

Sha Tin District Council
Minutes of the 3rd Meeting of
the Development and Housing Committee in 2019

Date : 2 May 2019 (Thursday)
Time : 2:30 pm
Venue : Sha Tin District Council Conference Room
 4/F, Sha Tin Government Offices

<u>Present</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Time of joining the meeting</u>	<u>Time of leaving the meeting</u>
Mr SIU Hin-hong (Vice-Chairman)	DC Member	2:30 pm	5:02 pm
Mr HO Hau-cheung, SBS, MH	DC Chairman	2:30 pm	7:40 pm
Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas, SBS, JP	DC Vice-Chairman	2:30 pm	8:20 pm
Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	DC Member	4:05 pm	8:16 pm
Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, James	"	2:33 pm	4:50 pm
Ms CHAN Man-kuen	"	2:32 pm	8:20 pm
Mr CHAN Nok-hang	"	2:30 pm	7:32 pm
Mr CHENG Tsuk-man	"	2:30 pm	5:46 pm
Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	"	2:30 pm	8:20 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Sunny	"	2:30 pm	8:16 pm
Mr CHIU Man-leong	"	2:30 pm	7:30 pm
Mr HUI Yui-yu, Rick	"	2:30 pm	3:34 pm
Mr LAI Tsz-yan	"	2:31 pm	8:20 pm
Ms LAM Chung-yan	"	2:30 pm	7:34 pm
Mr LEE Chi-wing, Alvin, MH	"	5:12 pm	7:28 pm
Mr LEUNG Ka-fai, Victor	"	2:30 pm	5:05 pm
Mr LI Sai-hung	"	2:30 pm	8:16 pm
Mr LI Sai-wing	"	2:30 pm	5:07 pm
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	"	2:30 pm	8:20 pm
Mr MAK Yun-pui	"	2:30 pm	3:28 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung	"	2:30 pm	7:30 pm
Mr PUN Kwok-shan, MH, JP	"	3:44 pm	7:18 pm
Mr TING Tsz-yuen	"	2:30 pm	7:30 pm
Mr TONG Hok-leung	"	2:30 pm	8:20 pm
Ms TSANG So-lai	"	2:30 pm	7:36 pm
Ms TUNG Kin-lei	"	2:33 pm	8:20 pm
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	"	2:30 pm	8:20 pm
Mr WONG Fu-sang, Tiger	"	2:30 pm	8:20 pm
Mr WONG Hok-lai	"	3:05 pm	8:20 pm
Mr WONG Ka-wing, MH	"	2:30 pm	7:28 pm
Ms WONG Ping-fan, Iris	"	2:30 pm	8:20 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun	"	2:30 pm	7:30 pm
Mr YIU Ka-chun, MH	"	2:36 pm	7:40 pm
Ms YUE Shin-man	"	4:28 pm	7:28 pm
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael	"	2:30 pm	8:20 pm
Ms LIU Sin-yi, Angela (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council) 5, Sha Tin District Office		

In Attendance

Mr WONG Tin-pui, Simon
Mr YUEN Chun-kit, Derek

Ms AU Wai-ha

Mr LAU Chun-him, Kenny

Mr WOO Tim

Ms NGO Po-ling

Title

Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin) (1)
Senior Executive Officer (District Council),
Sha Tin District Office
Chief Health Inspector 1,
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Senior Town Planner / Sha Tin,
Planning Department
Senior Estate Surveyor / South East,
Sha Tin District Lands Office
Senior Housing Manager (Tai Po, North District and Sha Tin 1),
Housing Department

In Attendance by Invitation

Ms CHAN Sze-wa, Debbie

Mr SOON Ka-wing, Kelven

Mr NG Tau-shing

Mr LAI Cheuk-ho

Mr YUEN Tat-yung, Zorro

Mr LAU Tin-lap, Daniel

Mr LEUNG Hon-wan

Mr MOK Wai-kee, Kenneth

Mr LEUNG Wing-tak

Ms LEUNG So-ping, Selina

Mr LAM Wai-kei

Mr LEUNG Chin-hung

Mr KU Siu-ping, Andy

Ms AU Pui-yi, Yoki

Mr LAI Kim-ming, Elvis

Mr Peter DY

Mr SO Ngai-long

Mr AU Tze-wai, William

Title

Executive Assistant (District Council) 7,
Sha Tin District Office
Executive Assistant (District Council) 9,
Sha Tin District Office
Principal Survey Officer / Sha Tin,
Lands Department (District Survey Office, Sha Tin)
Project Manager (North),
Civil Engineering and Development Department
Chief Engineer / North (Special Duties 2),
Civil Engineering and Development Department
Senior Engineer / 9 (North),
Civil Engineering and Development Department
Senior Engineer / Sewage Projects 5,
Drainage Services Department
Senior Engineer / Drainage Projects 3,
Drainage Services Department
Senior District Engineer / Southeast,
Highways Department
Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 1,
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Senior Engineer / Project Management 4,
Water Supplies Department
Engineer / New Territories East (Distribution 1),
Water Supplies Department
Senior Maintenance Surveyor (Tai Po, North District and Sha Tin),
Housing Department
Property Service Manager (Services)
(Tai Po, North District and Sha Tin) (1), Housing Department
Senior Building Services Engineer (Tai Po, North District and Sha Tin),
Housing Department
Senior Manager (Building Rehabilitation),
Urban Renewal Authority
Senior Manager (Community Development),
Urban Renewal Authority
Senior Engineer / General Legislation 3,
Electrical and Mechanical Services Department

In Attendance by Invitation

Mr TAI Chi-ho

Mr LAM Chi-hing

TitleSenior Structural Engineer / MBI-C,
Buildings DepartmentSenior Maintenance Surveyor (Independent Checking Unit) (4),
Housing Department**Absent**Ms PONG Scarlett Oi-lan,
BBS, JP (Chairman)

Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS

Mr WONG Yue-hon

Mr YIP Wing

Title

DC Member

(Application for leave of absence received)

”

(”)

”

(”)

”

(”)

Action

The Vice-Chairman welcomed members and representatives of government departments to the third meeting of the Development and Housing Committee (DHC) of the year.

Applications for Leave of Absence

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

Ms Scarlett PONG

Official commitment

Mr MOK Kam-kwai

”

Mr WONG Yue-hon

”

Mr YIP Wing

Sickness

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

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 28 February 2019

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

Matters Arising**Responses of Government Departments and Relevant Organisations to Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting**

(Paper No. DH 17/2019)

5. Members noted the above paper.

Discussion Items**2019-2020 Work Plans and Funding Applications of Working Groups under the Committee**

(Paper No. DH 18/2019)

6. Members unanimously endorsed the above paper.

Naming of Streets in Sha Tin District (Pak Hok Ting Street and On Muk Street)
(Paper No. DH 19/2019)

7. The Vice-Chairman said that he would have to deal with other important matters later. He hoped that the meeting would be completed by 6:00 pm today. If there were still outstanding items, resumption of the meeting would be scheduled for 7 May.
8. Mr Michael YUNG said that when discussing the date of a special meeting at the Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) meeting, he had pointed out that it would clash with the resumption of the DHC meeting, if any. And Ms Scarlett PONG had said that no resumption of the DHC meeting should be needed.
9. The Vice-Chairman said that if a resumption of the DHC meeting was needed, it would be convened after the special meeting of the TTC on 7 May.
10. Mr WONG Ka-wing said that if members had no objection to the street naming, the Vice-Chairman should announce the endorsement of the names and continue with the agenda.
11. The Vice-Chairman welcomed Mr NG Tau-shing, Principal Survey Officer / Sha Tin, the District Survey Office, Sha Tin (DSO) of the Lands Department (LandsD) to the meeting.
12. Mr NG Tau-shing briefly introduced the contents of the paper.
13. Ms Iris WONG disagreed with the DSO representative who said that no views had been received in the local consultation. She said that the regional consultation on On Muk Street conducted by the Sha Tin District Office (STDO), she had suggested naming the 2 parts of On Muk Street as the Upper Section and the Lower Section, if Shek Mun Estate was located in the middle of the road, so as that the Police could deal with illegal parking and members of the public could locate themselves more easily. She pointed out that the DSO should list all the views collected after the local consultations. There being no objections did not mean there were no views.
14. Mr WAI Hing-cheung objected to the naming of Pak Hok Ting Street. He pointed out that the DSO's proposed location was Yi Ching Lane outside the Royal Park Hotel. It was a traffic black spot. And the name Yi Ching Lane was also used in the prosecution figure on traffic offences provided by the Police. He opined that if it was now renamed Pak Hok Ting Street, it would cause confusion to the public and motorists.
15. The views of Mr Michael YUNG were summarised below:
 - (a) he would like to know the current number of buildings at On Muk Street and Pak Hok Ting Street, and to what extent those buildings would be affected by the name changes;
 - (b) he cited the paper as saying that the road names could not be changed unless with the consent of the Assistant Director of the DSO. He enquired about the rationale or objective indicators based on which the Assistant Director would approve or disapprove the name changes; and

- (c) regarding the process of street naming, he asked what the DSO would actually do after consulting the Hongkong Post, if objections were received from local groups. He also asked whether the Assistant Director would decide whether to continue the naming.

16. Mr NG Tau-shing gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he said that “no views received” in the paper meant there being no objections. Regarding the views received in the local consultation, he had personally explained the reasons for naming to Ms Iris WONG by telephone and in writing. He added that they did not intend to change the current name of On Muk Street, but only to change the description of the area of the road, because the Housing Department (HD) needed to recover the jurisdiction over the middle section of the road for building Shek Mun Estate Phase 2. According to the Road Traffic Ordinance, the relevant section was no longer part of a public road. For the purpose of traffic management, the middle section should be removed from the plan. The 2 remaining sections were still part of On Muk Street;
- (b) regarding Ms Iris WONG’s proposed renaming of the 2 sections as Upper On Muk Street and Lower On Muk Street, he said that generally it should be avoided to change well-known street names unless there was a strong justification. Renaming a street might cause confusion to residents, merchants, the general public and public services (such as postal, police, ambulance and fire services) in the area, and might even disrupt mail delivery;
- (c) in response to Mr WAI Hing-cheung’s comment that the location was generally referred to as Yi Ching Lane by the public, he reiterated that the official name of a street would not be gazetted unless there were no objections received in consultation with government departments, district organisations and the District Council. He added that the DSO had received public complaints from the public via the 1823 hotline about the lack of a name or sign for the street. Upon careful review, the DSO confirmed that it was suitable to name the street and started the naming work. At present, Pak Hok Ting Street was used in the postal addresses of 2 or 3 buildings at the section, which was actually a geographical extension of the carriageway of Pak Hok Ting Street. Therefore it was recommended to use Pak Hok Ting Street as usual;
- (d) Mr Michael YUNG mentioned that On Muk Street was closed. It was because that the HD was building Shek Mun Estate Phase 2 and needed to resume the section;
- (e) he said that he did not have relevant information about the number of buildings along On Muk Street using the name. He suggested that members consult the Rating and Valuation Department (RVD) for accurate and detailed numbering information; and

- (f) he explained that in street naming, the DSO would first review the application based on 3 criteria, i.e., whether it was legally defined as a street, whether there was a department responsible for erecting and maintaining the street sign, and whether the owner agreed in the case of a private road. If any of the 3 criteria was not met, or else under a special circumstance, the consent of the Assistant Director of the DSO should be obtained to continue with the street naming work. In the case of On Muk Street, if the Hongkong Post found the name appropriate, the DSO would consult 10 departments, including the Transport Department (TD), Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF), Hong Kong Fire Services Department (FSD), Highways Department (HyD), and Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). Later, it would conduct local consultation and submit a paper to the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) for discussion. The name must be approved by the STDC before being gazetted. And then relevant departments would be notified to take follow-up actions (such as erecting the street sign) and to take photos of the new street sign for record. If the name was not approved by the STDC, it might need to be revised, suspended or even cancelled.

