

Sha Tin District Council
Minutes of the 4th Meeting of
the District Facilities Management Committee in 2019

Date : 29 August 2019 (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>
Ms TUNG Kin-lei (Chairman)	DC Member	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr WONG Ka-wing, MH (Vice-Chairman)	”	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr HO Hau-cheung, SBS, MH	DC Chairman	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas, SBS, JP	DC Vice-Chairman	10:00 am	10:13 am
Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	DC Member	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, James	”	10:00 am	10:18 am
Ms CHAN Man-kuen	”	10:00 am	11:25 am
Mr CHAN Nok-hang	”	10:15 am	11:29 am
Mr CHENG Tsuk-man	”	10:11 am	11:29 am
Mr CHIU Man-leong	”	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr HUI Yui-yu, Rick	”	10:11 am	11:29 am
Mr LAI Tsz-yan	”	10:24 am	11:17 am
Ms LAM Chung-yan	”	10:27 am	11:29 am
Mr LEUNG Ka-fai	”	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr LI Sai-hung	”	10:00 am	11:17 am
Mr LI Sai-wing	”	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	”	10:11 am	11:29 am
Mr MAK Yun-pui	”	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS	”	10:11 am	11:29 am
Mr NG Kam-hung	”	10:25 am	11:26 am
Mr PUN Kwok-shan, MH, JP	”	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr SIU Hin-hong	”	10:19 am	11:29 am
Mr TING Tsz-yuen	”	10:26 am	11:29 am
Mr TONG Hok-leung	”	10:25 am	11:29 am
Ms TSANG So-lai	”	10:47 am	11:29 am
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	”	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr WONG Fu-sang, Tiger	”	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr WONG Hok-lai	”	10:00 am	10:37 am
Ms WONG Ping-fan	”	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr WONG Yue-hon	”	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr YAU Man-chun	”	10:15 am	11:28 am
Mr YIP Wing	”	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr YIU Ka-chun, MH	”	10:00 am	11:29 am
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael	”	10:00 am	11:29 am
Ms LAM Hang-ching, Dorothy (Secretary)	Executive Officer I (District Council) 2/ Sha Tin District Office		

In Attendance

Mr WONG Tin-pui, Simon

Mr YUEN Chun-kit, Derek

Ms CHENG Yuen-yi, Janny

Mr HO Sing-yan, Simon

Mr LAU Ting-fung, Toby

Ms YU Wai-ting, Amy

Mr NG Fuk-sing

Mr LAM Siu-kei

Ms HEUNG Ching-ye, Alice

Ms LO Lai-fong, Jackie

Ms CHAN Siu-kin, Ester

Ms LEUNG So-ping, Selina

Mr CHEUNG Hang-yiu, Galax

Ms LEE Mei-ye

Title

Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin) 1/

Sha Tin District Office

Senior Executive Officer (District Council)/

Sha Tin District Office

Senior Executive Officer (District Management)/

Sha Tin District Office

District Secretary/

Sha Tin District Office

Executive Officer (General)/

Sha Tin District Office

Executive Officer (District Council)1/

Sha Tin District Office

Senior Inspector of Works (Shatin)/

Sha Tin District Office

Project Manager (Architecture)/

Sha Tin District Office

Chief Leisure Manager (New Territories East)/

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

District Leisure Manager (Sha Tin)/

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Sha Tin/

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

Senior Librarian (Sha Tin)/

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

In Attendance by Invitation

Mr WONG Kok-ming, David

Mr CHAN Ying-ho

Mr FONG Wing-ho

Mr FU Tin-long

Ms TSANG Hing-kwan, Natalie

Mr YUEN Sze-chun

Mr LAU Kai-chung

Title

Architect (Works) 8/

Home Affairs Department

Senior Architect/

Ho & Partners Architects, Engineers & Development Consultants Limited

Architect/

Ho & Partners Architects, Engineers & Development Consultants Limited

Assistant Architect/

Ho & Partners Architects, Engineers & Development Consultants Limited

Senior Transport Officer/ Sha Tin/

Transport Department

Administration Assistant Lands (District Lands Office, Sha Tin)/

Lands Department

Senior Electrical and Mechanical Engineer/

Consumer Installations/ Electrical and Mechanical Services Department

Absent

Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH

Mr CHIU Chu-pong

Title

DC Member

(Application for leave of absence received)

