilitation works involving landmarks could be quickly processed in the future.

73. Ms Iris WONG said that an orchestral concert had been held at Shek Mun Playground Basketball Courts and nearby residents complained about noise nuisance. She hoped that no more loud programmes would be held at that venue.

74. Mr WONG Yue-hon said after Typhoon Mangkhut, many venues under the LCSD such as Sha Tin Park Main Plaza and Dragon Boat Pavilion canopies had not been restored, which affected members of the public having activities such as tai chi, kung fu or dancing as there were no suitable venues for their use during rainy days. He asked about the Department's response plan to assist members of the public to carry on their activities in

other covered venues. He also asked whether it was possible to open the nearby community halls from 7 am to 9 am, such as Lek Yuen Community Hall, Pok Hong Community Hall or Sha Kok Community Hall.

75. Mr Rico LEUNG, Senior Manager (New Territories East) Promotion of the LCSD gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he said that the Entertainment Office was responsible for coordinating the free entertainment activities in all 18 districts of Hong Kong. As early as 2008, the number of free entertainment activities in districts was set according to the resources available and the population distribution of each district at that time. He said that he had reflected the views of Mr Michael YUNG to the Entertainment Office and noted that the Office had actively reviewed the format, content and frequency of the programmes in all 18 districts. The review would take time and the district councils would be consulted upon completion of the review. 60 programmes per year would be maintained in Sha Tin District for 2019/2020;
- (b) he said that the main resource shortages were inadequate staffing and technical support. After the meeting, he would collect information on the manpower resources and the corresponding increase and decrease in the scope of responsible services from 2008 to the present from the Entertainment Office and would report to members; and
- (c) he said he had noted the noise situation at Shek Mun Playground Basketball Courts and, if necessary, would find suitable places in the area to replace Shek Mun Playground Basketball Courts for holding free entertainment activities.

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

- (a) she said that the Department was very concerned about the structural safety of Sha Tin Park Main Plaza and Dragon Boat Pavilion canopies. When it was discovered that the concerned facilities were damaged, the ArchSD was immediately notified and structural engineers had conducted inspections, studied improvement plans and started tendering. The tendering process had now been completed and a work schedule had been drawn up. Due to the complexity of the reconstruction of the Dragon Boat Pavilion and the need to close the site for rehabilitation, in order not to affect the dragon boat race, the rehabilitation works would be arranged after the dragon boat race;
- (b) the Department would install a small tent at Sha Tin Park Main Plaza in early March to provide shelter and shading for the public; and
- (c) the rehabilitation of the 2 canopies was undertaken by the ArchSD. She would pass the condemnation of members to the ArchSD and ask them to submit a written reply.

77. Mr Derek YUEN, Senior Executive Officer (District Council) of the STDO responded that members' proposal to open the community halls could be discussed at the Working Group on the Management of Community Halls and Libraries.

78. The Chairman asked Mr Rico LEUNG to submit the reply to Mr Michael YUNG's enquiry to the STDC Secretariat. The concerned reply would be included in the meeting paper "Responses of Government Departments to Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting".

79. Members unanimously endorsed the above funding application.

Recreation and Sports Activities Programme from April 2019 to March 2020 Organised by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department in Sha Tin District  
(Paper No. CSCD 17/2019)

80. Mr Michael YUNG asked the Department how many activities were increased as compared with the corresponding period last year.

81. Ms Jackie LO responded that there was an increase of 31 activities throughout the year.

82. Members unanimously endorsed the above funding application.

Promotional Activities of Public Libraries from April 2019 to March 2020 Organised by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department in Sha Tin District  
(Paper No. CSCD 18/2019)

83. Ms LEE Mei-yee, Senior Librarian (Sha Tin) of the LCSD added that the "Discover and Sharing the Joy of Reading" programme of the public libraries promoted reading culture across the territory. The details were set out in Annex III of the paper.

84. Members unanimously endorsed the above funding application.

Funding Application from the Sha Tin Sports Association  
(Paper No. CSCD 19/2019)

85. The Chairman welcomed the STSA representatives to the meeting to respond to members' questions.

86. Mr CHING Cheung-ying declared his interest as a member of the STSA. The Chairman said that he was allowed to attend the meeting, but would not have the voting right on this funding application.

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

- (a) regarding the application for the STDC funds of \$50,000 under Item 21 of the Expenditure Items in Annex II to subsidise the expenses of the dragon boats, he asked what equipment was included in the dragon boats, and why \$30,000 of the STDC funds was applied for Item 23 of the Expenditure Items to subsidise the expenses on the dragon heads and dragon tails;
- (b) with regard to Item 28 of the Expenditure Items, he asked why road closure required an expenditure of \$5,000;

- (c) with regard to Item 29 of the Expenditure Items, he said that the expenditure for inspection of the floating platforms was \$10,000, while Item 22 of the Expenditure Items had already included the purchase of floating platforms. He asked whether the floating platforms were purchase or rental items, and if they were rental items, the inspection fee should be included;
- (d) he asked whether the STSA purchased dragon boats every year and inquired about the relationship between Items 21, 22 and 23; and
- (e) he hoped that the Secretariat would record that the STSA would purchase the dragon boats this year. He said that there would be no need to purchase in the future.

88. Ms CHUNG June, Executive Secretary of the STSA gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that with regard to the dragon boats, some suppliers only sold dragon boats which did not necessarily include dragon heads and dragon tails. Therefore, the dragon heads and dragon tails were put under Item 23 of the Expenditure Items as other supporting devices;
- (b) regarding the temporary traffic control expense for Item 28 of the Expenditure Items, she said that bamboo poles were be constructed at Sand Martin Bridge to raise the railings to ensure the safety of the audience during the dragon boat activities every year. The concerned works must apply to the Transport Department and the Traffic New Territories South of the police for road closure before the works could be carried out;
- (c) the concerned floating platforms were owned by the STSA and would be dismantled for storage. Each year, the floating platforms were pieced up again for use for the dragon boat activities, and the permit issued by the Marine Department must be obtained to ensure that the floating platforms were in compliance with specifications and safety, and hence the floating platform inspection fee was paid annually; and
- (d) she said that dragon boats had rarely been purchased in recent decades, and the dragon boats were mostly repaired. As the dragon boats were stored in open space, Typhoon Mangkhut had caused serious damage to them. The concerned dragon boats had been used for nearly 30 years and the maintenance cost was expensive, hence it was hoped that new ones could be purchased this year. She added that the specifications of the old-style dragon boats did not meet international standards. If funding support was provided, dragon boats that met international standards would be purchased for participation in races.

89. Members unanimously endorsed the above funding application.

90. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to note that the STSA would purchase dragon boats this year.



**Information Item**

Reports of Working Groups  
(Paper No. CSCD 20/2019)

91. Members noted the meeting report submitted by the Working Group on Screening of Funding Application (Ad Hoc).

**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 (1st and 2nd Quarters of 2019)  
(Paper No. CSCD 21/2019)

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 (1st and 2nd Quarters of 2019)  
(Paper No. CSCD 22/2019)

Report and Plan on Public Libraries Promotion Activities Organised by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department in Sha Tin District (1st and 2nd Quarters of 2019)  
(Paper No. CSCD 23/2019)

Progress Report of the Sha Tin Arts Association  
(Paper No. CSCD 24/2019)

Progress Report of the Sha Tin Sports Association  
(Paper No. CSCD 25/2019)

92. Members noted the above 5 information papers.

**Date of Next Meeting**

93. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 10:00 am on 2 May 2019 (Thursday).
94. The meeting was adjourned at 12:47 pm.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat  
STDC13/15/50

March 2019