17. Mr Tiger WONG asked when the HD requested the resumption of that section of On Muk Street. He pointed out that the names of Wing Lok Street, Wing Lok Street West, Bonham Strand, Bonham Strand West, Queen's Road and Queen's Road West had all be changed. He wondered whether the DSO had initiated any procedure to determine how to revise the street name and follow up on Ms Iris WONG's advice.

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

- (a) he opined that it was unreasonable for the DSO to advise him once again to consult the RVD on the number of buildings on the street, following the previous TTC meeting; and
- (b) he pointed out that there were many "intersected roads" on the local map. For example, Canton Road stretched across Waterloo Road, Public Square Street, Mong Kok Road and Bute Street. He wondered whether the DSO would not accept members' views on the naming matter because there was already building numbers on the street.

19. Ms Iris WONG pointed out that the name of On Muk Street would remain even if the naming was not endorsed. She wondered why there should be such a big trouble. She suggested that the 2 parts of On Muk Street be named East & West Streets or Upper & Lower Streets, in order to distinguish between On Muk Street Park and On Muk Lane. She opined that it would help the FSD to quickly identify the location when performing emergency tasks. So she hoped that the DSO would consider her suggestion.

20. Mr NG Tau-shing gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) responding to Mr Michael YUNG's views, he said that there were currently 2 or 3 buildings on Pak Hok Ting Street. But he did not have the exact or detailed information on building numbers on On Muk Street;
- (b) he said that it was a good idea to divide On Muk Street into the upper and the lower sections. But there would be difficulties in reality, since local residents

might argue which direction was upper or lower. He stressed that the current discussion at the STDC was also part of the consultation. The DSO would decide whether to re-launch the naming work based on the voting result; and

- (c) the HD gazetted the closure of the section of On Muk Street on 23 December 2016. According to the Road Traffic Ordinance, closure meant that a road was off limits to members of the public or vehicles unless authorised. In other words, it was not qualified as a public passage. As the related section no longer met the definition of a public street, the DSO needed to conduct the naming work.

21. Mr Tiger WONG asked why the DSO had not started planning and conducted local consultation on renaming the 2 remaining sections as Upper & Lower Streets or East & West Streets back at the closure in 2016.

22. Mr NG Tau-shing gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he responded that the DSO began paying attention to the progress of the HD's works at On Muk Street back in 2016. He said that the remaining tasks could not continue until the DSO had determined the terrain and updated the street map. About 6 months ago, the DSO consulted 10 government departments on the naming, which had already taken 2 to 3 months. Therefore, the DSO had been making preparations for 1 or 2 years before the local consultation; and
- (b) he said that he had offer explanations regarding Ms Iris WONG's views by telephone many times. If a naming application was not endorsed by the STDC, the DSO would suspend it and make a reply to the complainant first. The DSO would not restart the naming process until a new application was received.

23. Ms CHAN Man-kuen said that members had put forward many views on the naming of 2 streets and the DSO's procedures. She suggested that the DSO should first accept those views and restart the naming process.

24. Mr Michael YUNG said that it was not ideal for the DSO to reject members' views on the street naming.

25. The Vice-Chairman announced that regarding the naming of streets in Sha Tin District, the proposed name of "Pak Hok Ting Street" was rejected by 0 affirmative votes, 18 dissenting votes and 5 abstention votes, while the one of "On Muk Street" was rejected by 4 affirmative votes, 14 dissenting votes and 3 abstention votes, with 4 members opting not to vote.

Progress Report on 2019/2020 Major Works Projects in Sha Tin District
(Paper No. DH 20/2019)

26. The Vice-Chairman welcomed the following government representatives to the meeting: Mr LAI Cheuk-ho, Project Manager (North), Mr Zorro YUEN, Chief Engineer / North (Special Duties 2) and Mr Daniel LAU, Senior Engineer / 9 (North) of the CEDD; Mr LEUNG Hon-wan, Senior Engineer / Sewage Projects 5 and Mr Kenneth MOK, Senior Engineer / Drainage Projects 3 of the Drainage Services Department (DSD); Mr LEUNG

Wing-tak, Senior District Engineer / Southeast of the HyD; Ms Selina LEUNG, Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 1 of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD); Mr LAM Wai-kei, Senior Engineer / Project Management 4 and Mr LEUNG Chin-hung, Engineer / New Territories East (Distribution 1) of the Water Supplies Department (WSD).

27. Mr LAI Cheuk-ho briefly introduced the contents of the paper.

28. Mr CHAN Nok-hang expressed concern about the exact location of Trunk Road T4 (T4). He enquired about the exact scopes and contents of the upcoming traffic and transport impact assessment, environmental impact assessment (EIA) and other technical assessments. He asked whether such assessments would cover the Lion Rock Tunnel Road opposite to Fung Shing Court.

29. Mr NG Kam-hung enquired about a DSD project concerning the injection of water from the Kowloon Reservoir into the Lower Shing Mun Reservoir. He asked whether it was one of the major works projects under discussion.

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

- (a) she pointed out that the “In-situ Reprovisioning of Sha Tin Water Treatment Works - South Works” had brought rodent infestation and inconvenient accessibility to the area. The WSD had said in November 2018 that it would seek funding from the LegCo. She enquired about the funding progress and asked whether the works could commence in the fourth quarter of 2019 as scheduled; and
- (b) she expressed concern that the well opening location of water mains rehabilitation works at Hin Keng (191WC) might affect the LCSD’s flower beds. She opined that the WSD should consult local DC Members and incorporate the restoration works as a major works project under discussion.

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

- (a) he had suggested at the meeting of the Health and Environment Committee (HEC) that the DSD lightly modify the sewer alignment of Project 393DS, so as to minimise the impact on trunk roads in the District. He asked whether the DSD had accepted the suggestion;
- (b) regarding the possible blasting in the construction of major connecting roads (425DS), he asked whether the DSD had designated sites in the District to monitor the vibration noise and the dust conditions. He also enquired about the progress of the DSD’s consultation with the management office of Chevalier Garden on related arrangements;
- (c) he enquired about the progress of Project 425DS, since constructing the iron bridge required the closure of the cycle track and the repavement of the footpath;
- (d) regarding the proposed improvement to the flood protection wall along Shing Mun River East (4100DX), he suggested also dealing with issues such as astronomical tides and river overflow caused by bad weather;

- (e) he had proposed that for the 182CD works, a large stormwater storage tank, instead of a temporary stormwater pumping station, should be built in Sha Tin Town Centre. He asked about the current situation;
- (f) regarding the feasibility study of the trunk road in Project 7100CX, he asked whether A Kung Kok Street bypassing Shek Mun Interchange bound for the Tate's Cairn Tunnel would be split from T4. He also enquired about the timetable of the project;
- (g) in view of the incident of Hung Hom Station of the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) (61TR) affecting commissioning, he enquired about the progress of the partial commissioning of the SCL;
- (h) regarding the construction of a pedestrian subway connecting to the columbarium at On Hing Lane, Shek Mun (5193TB), he asked the CEDD how road subsidence could be avoided during drilling, so as not to affect the traffic safety on Tate's Cairn Highway; and
- (i) he said that the lift at Exit A of Heng On Station in Ma On Shan under the Universal Accessibility Programme was poorly located. Neither the CEDD nor the consultant company had consulted him on the works.

32. The views of Mr CHIU Man-leong were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that members had moved a motion at the meeting unanimously opposing the reclamation at Ma Liu Shui, and the Government later announced that it would suspend the reclamation plan. He thanked the CEDD for removing the Ma Liu Shui reclamation works from the current projects;
- (b) he said that each time he conducted follow-up with the consultant company on the completion date of the Tai Shui Hang Station project (NS287) under the Universal Accessibility Programme, he was always told that it would be delayed. He opined that the CEDD did not have adequate monitoring of the consulting company. He wondered whether the project could be completed in June this year; and
- (c) with the upcoming works relating to Trunk Road T4 and the widening of Tai Po Road, he urged the CEDD to give priority to addressing the traffic problems at Shek Mun Roundabout and Shek Mun Industrial Areas. He also suggested that the "exclusive lanes" bound for the Tate's Cairn Tunnel be commissioned as soon as possible, so as to ease the traffic congestion in the district.

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

- (a) he thanked the CEDD, in particular Mr Zorro YUEN and Mr Daniel LAU, for their assistance in resolving problems relating to the roads, drainage works at Whitehead and Lok Wo Sha Phase 2 and the road works at To Tau Wan Village; and

- (b) he asked the CEDD to consider adding pedestrian crossings at Yiu Sha Road for residents' convenience.

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

- (a) the football pitch over Tai Wai Nullah already had peeling paint on the ground only 3 months into its soft opening. She asked the CEDD and other relevant departments to examine the material;
- (b) she asked the CEDD whether there were railings yet to be installed along the completed walkway at Shing Mun River Promenade; and
- (c) in view of the widening of Tai Po Road, the CEDD had changed the speed limit to 50 km/h at Shing Mun Tunnel and Castle Peak Road bound for Sha Tin Town Centre. She was concerned that the signs along the carriageway might be too small for drivers to adapt to, which could easily cause traffic accidents. She advised the CEDD to improve the signs along the carriageway.