"

(")

Welcome Remark

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

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 27 June 2019

2. Members unanimously confirmed the above meeting minutes.

Discussion Items

2019-2020 District Facilities and Improvement Works Proposals (Paper No. DFM 29/2019)

3. Members unanimously endorsed the above paper.

4. The Chairman said that ST-DMW 474 “Improvement Works to Chui Tin Street Sitting-out Area” endorsed by the District Facilities Management Committee (DFMC) at the meeting held on 27 June was not endorsed by circulation of papers in the Sha Tin District Council (STDC). No member raised any view on the ST-DMW 474 Works as a result of the circulation. The Works would be submitted to the STDC again in September for consideration. Members were invited to take note of this.

Funding Applications of Community Libraries (Paper No. DFM 30/2019)

5. The Chairman said that the applicants of funding for community libraries were “Ma On Shan East C&Y ISC of the Boys’ and Girls’ Clubs Association of Hong Kong” and the “Owners’ Corporation of Sunshine Grove” and asked members to declare their interests. No member declared interests at the meeting.

6. Members unanimously endorsed the above paper.

Questions

Question to be Raised by Mr WAI Hing-chueng on the Rain Shelter at a Minibus Stop near Sha Tin Town Hall (Paper No. DFM 31/2019)

7. The views of Mr Wai Hing-chueng were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that the District Lands Office, Sha Tin (DLO/ST) replied that it had replied twice in 1996 and 1999 regarding the application of the Transport Department (TD). In the second reply, the DLO/ST pointed out that the location where the shelter was to be built was under the jurisdiction of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD). He asked why the DLO/ST pointed out this issue only after 3 years instead of in the first reply;
- (b) he said that according to the reply from the DLO/ST, the location of the shelter of the minibus stop was under the jurisdiction of the LCSD. He pointed out that apart from the minibus stop, there were other bus stops and bus stop shelters along the road and asked if they were all under the jurisdiction of the LCSD. He pointed out that building minibus stops and bus stop shelters had no connection with the role of the LCSD. He asked whether it was acceptable to build minibus stops and bus stop shelters in

locations under the jurisdiction of the LCSD, whether the minibus stop shelter concerned could only be built in the location under the LCSD's jurisdiction with its approval, and if the LCSD did not give its approval, whether the shelter concerned had to be removed;

- (c) he asked the DLO/ST if the minibus stop shelter had never been approved by relevant departments. He said that the DLO/ST advised the applicant concerned to look for another suitable location for application in 1999, yet the minibus stop shelter was built in the same location. He believed that it showed the lack of supervision during the process from application to commissioning after completion;
- (d) he said that the TD had said in its reply that operators were encouraged to build shelters for the convenience of people in need; however, due to the lack of supervision, operators or applicants were not kept accountable for the responsibilities of repair and maintenance effectively after the completion of shelters according to the regulations of the TD. STDC Members only learnt of the issue because members of the public complained to them about damaged and leaking shelters;
- (e) he pointed out that the reply of the CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (CLP) only mentioned that the location that customers provided for the CLP to install power-supply equipment had to comply with all applicable laws and safety requirements of the company. He asked about the reason that power supply was approved by the CLP, if the application for construction of a shelter in the location concerned was not approved by the government departments;
- (f) he opined that the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) should make sure that applicants could legally build shelters in relevant locations before approving any electricity meter application;
- (g) he said that it had been a while since he received the complaints and the rainy season would soon be over, so he was concerned that it was delayed for too long. He asked if the TD would set a deadline for the operator of green minibus Route No. 403A to repair the shelter; and
- (h) he asked that if the minibus operator was not willing to repair or rebuild the shelter, whether the STDC could carry out the works through the District Minor Works (DMW) Programme. If it was possible, he asked whether the STDC would make preparations. He said that this was the last DFMC meeting of the current term of the STDC. If the proposal of the works would only be discussed upon the start of the next term of the STDC, he was concerned that the building of the shelter could remain unfinished after the rainy season of next year, which would be inconvenient for the residents.