35. Mr CHENG Tsuk-man said that for the lift works at Heng On Station (NS284), the consultant company and the HyD said the lift could not be built on the pavement due to the large number of underground cables. And they lobbied for retrofitting the lift at the pedestrian subway. He asked whether the high cost of removing the retaining wall was one of the reasons for rejecting retrofitting the lift at the original place. He also pointed out the pedestrian subway could not accommodate the passenger flows to and from the MTR Ma On Shan Line during morning rush hours. He asked the HyD to conduct an in-depth review.

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

- (a) he said that operation of the lift under Project NF73 had been suspended since the second day of its commissioning. Residents did not accept the consultant company's explanation that maintenance had been delayed by flooding. He requested the CEDD and the HyD to properly monitor the services of the lift contractor; and
- (b) residents welcomed the HyD to install noise barriers at Tai Po Road (Sha Tin section). Regarding the 3 existing noise barriers at the junction of T3, that is, from the works at Hilton Plaza to the place opposite to Scenery Court, he said that residents would like all the barriers to be replaced with semi-enclosure ones. He asked relevant departments to consider the suggestion.

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

- (a) now that Hin Keng Station was completed, he asked whether the SCL could be partially commissioned to divert the traffic at Tai Wai Station;
- (b) regarding the provision of barrier-free facilities for road structures, he asked when the CEDD would build the long-awaited footbridge for residents to travel between the Hin Keng Estate and Hin Keng Station;

- (c) regarding the different types of sewage treatment in small buildings in the district, he asked whether the CEDD would investigate the sewage treatment methods across Sha Tin, make related planning and improve ancillary facilities; and
- (d) he pointed out that stormwater drains in slopes across Sha Tin had different degrees of blockage. He suggested that the DSD dredge stormwater drains in slopes in the district and then conduct a thorough inspection, so as to cope with climate changes.

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

- (a) she enquired about the results of EIA and traffic impact assessment (TIA) conducted by the CEDD before the commencement of the 5193TB pedestrian subway project, so that residents could be informed of the related impacts; and
- (b) according to the paper, the feasibility study of Project 7100CX would be completed in May this year. She thanked the CEDD for accepting her earlier proposal to also studying connecting one end of On Muk Street to Tai Chung Kiu Road. She wondered whether the proposal was feasible and whether it would be included into this works project.

39. Mr LAI Cheuk-ho gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the CEDD would have adequate discussions with the TD and the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) on the TIA and EIA of the T4 project, respectively. The scope of the EIA generally covered a radius of about 300 to 500 metres around the project. The TIA, on the other hand, covered a larger scope since it involved vehicular flows throughout district. The CEDD could have further communication with members after the meeting;
- (b) the pedestrian subway connecting to the columbarium was still under design. The CEDD would closely monitor and control the impact of relevant works on the road condition;
- (c) the CEDD would discuss with the TD the feasibility of adding pedestrian crossings at Yiu Sha Road and consider the feasibility of incorporating it into existing works;
- (d) the CEDD had received members' views about erecting signs on Tai Po Road in line of the speed limit reduced from 70 to 80 km/h to 50km/h. The CEDD would further review the idea; and
- (e) the design of the noise barriers near Trunk Road T3 was adopted based on the requirements of the EIA report.

40. Mr Zorro YUEN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the CEDD would coordinate with different departments and seek priority for improvement works at the junction of A Kung Kok Street and Shek Mun Interchange;
- (b) the CEDD was discussing with the TD on arrangements for improvement works at On Muk Street. Since the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited had a temporary site there, the CEDD was making follow-up with the LandsD. He pointed out that the CEDD would report the progress to the STDC in due course;
- (c) the CEDD would step up communication with the TD regarding the proposal to add pedestrian crossings at Yiu Sha Road;
- (d) the CEDD would follow up with the contractor on the peeling paint on the ground of the football pitch over Tai Wai Nullah;
- (e) railings had been installed along the walkway of Shing Mun River Promenade; and
- (f) the Universal Accessibility Programme had been officially handed over to the HyD in April this year.

41. Mr LEUNG Wing-tak gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) responding to members' views about the slow progress of lift works at Tai Shui Hang (NS287), he explained that permanent re-routeing and relocation of public facilities were time-consuming. And it was necessary to coordinate with the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) and the Government. The contractor was currently conducting electrical and mechanical testing and the project was expected to be completed by the middle of the year;
- (b) regarding the complaint about the supervision of works at Exit A of Heng On Station and the lack of adequate consultation with DC Members, he would inform relevant HyD staff for follow-up. He also asked members to rest assured that the HyD would duly monitor the consultant company;
- (c) regarding the fact that Lift NF73, which was handed over by the CEDD to the HyD in April, ceased operation on the second day upon commissioning, he would inform relevant HyD staff for follow-up;
- (d) at the Government's request, the MTRCL was currently studying the feasibility of and different options for the partial commissioning of the SCL. It would commission as many stations and sections as possible, taking into account the technical feasibility, the carrying capacity of the railway system, the alteration of the signalling system and the road traffic. He said that no decision had been made at this stage. The Government would continue to actively discuss with the MTRCL and give priorities to the actual feasibility and safety of railway operation. It would make a decision in due course; and

- (e) in the planning of the SCL, relevant departments and the MTRCL had reviewed the traffic flow at Hin Keng Station. The pedestrian flow could be handled by only expanding the existing pedestrian crossing facilities and adjusting the traffic signals. Therefore there was no plan to construct a footbridge linking to Hin Keng Shopping Centre.

42. Mr LEUNG Hon-wan gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) responding to Mr NG Kam-hung's views, he said that the drainage tunnel works had already commenced on 27 February of the year;
- (b) regarding Mr Michael YUNG's views on the 393DS channel alignment, he would inform the relevant engineering team to follow up and respond;
- (c) the first phase of the 425DS project had commenced in February of the year. The DSD would materialise the monitoring stations according to the air quality and noise standards approved in the EIA report. The DSD was discussing with the management office of Chevalier Garden on the installation of monitoring stations;
- (d) the DSD was actively following up on Mr Michael YUNG's suggestion that a temporary footpath be paved along A Kung Kok Street (opposite Ma On Shan Tsung Tsin Secondary School) under the 425DS project. Upon completion of the relevant administrative procedures, the resident works team would contact Mr YUNG to implement the suggestion; and
- (e) the DSD would fully advance sewerage works that had been initiated. He pointed out that the EPD would conduct a comprehensive review and planning of village sewerage works that had yet to be initiated in due course.

43. Mr Kenneth MOK gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he pointed out that the improvement to the flood protection wall along Shing Mun River East was a short-term minor works project for specific purposes. The DSD was working on a project to improve the stormwater drainage systems in Sha Tin, including the pumping stations along Shing Mun River East & West as well as in Sha Tin town centre under Project 182CD, so as to reduce the risk of flooding in the district. The relevant consultancy study would commence in the third quarter of the year and was expected to be completed in early 2021. The detailed design would be subsequently carried out. Related works were expected to be carried out in phases in 2023; and
- (b) the DSD had a well-established and comprehensive patrol system for regularly inspecting, cleansing and maintaining stormwater drains on slopes. It also strengthened manpower to patrol such stormwater drains before the rainy season and after rainstorms, so as to conduct cleansing and maintenance as necessary.

44. Mr LAM Wai-kei gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the “In-situ Reprovisioning of Sha Tin Water Treatment Works - South Works” were expected to commence in the fourth quarter of the year upon project and funding approval by the LegCo. He said that the WSD would continue to maintain close contact with local DC Members and stakeholders to minimise the impact of the works on residents; and
- (b) the WSD would actively follow up with the LCSD on the road repair in the water mains works at Hin Keng.

45. The Vice-Chairman pointed out that after the speed limit was reduced from 70 km/h to 50 km/h because of the Tai Po Road works, the traffic overflow and there was traffic jam in Kau To Shan as early as around 7 am. He asked the HyD to follow up on and get hold of the traffic situation.

46. Ms LAM Chung-yan said that the HyD had promised at a meeting to investigate and review the necessity of building a footbridge linking to Hin Keng Station upon the opening of the SCL. She said that residents had a demand for the footbridge. The HyD had rejected the proposed footbridge even before the commissioning. She opined that such a move might not properly accommodate the passenger flow at the station in future.

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

- (a) he pointed out the frequent water main bursts in Ma On Shan. He wondered whether the WSD did not initiate water main replacement because local resources were used on maintenance works;
- (b) at the TTC meeting, he had suggested that additional junctions be provided on T4 bound for Tai Chung Kiu Road in Ma On Shan. But he expected various problems. He asked whether the CEDD would request different feasible options from the consultant company and expand the study scope based on the EIA report, in case it would be impossible to provide additional portals to divert the traffic of Tai Chung Kiu Road in future; and
- (c) he was concerned about whether the HyD had set a deadline for the MTRCL to respond on the partial commissioning of the SCL. He pointed out that if partial commissioning was implemented, it was necessary to discuss the rationalisation of bus routes in the district. He would like to be informed of the impact on public transport in the district as soon as possible.

48. Mr Zorro YUEN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he said that the scope of assessment of the T4 optimisation study was subject to the actual environment, generally being a radius of about 500 metres around the works. Mr CHAN Nok-hang was concerned that locations that might be affected by noise were also included into the study; and
- (b) there were some technical difficulties in adding a link to T4 from Ma On Shan to Jat Ming Chuen. The HyD would discuss different options with members after the meeting.

49. Mr LAM Wai-kei added that the timetable for water mains replacement in Ma On Shan was already contained in the paper about the Water Intelligent Network (WIN). He said that the related works were not included in the projects under discussion, and that the WSD would replace the water mains according to the timetable.

50. Mr LEUNG Wing-tak said that the SCL Hin Keng Station was discussed at the STDC meeting in November 2012. According to the MTRCL's review in 2013, after Hin Keng Station was put into service, the nearby Che Kung Miu Road and pedestrian crossing facilities would be enough to cope with the passenger flow. Therefore an additional footbridge would be unnecessary.

51. Ms LAM Chung-yan said that there had been a motion in 2015 requesting an additional footbridge at Hin Keng Station.

52. Mr LEUNG Wing-tak said that he would follow up with staff of relevant departments on the footbridge at Hin Keng Station. As far as he knew, the HyD did not set a deadline for the partial commissioning of the SCL.

53. Mr LAI Cheuk-ho concluded and believed that the HyD, the TD and the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) would announce details of the partial commissioning of the SCL as soon as there was a result. He also believed that government departments would review the adequacy of pedestrian crossing facilities at Hin Keng Station based on the actual passenger flow upon commissioning.