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

- (a) he pointed out that a similar shelter that was old, damaged and even leaking was also found at the Route No. 801 minibus stop at Yiu On Estate Bus Terminus in Ma On Shan. He considered the option of building a new shelter through the DMW Programme of the STDC. Unfortunately, upon site inspection, he found that it was difficult to get the relevant party to remove the old shelter. He pointed out that, when the setup of a minibus stop was proposed several decades ago, the minibus operator then probably received approval to build a minibus stop shelter in that location. The operator later stopped operating the minibus route; however, the new operator did not seem to have the authority and did not know how to remove the remaining minibus

stop shelter. At that time, when he applied for building a rain shelter, the officers also did not know how to remove the old rain shelter, and his application was thus not accepted; and

- (b) he asked the TD how the Government would manage these shelters after giving approval to operators to build them and whether there were terms requiring the operators to remove the shelters after they stopped operating to avoid leaving old shelters behind, as there was no way to deal with them when damaged. He hoped that the Lands Department (LandsD) could provide advice on how to deal with these shelters, so that STDC Members could answer relevant questions from residents.

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

- (a) he opined that many government departments were involved in the handling of the issue of minibus stop shelters and the process was very chaotic. He pointed out that although the department encouraged operators to build minibus stop shelters in its reply, the maintenance, repair and follow-up thereafter involved many administrative procedures. He opined that some departments were offering insufficient assistance and hoped that the Government could more appropriately coordinate the cooperation through policies;
- (b) he pointed out that the reply from the CLP mentioned that after the termination of power supply to the service box, the CLP had not dealt with it any further. He suggested that in consideration of environmental concerns, the Government could set up clear procedures for old and new minibus operators to hand over current usable shelters and dismantle damaged shelters. He opined that the government lacked supervision in this aspect;
- (c) he pointed out that, 2 years ago, he strove for the building of a regulator kiosk by the minibus stop of Route No. 810 by Villa Athena and obtained the approval for the project, however, it had yet to be completed. He hoped that the Government could provide assistance and expedite the handling process; and
- (d) he said that other minibus operators, such as those of Route Nos. 807K and 810A, were willing to build minibus shelters or seats at the stops or regulator kiosks, but the Government was slow in dealing with such affairs. He hoped relevant departments could speed up their work to encourage and provide greater convenience to minibus operators to build such facilities.

10. Ms Natalie TSANG, Senior Transport Officer/ Sha Tin of the TD gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the TD had always encouraged minibus operators to build shelters to provide passengers with a comfortable waiting environment and had required the minibus operator to repair the shelter of the minibus stop near the Sha Tin Town Hall as soon as possible at the same time. However, the minibus operator needed time to look for a contractor to undertake the repair works, so there was no timetable yet. But the TD would closely monitor the minibus operator's progress of looking for a contractor, so as to complete the relevant repair works as soon as possible;
- (b) in addition, she would relay the views regarding Route No. 803 minibus stop proposed by Mr LI Sai-wing to relevant officers of the TD for follow-up; and

- (c) also, regarding the enquiry of the conditions of Route No. 810 minibus shelter from Mr Wilson LI and his views on Route Nos. 807K and 810A, she would relay them to relevant officers for follow-up.

11. Mr YUEN Sze-chun, Administration Assistant/ Lands (DLO/ST) of the LandsD gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he responded to the views of Mr WAI Hing-cheung, clarifying that relevant maps had also been submitted to show that the proposed location was within the land allocated to the LCSD when the DLO/ST submitted the information to the TD in 1996; the DLO/ST counter-proposed in 1999 to move the stop outside of the land allocated to the LCSD, which was the only difference with the materials submitted by the DLO/ST in 1999. According to the information of the DLO/ST, the bus stops near the location was outside of the land allocated to the LCSD; and
- (b) the DLO/ST and the TD had agreed upon a set of one-stop approval procedures of building bus stop and minibus stop shelters. After obtaining approval from the TD, operators could build relevant shelters. He pointed out that the very old and damaged rain shelter referred to by Mr LI Sai-wing could have been built by an operator a long time ago and he would contact Mr LI Sai-wing to learn more about the circumstance after the meeting.