54. Members noted the above paper.

2019/2020 Work Plan Outline for Sha Tin District
(Paper No. DH 21/2019)

55. The Vice-Chairman welcomed the following representatives of the HD to the meeting: Ms NGO Po-ling as Senior Housing Manager (Tai Po, North District and Sha Tin 1); Ms Yoki AU as Property Service Manager (Services) (Tai Po, North District and Sha Tin) (1); Mr Elvis LAI as Senior Building Services Engineer (Tai Po, North District and Sha Tin); and Mr Andy KU as Senior Maintenance Surveyor (Tai Po, North District and Sha Tin).

56. Ms NGO Po-ling and Mr Andy KU briefly introduced the contents of the paper.

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

- (a) he pointed out that the HD was active enough in implementing the maintenance and repair works in Sun Tin Wai Estate. Except the remounting of communal antennae, all the items listed in the 2019/2000 Work Plan, such as replacement of aged metal gates, seats, play equipment matting and roadside railings in or near Sun Tin Wai Estate, as well as repaving of footpaths, were the same as those in last year's work plan. He opined that the HD only formally included the items into the work plan. He asked the HD to explain why it had delayed the replacement of play equipment matting; and
- (b) he pointed out that both the shopping centre and the wet market in Sun Tin Wai Estate had been dismantled. But the HD did not have a good solution.

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

- (a) she pointed out that the “Let’s Join Hands to Reduce Waste in Our Estates” Campaign under the “Green Delights in Estates” programme was promoted only through display boards, which was monotonous. She suggested that the Department review the manner and effectiveness of the campaign and enhance promoting the importance of waste reduction;
- (b) she had seen cleaning workers dumping sorted items from three-colour recycling bins into general collection bins. She asked how the HD would deal with items in 3-colour recycling bins;
- (c) regarding the new mosquito trapping devices in Shek Mun Estate, she observed that the devices in different estates were of different types and prices. And they were not operated around the clock. She suggested that the HD heed the advice of the Pest Control Steering Committee about comparing the efficacy and prices of different mosquito trapping devices, so as to quote the same price and adopt the same model. She also hoped that the HD would use the latest model of mosquito control devices of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD);
- (d) she pointed out that Shek Mun Estate was pretty new and its warranty period should be 10 years. But the maintenance contractor had never followed up on the problem of water leakage in corridor superstructures. After the typhoon “Mangkhut”, residents used silicon sealant for temporary repair, and the contractor said that it could not take any follow-up actions. She asked how the HD could effectively monitor the performance of maintenance contractors; and
- (e) the refuse room of Shek Mun Estate Phase 2 was equipped with a good ventilation system. She asked the HD to actively study the installation of gas extraction pipes in the refuse room of Phase 1, so as to maintain the cleanliness and environmental hygiene in public housing estates.

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

- (a) she thanked the HD for arranging the replacement of the ageing metal gates for tenants of Hin Keng Estate. She would like to learn about the detailed timetable for the works; and
- (b) she asked whether the HD had set up a complaint handling mechanism so that tenants could timely express their views on the newly installed facilities.

60. The views of Mr CHAN Nok-hang were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the replacement of aged folding gates in Chun Shek Estate had been expected to be completed by the end of 2018. But the project was still going on halfway through 2019. He asked whether the delay was related to the frequent replacement of contractors by the HD;

- (b) he asked the HD to improve facilities for carriageway management in order to reduce illegal parking; and
- (c) he pointed out that some members of the Estate Management Advisory Committee (EMAC) indiscriminately opposed items they disliked, such as the retrofitting of elderly fitness facilities or the replacement of play equipment matting, causing serious delay. He suggested that the HD should actively play the mediating role instead of accommodating the majority in order to face less pressure.

61. The Vice-Chairman said that he needed to excuse himself and could not continue to preside over the meeting.

62. Mr Simon WONG, Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin) 1, said that according to the procedures set out in Order 34(3) of the Sha Tin District Council Standing Orders, if both the Chairman and Vice Chairman were unable to attend the meeting, the members present shall elect from amongst themselves by simple majority consent a temporary Chairman to preside at that meeting. A nominee must be seconded by two Members. He asked whether there was a nomination at the meeting.

63. Mr YAU Man-chun nominated Mr Thomas PANG as temporary Chairman.

(Mr CHIU Man-leong and Ms TUNG Kin-lei seconded the nomination.)

64. Mr Simon WONG pointed out that if there was not any other person nominated, the nomination for temporary Chairman should be closed. He then asked whether Mr Thomas PANG agreed to accept the nomination and to accept the post as temporary Chairman if elected.

65. Mr Thomas PANG agreed to accept the nomination and to accept the post as temporary Chairperson if elected.

66. Mr Simon WONG asked Mr Thomas PANG to continue to preside over the DHC meeting.

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

- (a) he said that the damaged stainless steel doors in Yan On Estate should have been replaced as part of the follow-up work after “Mangkhut”. He wondered why the item was delayed until now and included in this year’s work plan;
- (b) he asked whether the HD would give priority to installing rain shelters for the lift rooms damaged in “Mangkhut”;
- (c) with the works at the car park and of the new road expansion, he asked when the HD could deploy adequate and even additional security guards and cleaning workers to maintain basic services;
- (d) apart from pressure reducing valves, he asked whether the HD would fully inspect hollow blocks in the lobbies of Yan On Estate to prevent more bursts;

- (e) he complained that the lighting system within the hoarded works area in the estate was unsatisfactory;
- (f) as the expansion works began, the smoking area had been relocated to outside 168 Restaurant. The HD had also provided rubbish bins with ashtrays at the backdoor of Yan Hei House. He asked the HD to follow up on the matter; and
- (g) he had complained to Mr Samuel WONG of the HD about the mediocre performance of the new housing manager of Yan On Estate. He asked the HD whether the previous housing manager could be deployed to serve the estate again.

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

- (a) she opined that the HD's annual tree risk assessment and the related database were relatively backward. Some trees in Mei Lam Estate were assessed as posing no leaning risk, but they still broke or fell after the typhoon. She suggested that the HD deploy 1 tree expert to each district for effective tree management;
- (b) she opined that it was inadequate for the HD to deal with mosquitoes, midges and rodents with old methods such as LPG mosquito traps. She also said that some security guards did not know how to place the rat baits and cage traps. She urged the HD to strengthen training and learn from the FEHD about the latest devices for controlling mosquitoes, midges and rodents; and
- (c) she was very dissatisfied with the performance of the contractor responsible for replacing metal gates in Mei Lam Estate. She said that the contractor was expected to replace 30 metal gates within a year, but the progress was slow. Many residents complained that they could not have their metal gates replaced as per appointments. There was no follow-up. And the hotline could not be connected. She asked the HD to follow up on the complaint.

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

- (a) he agreed with the views of Mr CHING Cheung-ying;
- (b) regarding the Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement, he wondered whether the HD could allot penalty points against persons from outside the estate for their violations;
- (c) he asked how the HD could ensure that a contracted management company could provide estate management services as good as the HD's;
- (d) regarding the HD's frequent deployment of managers to different estates, he urged the HD to study the stability of the contracts of estate managers;
- (e) he enquired about the HD's preparations for the introduction of the levy on bin liners; and

- (f) the Chief Executive had mentioned in the Policy Address that eligible elderly singletons could enjoy lifetime full rent exemption if they were willing to transfer to smaller units. He asked the HD about the progress of the scheme and the number of eligible tenants.

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

- (a) he pointed out that half of the items were indeed repeated from the 2017 and 2018 Work Plan. He asked which section of the footpath in Sha Kok Estate would be repaved and what the progress was;
- (b) regarding the external wall inspection and maintenance works, he suggested that the HD remind the contractor to properly enclose the area and to notify affected residents as soon as possible;
- (c) he asked whether the new project of “Construction of a Covered Walkway near Green Heron House” would commence within the year;
- (d) he wondered why the HD had no plan to replant the big trees in Sha Kok Estate which were felled by “Mangkhut”;
- (e) he was concerned about the progress of the replacement of folding gates in Sha Kok Estate. He also complained about the poor attitude of the contractor. He asked the HD to take follow-up actions; and
- (f) residents often fed feral pigeons in Sha Kok Estate. But HD staff said that there was no applicable misdeed under the Marking Scheme. He said that according to online information, penalty points could be allotted for feeding feral pigeons. He wondered whether the HD would follow up on such behaviour by PRH tenants and allot them penalty points.

71. The views of Mr Sunny CHIU were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that Pok Hong Estate had started replacing the aged metal gates 2 years ago. He asked whether the related item in the work plan referred to the replacement of the remaining metal gates or a new project;
- (b) he wondered why rewiring was not conducted in Pok Hong Estate as in other estates;
- (c) with the ageing of Pok Hong Estate, he urged the HD to seek comprehensive maintenance services for the tenants; and
- (d) the wet market, cooked food stalls, car parks and refuse collection points in Pok Hong Estate were all managed by the HD. Compared with estates managed by The Link Asset Management Limited (The Link), common areas in Pok Hong Estate were dilapidated. He urged the HD to include the said areas into the maintenance and repair works.

72. The views of Mr TONG Hok-leung were summarised below:

- (a) he said that he had requested the replacement of aged play equipment in Mei Tin Estate more than a year ago. But the HD said they could not find the replacement parts. He urged the HD to actively follow up on the matter;
- (b) he said that he had earlier requested the provision of more mosquito repellent lights and more seats in Mei Tin Estate, which was not included into the work plan;
- (c) he was not sure if the HD's contractors were paid by the number of units served. Residents had complained about being frequently badgered by the related contractor and asked to replace their drying racks. The contractor replaced the racks anyway even after some residents said no. He urged the HD to review the implementation of this large project; and
- (d) it often took a year for the HD to handle complaints about throwing objects from heights or noise from neighbours. He urged the HD to invest more resources and to review the procedures for timely handling of such complaints.

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

- (a) she enquired about the specific plan for replacing aged metal gates in Kwong Yuen Estate, including the first block to begin with, the timeline of the works, and the number of units involved. She also urged the HD to provide additional information after the meeting;
- (b) she asked why re-wiring was not carried out in Kwong Yuen Estate as in other Tenants Purchase Scheme (TPS) estates. She asked whether because related works had been completed or because of other reasons; and
- (c) she said that the quality of the HD's refurbishment works in Kwong Yuen Estate varied greatly. Some new tenants were quick to find problems such as blocked drains, flaking ceilings and even plumbing leakage. She urged the HD to review the quality of refurbishment works to protect the interests of tenants.

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

- (a) he hoped that the HD would expedite the modification of exhaust outlets of ventilation systems at food premises on North Wing Podium of Shui Chuen O Plaza, so that residents did not have to continue to endure the emissions from the shopping centre; and
- (b) he said that every day residents could be seen smoking in front of the HD's banner saying of "No Smoking; Penalty Points for Non-compliance". And children playing nearby were involuntarily exposed to second-hand smoke. He hoped that the HD would allocate adequate resources to step up law enforcement and education in Shui Chuen O Estate.

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

- (a) he said that residents of Sun Chui Estate could not reach the related contractor responsible for replacing their folding gates, since the contractor's hotline was seldom connected;
- (b) some elderly people complained that their windows were soiled by the cement of external wall maintenance works, but they could not do anything. He requested that the HD ask the contractor to follow up on the matter;
- (c) he urged the HD to review the hygiene problems caused by contractor's green meshes erected in the works area over an extended period of time;
- (d) he said that some residents of Sun Chui Estate poured noodles or rice out of their windows. But HD staff followed up on cases of throwing objects from heights only during office hours, which was not effective; and
- (e) he said that rodent infestation became even more serious after "Mangkhut". And the mosquito problem was expected to be aggravated during the rainy season. He requested that the HD introduce newer methods of pest control for improvement, instead of relying only on baits.

76. The views of Mr WONG Hok-lai were summarised below:

- (a) he enquired about the HD's guidelines on mosquito control, such as the number of larvicidal oil spraying actions per week;
- (b) he said that stagnant water was not timely cleaned up in Mei Tin Estate and had caused a resident to fall and be sent to hospital. He requested the HD to speed up the clean-up of stagnant water;
- (c) it was relatively slippery outside Mei Chi House. He hoped that the HD would install more anti-skid materials to ensure residents' safety; and
- (d) he urged the HD to pay attention to the contractor's unauthorised replacement of residents' drying racks.

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

- (a) since some properties in Hin Keng Estate had been sold to The Link, he wondered whether the HD could follow up on illegal parking cases on the road such as those in front of the railing of emergency vehicular accesses; and
- (b) he asked whether the HD had any good strategy for dealing with throwing objects from heights.

78. The temporary Chairman said that the problems mentioned by members were mostly related to property managers of housing estates. He suggested that the HD invite all property managers in Sha Tin to the next meeting when the annual work plan was briefed, so as to response to and follow up on members' views and questions.

79. Ms NGO Po-ling gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she thanked Ms Iris WONG for proposing centralised procurement of mosquito traps for all estates. At present, housing estates purchased different brands of mosquito traps on their own, so as to test which one was more effective. The HD would also consult the LCSD on the latest mosquito killers for better control;
- (b) regarding the complaint handling mechanism, views on the HD's works could be conveyed through tenancy service management offices and the HD would take follow-up actions as appropriate;
- (c) regarding carriageway management, the HD mainly locked up illegally parked vehicles or else issued fixed penalty tickets to related owners. It would also strive to strengthen manpower for enforcement;
- (d) if works progress was delayed due to opposition from Members of an EMAC, she said she would remind her colleagues to strengthen communication among different parties;
- (e) regarding "Mangkhut", the HD would review the measures of tree management;
- (f) she said that the current Marking Scheme only applied to residents of the same estate. The Marking Scheme, launched in 2003, was intended to encourage residents to cherish their living environment. She would consult relevant documents as for whether penalty points would be allotted for feeding feral pigeons; and
- (g) due to manpower and resources constraints, it was relatively difficult for the HD to deal with all smoking offences. She said that the HD would work with EMACs and Mutual Aid Committees to strengthen education. Residents would be reminded that smoking offences were subject to penalty points and their tenancy would be affected if they were allotted 16 penalty points.

80. Mr Andy KU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he pointed out that the name of project in Sun Tin Wai Estate was the same as the one last year, because some works might continue for years;
- (b) the HD would urge the contractor of Shek Mun Estate to follow up on the problem of water seepage in corridors;
- (c) regarding the request for deodorisation facilities in the refuse room of Shek Mun Estate Phase 1 in accordance with those for Phase 2, the HD needed to firstly study the technical feasibility due to the different ages of buildings;
- (d) a large number of metal gates needed to be replaced. The project was now in the second phase. It was expected to complete the replacement of metal gates in all housing estates by December this year;

- (e) there were 2 contractors for the metal gate replacement in Chun Shek Estate. Now the second contract had started and was expected to be completed by December this year;
- (f) replacement of stainless steel doors in Yan On Estate was expected to be completed within the next 1 or 2 months;
- (g) the HD would install rain shelters at lift rooms of Yan On Estate as soon as possible;
- (h) the HD would inspect the corridors and would arrange maintenance as soon as possible if it found hollow blocks;
- (i) regarding the performance of the metal gate contractor of Mei Lam Estate, the HD would urge it to ensure normal connection of its hotline and to carry out replacement works for residents as per appointments;
- (j) regarding Mr PUN Kwok-shan's comments, the HD would follow up on improvement works which could be added;
- (k) the HD would provide a location plan of the repaved footpath in Sha Kok Estate after the meeting;
- (l) regarding the nuisance of external wall maintenance, the HD would urge contractors to issue notices before commencement of works, reminding residents to close windows. It would also request contractors to make improvements;
- (m) the HD would file an application to the Independent Checking Unit within the year regarding the construction of a covered walkway. It would formally commence the works, possibly at the end of this year or the beginning of next year, as soon as the plan was approved;
- (n) the HD would review the attitude of workers replacing metal gates and the appointment system. Regarding the contractor's nuisance to residents, the HD had issued a warning and would continue to monitor the situation;
- (o) the HD was studying the improvement works of renovating Pok Hong Estate Market;
- (p) to ensure safety, the same contractor would be engaged for the play equipment at Mei Tin Estate Playground, since the project took a longer time. The HD would study how to improve the process to shorten the project duration;
- (q) the HD would urge the outsourced works section to pay attention to the acceptance standards for the renovation project in Kwong Yuen Estate;
- (r) the improvement of the ventilation systems in Shui Chuen O Estate was expected to commence and finish within the year;

- (s) the HD would urge the contractor of Sun Chui Estate to clean the green meshes on external walls on a regular basis; and
- (t) the HD staff would be deployed to inspect the anti-skid materials at the site of Mei Chi House and would make improvements as necessary.

81. Mr Elvis LAI pointed out that the HD expected to conduct indoor re-wiring for tenants of Kwong Yuen Estate and Pok Hong Estate in the years of 2020/2021 and 2023/2024, respectively. The HD would also review the necessity to advance the works in light of the actual situation.

82. Ms Yoki AU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) regarding the complaint that the hoarding in the modification works in Yan On Estate Phase 2 would result in insufficient street lighting, the HD would continue to monitor the situation and remind the contractor to install additional lighting as appropriate;
- (b) the HD had designated a new smoking area for Yan On Estate;
- (c) regarding the performance of the manager of Yan On Estate, the HD played a monitoring role and would follow up with Mr Michael YUNG on individual cases after the meeting;
- (d) regarding the necessity to replace mosquito repellent lights and seats, the HD would asked the management company to follow up with Mr TONG Hok-leung after the meeting; and
- (e) regarding the improvement of slip resistance of ground surfaces in Mei Tin Estate, the HD would convey the message to relevant staff for follow up on the specific locations.

83. Mr NG Kam-hung was concerned about the handling of illegally parked vehicles in Hin Keng Estate.

84. Ms NGO Po-ling added that since Hin Keng Estate was a TPS estate, it was managed in the same way as a private property. Both illegal parking and throwing objects at heights were handled by the management company under the incorporated owners (IO).

85. Mr CHING Cheung-ying said that the manager of Sun Tin Wai Estate was completely incapable of handling unauthorised works and was unable to provide effective follow-up measures, which made residents unhappy. He asked the TD to consider replacing the manager.

86. Mr Michael YUNG said that 6 months had passed after “Mangkhut” hit Hong Kong. He wondered why the replacement of stainless steel doors was repeatedly delayed. And he did not agree to the HD’s visual inspection of hollow blocks. He urged the HD to request follow-up actions by the responsible contractor, as in the “lead water” incident.

87. Mr Andy KU added that a lot of works were carried out after “Mangkhut”, and the replacement stainless steel doors involved design and materials ordering, which took time. He hoped that members could understand that. In addition to visual inspection, the HD also identified hollow blocks by tapping or other methods.

88. The temporary Chairman thanked the HD for sending a senior engineers and a senior maintenance surveyor to the meeting for communication with members. He suggested that representatives of the HD leave their contact information so that members could follow up on outstanding questions and the works progress.

89. Members noted the above paper.

Briefing on “Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme”
(Paper No. DH 22/2019)

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

- (a) he said that an IO or owners’ committee (OC) had invited bids from 20 companies. But eventually it received only 2 bids, one from the original contractor and the other from an unknown supplier. The options were limited;
- (b) the repair and maintenance of lifts were subject to the model and the number of floors. He asked the Administration to provide the reference prices; and
- (c) due to the increase in rents, he believed that many housing courts in Sha Tin might not meet the criteria of \$162,000 or below in terms of the annual average rateable value (ARV). He asked the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) to review the possibility of lowering the application threshold so as to benefit more residents.

91. Mr Tiger WONG pointed out that dozens of lifts in housing courts lacked the relevant safety devices, and the maintenance would involve a lot of money. He wondered whether housing courts were eligible if they conducted tender exercise firstly for some lifts and then optimised the remaining ones upon completion of the works.

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

- (a) the first round of applications would close on 31 July of the year. The results would be announced in the fourth quarter. She wondered whether there was a limit on the number of approved lifts in the first round. She enquired about the URA’s criteria for determining the approved lifts in the first and the second rounds, if the plan was well received; and
- (b) the funding would cover the equipment of 4 safety devices. She asked whether residents could apply for funds for replacing an entire lift to avoid frequent damages.

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

- (a) she wondered whether the URA had a mechanism for housing courts rejected in the first round to be automatically listed for the second round of applications; and
- (b) the funding scheme would last 6 years. She pointed out that there were 48 lifts in Hin Keng Estate. She asked whether the URA would continue to provide funding if the replacement of safety parts could not be completed within 6 years.

94. Mr TING Tsz-yuen said that the maximum subsidy amount per lift would be \$500,000 or else 60% of the modernisation cost under the “scope of grant”. He asked whether the URA or relevant departments had any anti-corruption measures and how they would prevent price fixing amongst contractors.

95. The views of Mr Sunny CHIU were summarised below:

- (a) he said that there were 39 lifts in Pok Hong Estate. It might cost over 1 million to replace a lift, but the maximum subvention amount was only \$500,000 each lift. He was afraid that small property owners could not afford the costs. He asked the Administration to consider increasing the upper limit of the grant after the first two rounds; and
- (b) he asked what the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) would do if the OC of a housing court had not decided whether to replace the lifts, which however lacked the essential safety devices.