12. Ms LEE Mei-yee, Senior Librarian (Sha Tin) of the LCSD indicated that the relevant location was handled by administrators of the Sha Tin Town Hall and she would relay relevant information to the administrators for follow-up and bring relevant issues to their attention.

13. Mr LAU Kai-chung, Senior Electrical and Mechanical Engineer/ Consumer Installations of the EMSD indicated that according to the current Electricity Ordinance, individual users' application for power supply required no approval from the EMSD. Users could directly apply to electricity suppliers. Electricity suppliers would examine relevant electrical installations and Work Completion Certificates issued by registered electrical contractors. Power would only be supplied after the electrical installation was confirmed to be in compliance with relevant laws and the requirements of the Supply Rules.

14. Mr Simon WONG, Assistant District Officer (1) of the Sha Tin District Office (STDO) responded to the view of Mr WAI Hing-cheung regarding whether old shelters could be dismantled and new shelters be built as DMW. He said that upon receiving a relevant proposal, the Home Affairs Department (HAD) would conduct a preliminary study and determine if there was any serious technical issue. If no, the proposal of the works would be submitted to relevant working groups or committees for discussion according to procedures. If Mr WAI Hing-cheung submitted a proposal, the STDO would follow up according to the established mechanism upon receiving the relevant proposal.

15. The Chairman indicated that the CLP could not send a representative to this meeting. The Secretariat would relay members' views on the CLP to the company and ask the CLP to contact Mr WAI Hing-cheung for follow-up.

[Post-meeting note: The Secretariat had passed Mr WAI Hing-cheung's views on to the CLP on 16 September this year for follow-up.]

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

- (a) he clarified that it was not a shelter but a regulator kiosk that had to be built for Route No. 810. Also, he said that the residents of Villa Athena had also agreed to the

building of a regulator kiosk at the proposed location; however, it was still in progress after 2 years; and

- (b) he believed that if the STDC could provide assistance in the repair, maintenance or even demolition and rebuilding of the shelters, many concerns could be allayed. For example, Route Nos. 810A and 807K in Whitehead were operated by 2 different operators. He had also communicated with the operators to try to get the shelters built as soon as possible. But the operators were worried about the administrative procedures after the completion. He hoped that the TD could make further improvements. In addition, if the STDC could provide further assistance, people's livelihood would be further improved. If there was any progress, he could inform relevant operators of the minibuses routes. He hoped shelters could be built for the use of the residents as soon as possible.

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

- (a) he said that the minibus stop he referred to just now was the minibus terminus of Route No. 801. He asked the TD if it could contact the minibus operator who built the shelter then to hold it accountable for the repair. He also asked when the TD gave approval to the operator to build a shelter in a location under the purview of the LandsD, whether the 2 departments had entered into any agreement on future management issues; and
- (b) if the relevant operator could not be contacted and there was no record of such agreement, he hoped that the TD and the LandsD could cooperate and handle the repairs of the shelter of Route No. 801 minibus stop at Yiu On Estate Bus Terminus. He opined that there should be clear inter-departmental agreements and guidelines on management and responsibilities in the future when similar shelters were to be built in order to avoid similar situations in the future.

18. Ms Natalie TSANG indicated that she would relay Mr Wilson LI's views on the facilities of Route Nos. 807K and 810A to relevant officers of the TD and would learn if the relevant operator had submitted applications. The TD would conduct the procedure of consultation as soon as possible upon receiving relevant application.

19. Mr YUEN Sze-chun responded that he would follow up on the minibus stop shelter records that Mr LI Sai-wing was concerned about after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: According to the records of the DLO/ST, Yiu On Estate minibus stop shelter should have been built by the minibus operator and the relevant information had been passed on to the TD for follow up.]

20. The Chairman said that many of the minibus stop shelters in the Sha Tin District had not been properly taken care of, even if relevant minibus operators were still in operation. For example, the shelter of Route No. 63 minibus stop at Tai Wai MTR Station was damaged after Typhoon Mangkhut last year. The operator had not dealt with the shelter, as it involved many issues of the land grant provision or problems of the supervision mechanism at the time of the grant. She hoped that, when the departments had to handle matters regarding the building of minibus stop shelters in the future, they could properly formulate regulations stipulating how operators should handle such shelters during or after their operation. She urged the relevant departments to properly supervise the matter.