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

- (a) unlike “Operation Building Bright”, this scheme allowed IOs to choose whether to engage consultants provided by the URA. The original contractor might have an advantage, or its maintenance contract might forbid the use of outsourced services. He asked how the URA could ensure related tenders would not be compromised by bid-rigging or else monopolised by the original contractor;
- (b) eligible elderly owner-occupiers aged 60 or above would be granted full subsidy, subject to a cap of \$50,000 per domestic unit. He asked whether eligible elderly residents would not benefit from the grant, if the cost was collected from each household or else was covered by the contingency fund of the court;
- (c) he enquired about the transitional arrangements, asking how housing courts could benefit from the scheme, if they were already replacing lifts; and
- (d) in the event of a lift accident, the original contractor might be responsible for maintenance and a new contractor might be responsible for updating or modifying the safety devices. He enquired about the liability in that regard, and asked how the EMSD would monitor and handle disputes over the safety of lifts.

97. The views of Mr WONG Hok-lai were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that it was expensive to replace a lift. The maximum subsidy of \$500,000 or 60% of the modernisation cost would be only a drop in the bucket. He asked whether the Administration would consider raising the amount; and
- (b) he asked whether the URA or the EMSD would remind the IO to install “essential safety devices” before the commencement of related works and whether they would monitor the compliance afterwards.

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

- (a) he welcomed the “Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme” launched by the URA;
- (b) he said that private estates along Shing Mun River, including Ravana Garden, Garden Vista, Pictorial Garden, City One Shatin, Yue Tin Court, Belair Garden, Garden Rivera and Sha Tin Town Centre, had an average age of 30 years. Most of the lifts there did not have the double brake system. Therefore, after the launch of the scheme, he had sought quotations from large contractors across the territory and found that it cost between \$800,000 and \$1.2 million to repair a lift. For the maximum subsidy of \$500,000, it meant that owners had to fork out \$500,000 to \$1 million on their own. He opined that it would be a heavy burden for them, since some units were only occupied by elderly residents with limited savings. He suggested that the URA consider raising the maximum subsidy amount; and
- (c) he believed that only a small number of housing courts in Sha Tin could meet the criteria of \$162,000 or less in terms of the annual ARV. He urged the URA to consider raising the minimum rateable value in view of the situation in Sha Tin, when launching phase 2 of the scheme.

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

- (a) he asked whether the URA would impose a cap on each round of application, in case the subsidy amount was used up in the first round;
- (b) regarding risk-based priorities, he cited 2 cases as an example. In both cases, the lifts were not equipped with the “4+3” safety devices. The lifts in Case 1 were used in an old building but had never failed. The ones in Case 2 were used in a newer building but often failed. He wondered which case would be assessed to have a higher risk; and
- (c) he enquired about the URA’s arrangements for the remaining applicants if the subsidy amount for the second round was used up.

100. The views of Mr CHAN Nok-hang were summarised below:

- (a) he enquired about the definition of aged lifts and asked whether there was any requirement on the years of service of lifts;

- (b) regarding the 4 “essential safety devices” for lifts, he was worried that the subsidy of \$500,000 might be inadequate to cover the cost of replacing the entire lift, if it was too old to be equipped with those devices;
- (c) he agreed to the URA’s provision of free consultancy services, which, however, were not mandatory. He asked how the URA would prevent corruption; and
- (d) apart from the minimum age of 60, he asked whether there were other requirements, such as an asset ceiling or receipt of the Old Age Living Allowance, like those under the “Building Maintenance Grant Scheme for Elderly Owners”.

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

- (a) he expressed his gratitude to Mr Peter DY, Senior Manager (Building Rehabilitation) of the URA, who started serving Sha Tin District in 2015 and who had organised and participated in a number of briefing sessions to disseminate building maintenance information to local property owners;
- (b) regarding the definition of “owner-occupiers” under the “Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme”, he suggested that elderly occupiers should be eligible if it could be proved that they were long-term dwellers and the units were owned by their children;
- (c) if the scheme was well received, he hoped that the \$2.5 billion could become a recurrent funding arrangement in the next year’s Budget;
- (d) regarding the subsidy cap of \$500,000, he suggested that the entire cost or at least 80% of it should be subsidised;
- (e) he suggested that the eligibility criteria should be raised to an ARV of \$180,000 per annum, so that more housing courts could benefit;
- (f) he said that some housing courts in his constituency had applied for the subsidy. But they found that the URA actually could finance only 30-40% of the total cost, and the remaining amount should be covered by the property owners. He hoped that the URA could show sympathy to elderly residents with heavy burdens in the district;
- (g) he asked whether the semi-annual maintenance inspections, which cost about \$70,000 to \$80,000, could be waived, if the related optimisation works had been completed; and
- (h) he asked whether housing courts not included in the first round were automatically listed for the second round, or whether they should resubmit the application.

102. Mr William AU, Senior Engineer / General Legislation 3 of the EMSD, gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he would like to clarify 2 things. First, with the cap of 60%, the maximum subsidy amount of \$500,000 applied only when the total cost exceeded \$800,000. Therefore part of the works cost would be borne by residents. Second, the core of the scheme was to improve the safety level of aged lifts, instead of reducing their failure rates. He pointed out that even new lifts could fail in daily uses;
- (b) there were currently 41 local contractors of lift maintenance contractors on the EMSD's list, and more than 30 of them were active ones;
- (c) regarding the lukewarm response in tenders, as mentioned by members, he said that it might be related to the models, brands and parts conditions of the lifts. Some registered contractors might not have adequate maintenance expertise for certain brands or models, or else they had different strategies of business operation. As a result, they might refrain from bidding for contracts involving certain types of lifts. He drew the analogy of car repair. When an auto brand had unique design, there were relatively fewer service suppliers with the appropriate maintenance expertise. Therefore the matter was also related to the supply and demand and the procurement choices for new lifts in the first place. It might not necessarily be bad to have a small number of bids. He suggested that the responsible persons of lifts should take active actions in the modernisation, so as to attract more bidding contractors in future;
- (d) in the event of a lift accident, no matter whether the lift was maintained by the original contractor or another contractor, there should be only 1 contractor carrying out the maintenance or the major alteration works on the day of the accident. And that exact contractor should handle the accident in accordance with the Lifts and Escalators Ordinance (Cap. 618). Therefore, during the handover, the old and the new contractors should clarify the liabilities under the defect follow-up list with the responsible person of the lift concerned. If the accident involved a violation under the Lifts and Escalators Ordinance (Cap. 618), the EMSD would conduct a criminal investigation and strictly enforce the law;
- (e) starting from 1 February this year, lifts without the 4 essential safety devices would be classified as aged ones. The EMSD defined aged lifts based on their safety instead of their years of service. He said that according to the EMSD's regulations, all lifts installed in or after 2012 should be equipped with the 4 essential safety devices. Therefore, lifts installed before 2012 could be aged ones;
- (f) in view of the 2 serious lift incidents in 2018, the EMSD revised the "Code of Practice on the Design and Construction of Lifts and Escalators" in August 2018, requiring that at least 2 "special maintenance actions" be carried out each year or else any other measure proposed by the manufacturer be adopted, in order to enhance safety, for an aged lift which was not equipped with the ascending car overspeed protection device, the unintended car movement protection device or the double braking system;

- (g) the Code was intended to clarify the practical work requirements and to provide guidance for the safety of lifts and escalators. Following the Code could be regarded as compliance with relevant requirements in the Lifts and Escalators Ordinance. Besides, the EMSD also required contractors to submit the scheduled dates and results of maintenance works, as well as related inspection and technical data, to the EMSD via the computer platform, for the purpose of records and spot checks. To ensure adequate time for the industry and the stakeholders to make preparations and negotiation, the EMSD set a 6-month grace period for the measures, which were not fully implemented until 1 February 2019. It was the statutory duty of responsible persons of lifts to ensure that their lifts could effectively be kept in a proper state of repair and in safe working order. Aged lifts were not equipped with the latest safety devices; therefore they might not be as safe as the latest models. In that case, “special maintenance” was an important measure to ensure the effective operation of important safety components, in order to protect public safety. In the long run, the EMSD suggested that responsible persons modernise or replace aged lifts, for the sake of greater safe, comfort and peace of mind;
- (h) installing related safety devices was a major alteration under Lifts and Escalators Ordinance (Cap. 618). The EMSD must be notified with the specified form before such installation. After the works was completed and inspected by a registered lift engineer, EMSD personnel would conduct a safety patrol and examination on site. The lift concerned could not continue to be used until it was confirmed safe with a resumption permit issued by the EMSD; and
- (i) regarding the risk-based principle, he explained that newer lifts were theoretically equipped with the 4 “essential safety devices”; therefore they were not eligible for the application. As for lifts with lower failure rates in older buildings, he said that they could still operate safely if related stakeholders fulfil their roles and properly maintain the lifts.

103. Mr Peter DY gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he said that the “Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme” was initiated by the Development Bureau and jointly implemented by the URA and the EMSD;
- (b) he said that it was the first time that the URA had provided free consultancy services to IOs or OCs under a funding scheme;
- (c) as for the works prices, IOs participating in the “Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme” could also refer to the valuation obtained from the URA’s free consultants;
- (d) responding to Mr Tiger WONG’s enquiry about the subsidy amount for replacing some or all lifts in a housing court, he pointed out that either practice was acceptable, and the cap of subsidy was \$500,000 per lift. However, the IO must include all the lifts in the application under the “Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme”;

- (e) he said that the first round of applications had started on 29 March and would close on 31 July this year. He stressed that, instead of the “first come first serve” approach, related applications would be considered based on the risk assessment and the safety level. The more a lift lacked the 7 safety devices mentioned in the paper, higher the score would be. The second round of applications was expected to begin at the end of the year;
- (f) he added that if an application would be also valid if the IO considered replacing an entire lift to improve its safety;
- (g) he pointed out that if the lifts of an estate lacked the 4 “essential safety devices”, all of them should be replaced under the “Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme”. The IO could not choose to replace only some of the lifts;
- (h) regarding the calculation of the subsidy amount, he said that if the works cost was only \$500,000, the funding amount would be only \$300,000 (i.e., 60% of the works cost). In other words, not every lift would be fully covered by the subsidy cap of \$500,000;
- (i) regarding corruption prevention, he said that all applicants for the “Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme” needed to use the “Smart Tender” services, including the E-Tendering Platform for bidding. Besides, property owners could refer to the prices quoted by the URA’s free consultants. Hopefully those initiatives could reduce unreasonable bidding price and irregularities;
- (j) he pointed out that the “RenoSafe Scheme” implemented by the Police was mainly intended to prevent crimes in building maintenance works in the market. The Scheme was expected to prevent engineering consultants, contractors or others from using unlawful means to influence building management or works tendering and implementation. There were designated police officers to follow up on related cases;
- (k) he pointed out that under the “Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme”, owner-occupiers aged 60 or above were eligible to apply. There was no means test. However, elderly residents were not eligible under the Scheme if they let out their units. Regarding Mr Alvin LEE’s suggestion that long-term elder dwellers should also be eligible to apply, he said that it was not intended under the Scheme. But he said he could convey the opinion to the Government;
- (l) he said that the Government and the EMSD had referred to market rates when setting the subsidy cap at \$500,000 per lift. The amount should be enough for modernisation works alone. He said that the total cost would be higher if an entire lift was to be replaced;
- (m) he said that at the current stage, there was no cap on the total subsidy amount in the first round. It would depend on the background, service years and safety devices of the lifts in related cases after closing of applications;
- (n) under the current Scheme, applications rejected in the first round would be automatically included in the second round; and

- (o) he pointed out that the rateable value of \$162,000 per annum was an average figure, because the value would be subject to the floor level, the orientation and other factors. Many housing courts in Sha Tin were still eligible for funding under the Scheme. He said that the URA could consider members' suggestion about raising the minimum ARV.

104. Mr Wilson LI opined that it was not appropriate for the EMSD to compare lifts to expensive cars. He pointed out that currently the number of tenders received was small. In some cases, only 1 contractor submitted a tender. It was difficult for members of the public to make the right choice without sufficient information.

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

- (a) he gave an example, in which the market price for parts replacement was \$480,000, but the bid price was higher at \$560,000. And only 1 contractor submitted a bid. He asked how the URA would assist the IO;
- (b) he said that it was not considered bid-rigging if only the lift manufacturer provided maintenance services and no other companies took part in the bidding process. But he asked what advice the URA would offer if there was only 1 bid submitted; and
- (c) he wondered how such a situation would be handled under the "RenoSafe Scheme".

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

- (a) he pointed out that some maintenance contracts might specify that the same contractor should be engaged for maintenance works and that no other companies should be allowed to repair or replace parts. If the IO replaced the contractor without realising the contract specifications, it might be subject to civil claims by the original contractor. In this connection, he asked whether an IO would be reminded of the terms of the original contract when it received free consultancy services; and
- (b) he wondered how the EMSD would handle the situation if the original contractor, upon being aware of the engagement of a new contractor, offered to resign and ceased to provide maintenance services.

107. The views of Mr CHAN Nok-hang were summarised below:

- (a) he asked whether elderly persons aged 60 or above needed to undergo a means test or submit any proof when applying for the subsidy;
- (b) he gave an example, in which the lifts of a housing court had been replaced five years ago but the model did not support the "essential safety devices". Now they needed to be replaced again, incurring additional expenses. He wondered whether the EMSD would provide relevant technical support in such a case; and

- (c) he asked whether lifts managed or else installed as replacement by the HD should be equipped with the 4 “required safety devices”.

108. The views of Mr WONG Hok-lai were summarised below:

- (a) he asked the URA to provide the market rates for the public’s reference;
- (b) he asked whether the optional safety devices at present would become mandatory ones in future;
- (c) he asked how persons aged 60 or above should apply for the subsidy; and
- (d) he asked whether elderly residents could not benefit from the Scheme if the cost was covered by the contingency fund of the estate.

109. The views of Mr Sunny CHIU were summarised below:

- (a) he asked whether there was a means test under the Scheme on persons aged 60 or above; and
- (b) he asked whether elderly residents could not benefit from the Scheme if the cost was covered by the contingency fund of the estate.

110. Mr Peter DY gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he reiterated that elderly people aged 60 or above could apply as long as they were owner-occupiers. And there was no assets limit under the Scheme;
- (b) if the cost was covered by the contingency fund, elderly owners could file individual applications based on the payment notices issued by the IO. The maximum subsidy was \$50,000 for each elder owner-occupier;
- (c) he explained that unlike building maintenance, there were not many participants in the lifts market at present. Therefore works under the “Lift Modernisation Subsidy Scheme” were expected to be carried out over 6 years, in case too many concurrent works in the market would cause problems. An IO needed to consider the bidding prices and the number of tenders received; and
- (d) he further added that the IO could consider the information of bidders and the URA’s reference prices when consider the tenders received.

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

- (a) he suggested that the IO could invite bids from all the 41 contractors across the territory at the same time, so as to increase the number of tenders received;
- (b) the IO could ask contractors whether they did not submit bids because they had recently undertaken a lot of works;

- (c) if there was still 1 or 2 contractors submitted their bids, the IO should accept the fact since lifts maintenance was a professional trade, the number of contractors was limited;
- (d) regarding the dispute over the replacement of the contractor, he said that technically speaking, the original contractor was responsible for maintenance and the other contractor carried out the major alterations. There should not be conflicts if there was a clear handover process. If the original contractor was unwilling to undertake the works, the responsible person should carefully discuss commercial issues with it. The EMSD could provide technical assistance as necessary and appropriate;
- (e) he suggested that the IO should have a clear idea about when the current maintenance contract would expire, whether a new contractor should be engaged, and how to make good use of the free consultancy services; and
- (f) he added that the Scheme would last 6 months, since the EMSD and the URA had considered coordination issues in the operation of maintenance contracts. And the validity of such contracts was usually 2 or 3 years. So the handover period was also covered by the Scheme.

1 1 2. Members noted the above paper.

Nomination of a Sha Tin District Council Representative for Appointment to the Selection Panel of the Buildings Department
(Paper No. DH 23/2019)

1 1 3. The temporary Chairman said that the Secretariat had received the nomination forms for two members, namely:

Candidate (1):	Mr Tiger WONG
Nominator:	Ms TUNG Kin-lei
Seconders:	Ms Iris WONG
Candidate (2):	Mr WAI Hing-cheung
Nominator:	Mr CHING Cheung-ying
Seconders:	Mr TING Tsz-yuen

He asked members to vote and choose one of them to be the STDC representative.

1 1 4. The temporary Chairman said that since Mr Tiger WONG and Mr WAI Hing-cheung each had 14 votes, another round of voting was required.

1 1 5. The temporary Chairman said that the 2 candidates still tied in the second round (each with 14 votes), the nominee would be determined by drawing of lots.

1 1 6. The temporary Chairman said that staff would put 10 ping-pong balls in a box. The balls were each marked with a number from 1 to 10, with 1 being the smallest and 10 being the largest. The 2 candidates would draw lots in the order of their candidate numbers. Each candidate would draw 1 ball from the box and then put it back, so that the two of them would have the same chance. The candidate getting the larger number would be elected.

117. The temporary Chairman said that since both candidates had drawn Ball No. 4, another round of lots drawing was required.

118. The temporary Chairman said that in the second round, Mr Tiger WONG got Ball No. 7, and Mr WAI Hing-cheung got Ball No. 8. He announced that Mr WAI Hing-cheung was nominated as the STDC representative to the Selection Panel of the Buildings Department (BD).

Questions

Question to be Raised by Mr YAU Man-chun on the Provision of Elderly Housing at Jat Min Chuen by the Hong Kong Housing Society
(Paper No. DH 24/2019)

119. The temporary Chairman said that Mr YAU Man-chun would like to postpone his question to the next meeting, since there was no representative from the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS). He agreed to postpone the question to the next meeting for discussion.

Question to be Raised by Mr CHAN Shiu-yeung, Billy on Aged Water Mains in Sha Tin District
(Paper No. DH 25/2019)

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

- (a) he pointed out that water main bursts occurred in Sha Kok Estate from time to time. In one case, a burst water main in Skylark House was repaired in the morning but burst again in the evening. He enquired about the timetable and specific arrangements for the replacement of water mains in Sha Kok Estate;
- (b) he asked the HD why the average cost of plumbing repairs had risen from \$17,000 to \$35,000;
- (c) he said that since Sha Kok Estate and Yue Shing Court shared water mains, related maintenance works in the former might affect water supply to the latter. He asked whether the HD would separate the water mains in the full replacement of pipes;
- (d) he enquired about the process of water pipe replacement works in Sha Kok Estate. And he asked whether the HD had issued warning letters to the related contractor for the large number of water mains bursts in Sha Kok Estate; and
- (e) he asked the HD why the average cost of plumbing maintenance had risen from \$170,000 to \$280,000.

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

- (a) he asked the WSD how the responsibilities for maintenance within and outside the housing estate were determined;

- (b) the HD said that it was reviewing the number of pipes to be replaced and could not provide the figure at the moment. He asked whether the water pipe network was ring-shaped or star-shaped. He pointed out that fresh and salt water pipes in Fu On area had burst due to ageing. He asked whether the WSD would upgrade the water mains in old housing estates to enhance the stability of water supply; and
- (c) he advised the WSD to study the improvement of the water pipe network to eliminate the frequent bursting of fresh and salt water pipes.

1 2 2 . Ms NGO Po-ling gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) in view of the progress of other works in Sha Kok Estate, the replacement of water mains was expected to commence in the third quarter of 2019;
- (b) the average cost of plumbing maintenance had become higher, because the contract was new and the scale of each burst varied;
- (c) she said that the water pipe network in most estates featured the ring design, which would also apply to the replacement works. If a burst could not be controlled by turning off the valve in the estate, the water stoppage would be expanded;
- (d) there were many reasons for the bursting of water mains, including ageing. Therefore the contractor was not necessarily to blame. She said that the HD would provide additional information after the meeting as to whether warning letters had been issue to the water mains contractor of Sha Kok Estate; and
- (e) the HD would also provide additional information after the meeting regarding the branch pipes and ring-shaped water pipes in Yue Shing Court, as well as the timetable for plumbing maintenance in Sha Kok Estate.

1 2 3 . Mr LEUNG Chin-hung gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the average cost of plumbing repairs was affected by the annual number of cases and the locations. He pointed out that over the past 3 years, there had been only 1 or 2 cases in which the bursting of WSD mains affected water supply to the public housing estates in Sha Tin. In the case in 2018, a salt water main near Hin Keng Estate burst and affected the supply to Lung Hang Estate. Later the WSD had to repave the 3 traffic carriageways at Fu Kin Street. He said that the cost of works on carriageways were usually higher than those on footpaths. And the said maintenance case involved a large scope, resulting in a higher cost of plumbing maintenance on average than usual; and
- (b) the responsibilities for maintenance were generally divided by the geographical boundaries. Water mains within Sha Kok Estate were managed by the HD, and those outside by the WSD. Alternatively, water pipes up to the last WSD supply valve outside the estate was managed by the WSD, and those afterwards were managed by the HD or a private company.