Question to be Raised by Ms LAM Chung-yan on Barrier-free Access Facilities
(Paper No. DFM 32/2019)

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

- (a) she pointed out that many housing estates had limited resources; however, such estates had always wanted to provide barrier-free accesses in public places for the convenience of the disabled or elderly wheelchair users; Hin Keng Estate, for instance, was in a similar situation. The “Universal Accessibility Programme” proposed by the government did not seem to suit the needs of the community. She asked the STDO if any housing estate had enquired or learnt from the STDO about where they could get resources to build barrier-free accesses when the STDO was collecting requests or information in the district. She pointed out that the current STDC DMW Programme could approve proposals submitted by DC Members or Area Committees. She therefore opined that the STDO did not have a comprehensive understanding of the number of people with actual needs in the entire community;
- (b) she asked about the types of work involved in the DMW in the past and asked how many of them were related to barrier-free accesses;
- (c) she opined that the Government should study and consider how to make adjustments, so that resources could be used to help improve barrier-free access facilities in the district;
- (d) she said that community facilities for most of the time could hardly achieve “Ageing in Place” or could not achieve such result at all. She hoped to know how they could help these people; and
- (e) she pointed out it was mentioned in the reply in the paper that if a housing estate could obtain consent from relevant owners, it might make an application to the DMW Programme. She hoped to know, in terms of the procedure, whether a funding application should be made first before internal approval of a proposal, or whether a general meeting of the owners had to be convened to internal approve a proposal before submitting an application. She opined that if housing estates were to call for general meetings of the owners first, proposals could be passed in such general meetings of many housing estates as the owners knew nothing about the works, and that could lead to confusion, rumours or disputes. She hoped to know how these facilities could be implemented.

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

- (a) he asked about the criteria of the STDO when prioritising works;
- (b) he asked if there was any works of the STDC in the past that cost or almost cost \$30,000,000; and
- (c) he asked whether the STDO could coordinate the works when venues of the LCSD or land owned by the LCSD was involved. For example, he asked why could the service box of ST-DMW 134 “Provision of covered walkway at Hung Mui Kuk Road besides Tin Sum Street Footbridge” not be placed in the planter of the LCSD instead of the roadside. He opined that it would affect access and safety.

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

- (a) he pointed out that some places were jointly owned by the Housing Department (HD) and private owners. There were 2 types of barrier-free tiles in some housing estates. Some tactile tiles were laid directly onto the surface of the ground, while some were laid into pits dug in the ground. There were no unified standards on laying tactile tiles for different government departments and organisations to follow. For instance, most of the tactile tiles in the public places in Lee On Estate were yellow, while some were grey, lacked maintenance and were covered with water. He opined that the Government should have a set of criteria for maintenance, design scheme, and installation and distribution for the reference of departments or organisations involved in public places; and
- (b) he asked how the HD would deal with a public place with more than 1 owner, and whether it would only deal with the tactile tiles after they were damaged or covered with water.

24. Mr David WONG, Architect (Works) 8 of the HAD responded that the location of the service box of ST-DMW134 had been accepted by the TD, Highways Department (HyD) and Advisory Committee on the Appearance of Bridges and Associated Structures. There was originally a big tree near the location of the service box, but it was blown down by Typhoon Mangkhut last year. So, currently there was no tree beside the service box. He would conduct a site inspection with relevant members after the meeting to look for methods of improvement. In addition, he pointed out that the location was subject to various limitations, such as the CLP's requirements on the location of power supply and the HyD's requirements on the distance between the location and the existing pedestrian footbridge. Nevertheless, the HAD was still willing to look for other practicable methods, and he would learn more about the situation from members.

25. Mr Simon WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he indicated that barrier-free accesses were in one of the categories of works which could be carried out in the DMW Programme, but such works were rarely seen in the past. According to his experience in dealing with DMW over the past few years, he had the following observations:
 - (i) the barrier-free facilities required by residents often involved some facilities connecting public footbridges or tunnels, etc. Such works would involve large ramps or large elevators, and relevant departments, such as the HyD and the TD, already had their respective plans regarding such works. As such works would usually cost more and the departments already had relevant plans to conduct relevant works, he believed that was why no barrier-free facility project had been set up under the DMW Programme; and
 - (ii) the need of barrier-free facilities often arose in private housing estates or areas under the jurisdiction of the HD, and the Guidelines for Implementing District Minor Works Projects also mentioned that "the responsibility for [improving the environment in indoor] private areas should rest with the owners or tenants". During past DMW implementation in Sha Tin, if other government departments were responsible for the repair, maintenance or management of the relevant location or facilities, the STDC seldom paid for them as DMW. This principle had been clearly laid out as discussed in working groups or committees before, and members of the working groups or committees also agreed with this principle. If the repair and maintenance of local facilities were originally handled by other government departments, then such works would

usually not be conducted as DMW based on the consideration of allocation of resources.

- (b) if barrier-free facilities were needed in public places and there might not be relevant government departments in charge, STDC Members could make an application to the STDC regarding the relevant proposal. The relevant working group or committee would consider the proposal according to relevant principles or the nature or the actual situations of individual cases;
- (c) in accordance with his initial understanding, no barrier-free facility project had been established or endorsed by the current term of the STDC;
- (d) he pointed out that there was no arrangement of priority in the Sha Tin District DMW. Upon receiving minor works proposals from the STDC, area committees or government departments, initial studies, including the appropriation status of relevant land allocation, underground public facilities, and initial feasibility of the works, etc., would be conducted immediately, and district consultation would also be conducted. If such proposals of works were in compliance with the regulations in the Guidelines for Implementing District Minor Works Projects, the works would be preliminary assessed as practicable and be submitted immediately to the relevant working group for consideration. No arrangement of priority would be made for different items of works;
- (e) he said that no works that cost over \$30,000,000 or almost \$30,000,000 had been carried out in the past. ST-DMW 385 “Construction of a Sitting-out Area at Hang Ming Street, Ma On Shan (Area 90 in Ma On Shan)” led by the LCSD was a project that cost nearly \$20,000,000 and one that was relatively closer to the upper limit. Apart from this project, most of the other works were works of rain shelters or seats which costs were considerably lower than the upper limit;
- (f) he pointed out that, under the current mechanism, with the close cooperation between the STDO and the LCSD or the LCSD and STDC Members, quite a few DMW had been carried out in areas under the jurisdiction of the LCSD. Significant improvements had also been made. If Mr PUN Kwok-shan opined in the future that certain facilities under the jurisdiction of the LCSD, such as bushes or parks, could be improved, he could also discuss ways of improvement with the LCSD or the STDO; and
- (g) he would relay the views of Mr MAK Yun-pui to the HD for consideration.

[Post-meeting note: The Secretariat relayed the views of Mr MAK Yun-pui to the HD for follow up on 16 September this year.]

26. Ms LAM Chung-yan hoped to know whether the STDO had received any appeal from members of the public regarding the need for barrier-free facilities in housing estates that could not be met due to financial concerns and the number of such cases. She suggested that the government ease relevant policies for the benefit of the community.

27. Mr Simon WONG responded that the Guidelines clearly set out that “funds should normally not be used for projects on access roads/walkways and beautification of external walls on private land. Consideration may only be given to funding these projects on an exceptional basis and provided that it can be clearly justified that the public at large will be benefited and owners’ consent is obtainable”. In the discussions of working groups in the past, committee members and working group members had strictly abided by the Guidelines in making approvals. If Ms LAM Chung-yan

considered that any proposal was in compliance with the Guidelines and could benefit the public at large, she could submit such proposal to relevant working group for review. He said that the DMW Programme was flexible, but proposals had to be discussed by working groups and the Committee.

28. Mr YIU Ka-chun responded in the capacity of convener of the Working Group on District Facilities and Improvement Works that the working group had not received any proposal on improvement works on barrier-free facilities that connected private housing estates in the past 4 years. Former DC member Mr LAW Kwong-keung had proposed building barrier-free facilities in Saddle Ridge Garden in a previous term of the STDC, and a project had currently been set up by the HyD. He said if members made relevant works proposals, the working group would handle them and the discussion of the proposals could resume in the next term of the STDC. He hoped that the STDO could study, within its competence, how to improve the lands at the junction of private buildings and housing estates and government departments for the benefit of residents in the district.