1 2 4 . Members noted the above paper.

Question to be Raised by Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Sunny on the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme and Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme
(Paper No. DH 26/2019)

1 2 5 . The views of Mr Sunny CHIU were summarised below:

- (a) the Independent Checking Unit of the THB pointed out that over the past 3 years, statutory notices had been issued to 10 and 48 housing courts under the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme (MBIS) and the Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme (MWIS), respectively. The Administration said that such notices were issued to selected buildings “not less than 6 months later”. He asked how long it was. He pointed out that Pok Hong Estate had received a pre-notification letter in November 2017, but it had not yet received the relevant statutory notice more than 18 months later. He said that residents would like to be informed of the time limit of the statutory notice as soon as possible;
- (b) the Independent Checking Unit said that only a small number of housing courts had voluntarily completed the prescribed inspections after receiving the pre-notification letters. He enquired about the exact number of related housing courts. And he asked why housing courts still received statutory notices upon completing the prescribed inspections;
- (c) he asked whether the number of housing courts in question (e) referred to the number of backlog cases of the HD;
- (d) the BD would serve statutory notice directly to the owners of the target building, but the Independent Checking Unit would issue a pre-notification letters first. He enquired about the rationale for the difference;
- (e) he said that the BD had no backlog cases. And it had served notices to 20 000 and 100 000 private housing courts under the MBIS and the MWIS since 2016, respectively. He asked why the BD was more efficient than the Independent Checking Unit. He wondered whether it was related to the fact that the BD did not have to issue the pre-notification letter;
- (f) the BD said that it would not serve a statutory notice for the same building or window within the inspection period. He asked whether the Independent Checking Unit had the same arrangement as the BD’s; and
- (g) he asked whether the Independent Checking Unit would learn from the BD, reviewing and cancelling the arrangement of the pre-notification letter.

1 2 6 . The views of Mr WAI Hing-cheung were summarised below:

- (a) he asked why the BD did not maintain information on housing courts under Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) and TPS estates;

- (b) he enquired about the number of private buildings and housing courts involved under the MBIS and the MWIS each year, respectively; and
- (c) he asked why the number of statutory notices issued by the BD under the MBIS or the MWIS was declining year on year.

127. Mr LAM Chi-hing, Senior Maintenance Surveyor (Independent Checking Unit) (4) of the HD, gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) in terms of timing, he said that the implementation of the MBIS and the MWIS was complicated. The Independent Checking Unit would issue pre-notification letters regarding not only the common parts of the entire housing court/estate, but also the components belonging to individual owners of the target building, such as projections/windows, before it served statutory notices regarding such components/windows. The difference in execution time between the two involved more than 100 000 records. And the Independent Checking Team did not maintain the relevant information;
- (b) so far, only 1 housing court had completed the prescribed inspection before receiving the statutory notice. Despite so, according to the law, the process was not completed until the housing court had duly conducted prescribed repair works for its buildings. Therefore the Independent Checking Unit would still issue the statutory notice to the housing court to ensure its compliance;
- (c) the figures provided under Question (e) were the numbers of HOS and TPS estates to which the Independent Checking Unit had issued pre-notification letters by the end of the year and for which it were preparing statutory notices by the end of each year;
- (d) regarding the implementation of the MBIS and the MWIS, he said that the Independent Checking Unit and the BD adopted the same enforcement standards, in terms of the coverage, specified deadlines, prescribed inspections and scope of repairs. Both HOS and TPS estates were under the jurisdiction of the Independent Checking Units, and they normally had IOs and/or management companies. Upon receiving pre-notification letters and before receiving statutory notices, the IOs of target buildings could make preparations for tender exercises and contracts, which generally required discussions at owners' meetings. By contrast, the BD was responsible for enforcement over private buildings, including "three-nil" ones (i.e. those without IOs, management companies or residents' associations). Therefore, the pre-notification arrangement was different from that relating to the Independent Checking Unit;
- (e) he said that due to objective factors, the BD had more manpower and supervised more buildings than the Independent Checking Unit did. Accordingly, it also issued more statutory notices;
- (f) he said that the Independent Checking Unit regularly reviewed the implementation of the schemes. Since the URA had recently launched the "Smart Tender" and other related services, IOs needed extra time to

understand the details and file applications. Therefore statutory notices might be issued more than a year later. He pointed out that the long-term goal of the Independent Checking Unit was to shorten the gap in time and to consider whether to adopt the BD's approach and cancel the pre-notification arrangement;

- (g) he said that the statutory notice for Pok Hong Estate was being prepared and was normally expected to be issued within the year; and
- (h) buildings under the jurisdiction of the Independent Checking Unit would be selected for both the MBIS and the MWIS, so as to minimise nuisances to residents. But some buildings were selected for the MWIS only.

128. Mr TAI Chi-ho, Senior Structural Engineer / MBI-C of the BD, gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the BD was responsible for enforcement over private buildings across the territory according to the Buildings Ordinance. In the review in 2017, that is, 5 years after the implementation of the MBIS and the MWIS, it was found that most private buildings only started inspections upon receiving statutory notices. Therefore, the BD stopped serving pre-notification letters in 2018;
- (b) upon identifying target buildings, the BD would arrange for a large number of staff to prepare and serve statutory notices. Therefore there were no backlog cases;
- (c) since HOS and TPS estate were under the jurisdiction of the Independent Checking Unit, the BD did not have relevant information. And the number of private properties was included in the paper;
- (d) under the MBIS and the MWIS, the BD would consider the advice of the Selection Panel on target buildings, before serving related statutory notices to related IOs/property owners. In the event of frequent window falling incidents, the BD would consider serving statutory notices under the MBIS and the MWIS to the IOs/property owners concerned;
- (e) the BD would provide the numbers of individual units and housing courts under the MBIS and the MWIS after the meeting; and
- (f) he said that at the workload was huge at the beginning of the schemes, since the BD had to deal with an increasing number of residents in each target building on average. Upon reviewing the 2 schemes in 2017, the BD had decided to issue statutory notices to housing courts in a risk-based manner under the MWIS. Now the BD was issuing a smaller number of statutory notices, considering the progress of the 2 schemes and the general hope that Government would slow down the implementation, so that property owners could have sufficient time to understand the schemes and make preparations.

129. Members noted the above paper.

Question to be Raised by Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas on Dividing the Management and Maintenance Fees for Public Spaces between the Owners of Sui Wo Court and the Link REIT

(Paper No. DH 27/2019)

130. The views of the temporary Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the reply from the HD did not clearly state the split ratio details prescribed in the contract. He wondered how the ratios were determined as 50.8% for residential units, 20.2% for the shopping centre and 29% for the car park. He also asked the HD to provide a copy of the relevant part of the contract for members' reference;
- (b) the attached plan of 1978 as provided by the HD failed to clearly show the locations of the residential part, the lifts or relevant facilities. Therefore he hoped that the HD would provide information relating to facilities in Section A and the remaining portion, in words and in graphs, after the meeting;
- (c) he asked the HD to give a direct answer as to whether the covenant covered lifts of the shopping centre and the footbridge connecting it with the housing court;
- (d) regarding Question (f), he asked the HD whether owners of Sui Wo Court had to pay extra money due to the incomplete implementation of the covenant. If yes, he asked how much the total amount was and how the HD and The Link would compensate those owners;
- (e) regarding places for rent, he said that the kindergarten should be under the area where residents owned but was listed by the HD as one for letting purposes. He asked the HD for an explanation. He asked whether the HD collected rent from the kindergarten. If yes, he asked how the HD would compensate owners of Sui Wo Court for their losses;
- (f) the HD did not clearly list the scope of plant watering in public places and non-residential areas in the housing court. He asked the HD to provide sufficient information after the meeting; and
- (g) he urged the HD to actively follow up on important documents with the IO of Sui Wo Court, so that the owners could get to know the truth as early as possible.

131. Ms NGO Po-ling gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that the attached plan provided by the HD was the deed poll for the lot where Sui Wo Court was located, as registered with the Land Registry. It was not appropriate for the HD to manually draw on the plan. The HD would display the plan of the lot in another manner if necessary;
- (b) according to the land lease, Sui Wo Court was located at Sha Tin Town Lot 43, which was divided into Section A (i.e., the non-residential portion) and the remaining portion (i.e. the residential portion) in the deed poll. She

pointed out that in property transactions, the residential portion was subject to the deed of mutual covenant, which was no different from the arrangement for an ordinary private property. According to the deed of mutual covenant, owners needed to pay for facilities in common areas within the court. The Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA), as the previous manager of Sui Wo Court and the owner of Section A, had been liable for the costs covering the slope and carriage maintenance as well as plant watering. After the takeover by the IO, the slop maintenance became the responsibility of respective owners. The carriageway was located at Section A; therefore the related costs had been borne by the HA. Later, the HA divested the property to The Link (formerly Link Reit) in 2005 and signed an assignment deed, the attached plan of which clearly showed the scope of the lot. The costs of common facilities were shared by owners of the relevant section according to the undivided shares. She said that the water for plants came from the remaining portion, but the pipes extended across both the remaining portion and Section A. Therefore, before the divestment the watering costs had been shared as per the split ratios, which were therefore also applicable;

- (c) since the IO took over Sui Wo Court many years ago, it should have more complete information than the HA. During its meeting with the IO, the HA had asked the IO to list facilities to which they suspected that the split ratio covenant should apply, other than watering facilities, so that the HA and The Link could follow up. However, the IO had not yet provided relevant information;
- (d) in response to the IO's allegation regarding the kindergarten lease, she said that the HA did not have relevant records. The IO had not submitted any document or proof to support its allegation in the earlier meeting, either; and
- (e) both Lifts L37 & L38 were located at the remaining portion.

132. Members noted the above paper.

Information Item

Report of Working Group
(Paper No. DH 28/2019)

133. Members noted the above paper.

Information Papers

2019-2020 Approved Estimates of an Expenditure Head under the Committee
(Paper No. DH 29/2019)

134. Members noted the above paper.

Population of Public Housing Estates and Private Sector Participation Scheme Courts in Sha Tin
(Paper No. DH 30/2019)

135. Members noted the above paper.

Date of Next Meeting

136. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 2:30 pm on 4 July 2019 (Thursday).

137. The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat
STDC 13/15/30 Pt X

June 2019