29. Ms LAM Chung-yan opined that the Government could review parts of the policies that could be moderately adjusted. She said that many housing estates in the Sha Tin District were built along mountains, and quite a few of them needed such barrier-free accesses. She hoped that the Government could consider how to help Sha Tin residents.

30. The Chairman said that this question involved several departments, and the DFMC had limited resources and authority. She opined that the Government had to make a better set of policies for barrier-free facilities on the whole. However, the scope of authority of the DFMC did not allow it to include in the discussion the barrier-free facilities of all departments. She hoped that the Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin) could study the views of members with relevant departments.

Information Items

Reports of Working Groups (Paper No. DFM 33/2019)

31. The views of Mr LI Sai-hung were summarised below:

- (a) he indicated that he had not been consulted on the change of works location of ST-DMW 415 “Provision of Arbour and Benches near Bus Stop at Sun Fong House at Chui Tin Street”. He said that the arbour was originally proposed to be built against the railing. He opined that the new proposed location would obstruct the road and was concerned that residents could disagree. He hoped that the department could explain to the residents; and
- (b) he asked if the works would certainly be implemented and how many seats would there be at the arbour. He suggested discussing with the bus company to see whether the location of the bus stop could be adjusted to meet the community’s need for waiting seats.

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

- (a) he asked if ST-DMW 467 “Provision of Elderly Fitness Corner in A Kung Kok Street Garden”, ST-DMW 468 “Green Belt Landscaping Works in Tai Shui Hang Village”, and ST-DMW 469 “Provision of Elderly Fitness Corner in Hang Fai Street Park” would be delayed due to the typhoon;

- (b) he asked if ST-DMW 150 “Provision of Public Toilet in Area 86 Park (i.e. in Hang Fai Street Park)” had been handed over to the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) for repair and maintenance and if any works would be carried out to improve the doors of accessible toilets or the issue of dripping from the ceiling of the toilet; and
- (c) he pointed out that ST-DMW 378 “Provision of Covered Walkway at Hang Tai Road near Kam Tai Shopping Centre Leading to Exit of MTR Station” had been suspended due to a change in the exit of Kam Tai Shopping Centre. He said that the shopping centre was undergoing reconstruction, but the owner had not yet informed the STDO of the latest location of the exit of the shopping centre. He would like to know the latest progress.

33. Mr David WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he said that the new location of ST-DMW 415 was proposed by a resident representative of the district, and it had been discussed at meetings of the working group before. He said that since there were many underground pipes of different public facilities at the original location, the proponent suggested changing the location of the works to a location next to the carriageway, so as to provide seats for the elderly waiting to commute to the Prince of Wales Hospital. Upon communication with the TD, the TD believed that the new location would not affect the access of residents and accepted the proposal to change the location. According to the latest proposal, the seats would be near the walkway beside the carriageway, and would avoid having members of the public sitting with their back to the carriageway. If Mr LI Sai-hung had any opinion on the matter, the HAD was willing to explore proposals of possible improvements. Generally speaking, after the feasibility study was endorsed by the working group and the DFMC, the HAD would certainly approve the design and conduct a tendering exercise. The HAD could explore further with the leading department and arrange for site inspections with Mr LI Sai-hung and the proponent. In addition, he said that the proponent hoped that 2 benches to be built could seat 4 persons; and
- (b) the HAD was waiting for the owner of Kam Tai Shopping Centre to inform them of the latest location of the exit of the shopping centre before the latest design of ST-DMW 378 could be confirmed. Only after the proposal concerned had been endorsed by the working group and the committee, could the trial pit be dug and follow-up be carried out.

34. The Chairman asked Mr David WONG to invite Mr LI Sai-hung and the proponent of ST-DMW 415 to inspect the site and explore if the location of the works would lead to disputes to ensure proper use of the resources.

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

- (a) the ArchSD had promised to follow up on the repair and maintenance work of ST-DMW 150 as well as issues of overly heavy door of the accessible toilets, dripping from the ceiling and other minor defects;
- (b) the ST-DMW 467 works included ground levelling and installation of facilities for the elderly. The construction period would be about 90 days, and it was estimated that the works would be completed in January next year;

- (c) the progress of the ST-DMW 468 project was satisfactory, and the operator would prune the plants and replace the plants that were not growing well; and
- (d) the ArchSD was levelling the ground for ST-DMW 469, and the LCSD was placing an order for facilities for the elderly. It was estimated that the works would be completed in the fourth quarter this year.

36. Ms Dorothy LAM, Executive Officer I (District Council) 2 of the STDO said that the Secretariat had not yet received from GAW Capital Partners, the owner of Kam Tai Shopping Centre, the latest layout plan of the shopping centre, to which ST-DMW 378 would be connected. The Secretariat, according to the decision made by the working group on 16 August, had arranged to hold a meeting on 13 September to discuss the progress of the project concerned with the representatives of GAW Capital Partners, the convener of the working group and relevant members of the working group.

37. Members noted the above reports.

Report on the Management of Recreation and Sports Facilities in Sha Tin
(Paper No. DFM 34/2019)

38. Mr YIU Ka-chun pointed out that members of the public relayed to him that water was dripping in several places in Yuen Chau Kok Public Library when the rainfall was heavy when the amber rainstorm warning signal was in force last Saturday. He hoped to know the area affected by dripping. He opined that if the problem was not solved for good, it would affect library staff, users as well as the books. He hoped that the Librarian could actively follow up with the ArchSD or relevant maintenance departments on the issue. Moreover, he pointed out that the outdoor climbing wall at Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre was dripping under heavy rain and hoped that the persons-in-charge of the Sports Centre and the Library of the LCSD would make appointments with repair departments after the meeting to inspect the dripping problem together with him and to solve it for good.

39. Both Ms Jackie LO and Ms LEE Mei-yee said that they had asked the ArchSD to follow up on the dripping issue of the outdoor climbing wall at the Yuen Chau Kok Sports Centre and the library. The ArchSD was asked to first identify the sources of dripping and then implement improvement plans. Mr YIU Ka-chun would be invited to learn more about the situations on-site by then.

40. Members noted the above report.

Report on the Services and Promotional Activities of Public Libraries in Sha Tin
(Paper No. DFM 35/2019)

41. Ms LEE Mei-yee said that the foundation works of the Tai Wai Self-service Library Station had been completed, and the steel structures had also been installed. The ArchSD was actively following up on the rest of the works. It was estimated that it could be put into service in the third quarter the earliest if everything went smoothly.

42. The Chairman said that members had proposed to conduct on-site inspection after the completion and before the commissioning of the Tai Wai Self-service Library Station to learn about its operation. She hoped that Ms LEE Mei-yee could liaise with the Secretariat to invite members for a visit.

43. Mr Michael YUNG said that the Yan On Estate Extension Works was about to commence and hoped that the LCSD and the HD could communicate to make sure that the extension works would not affect the service of the mobile library.

44. Ms LEE Mei-yee responded that she would learn more from relevant officers of the HD later to avoid any impact on the service of the mobile library as much as possible.

45. Members noted the above report.

Report on the Management of Community Halls in Sha Tin
(Paper No. DFM 36/2019)

46. Members noted the above report.

Information Papers

Progress Report on 2019-2020 District Facilities and Improvement Works
(Paper No. DFM 37/2019)

47. Members noted the above report.

Financial Position and Activity Progress of Expenditure Head 9 (District Facilities Management)
(Paper No. DFM 38/2019)

48. Members noted the above report.

Final Report on the Work of the District Facilities Management Committee
(Paper No. DFM 39/2019)

49. Members noted the above report.

Date of Next Meeting

50. The Chairman said that this was the last meeting in the current term of the DFMC and thanked members for their support over the past few years. She hoped that the new term of the DFMC could continue to serve members of the public in the district and to benefit residents of the Sha Tin District.

51. The meeting was adjourned at 11:29 am.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat
STDC 13/15/50

December 2019