

Sha Tin District Council
Minutes of the 6th meeting of
the Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee in 2020

Date : 29 October 2020(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 LI Wing-shing, Wilson (Chairman)	DC Member	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Mr CHENG Chung-hang (Vice-Chairman)	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	DC Chairman	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Mr WONG Hok-lai, George	DC Vice-Chairman	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	DC Member	2:50 pm	5:09 pm
Mr CHAN Nok-hang	"	2:51 pm	5:42 pm
Mr CHAN Pui-ming	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa	"	2:46 pm	5:42 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong	"	2:59 pm	5:42 pm
Mr CHOW Hiu-laam, Felix	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Mr CHUNG Lai-him, Johnny	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Mr HUI Lap-san	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Dr LAM Kong-kwan	"	3:00 pm	4:34 pm
Mr LI Chi-wang, Raymond	"	3:31 pm	5:42 pm
Mr LI Sai-hung	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Mr LIAO Pak-hong, Ricardo	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Mr LO Tak-ming	"	2:45 pm	3:45 pm
Mr LO Yuet-chau	"	2:58 pm	5:13 pm
Mr LUI Kai-wing	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Ms LUK Tsz-tung	"	3:06 pm	5:42 pm
Mr MAK Tsz-kin	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS	"	2:30 pm	3:18 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung	"	2:30 pm	5:21 pm
Mr SHAM Tsz-kit, Jimmy	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Mr SHEK William	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Mr TING Tsz-yuen	"	3:00 pm	5:42 pm
Mr TSANG Kit	"	3:21 pm	4:42 pm
Ms TSANG So-lai	"	2:59 pm	5:42 pm
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	"	2:30 pm	5:20 pm
Mr WONG Ho-fung	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Ms WONG Man-huen	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun	"	2:30 pm	3:40 pm
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael	"	2:30 pm	5:42 pm
Ms WONG Hei-lam, Helen (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council) 2 / Sha Tin District Office		

Present

Ms TAM Yuen-fun, Betty	Senior Manager (New Territories East) Promotion, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms SAM Fung-mei, Esther	Manager (New Territories East) Marketing and District Activities, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms LEE Mei-yee	Senior Librarian (Sha Tin), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms YAU Ming-wai, Nellie	School Development Officer (Sha Tin) 11, Education Bureau
Ms HA Lok-yan	Senior Integrity Education Officer, Independent Commission Against Corruption
Mr YUEN Chun-kit, Derek	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Sha Tin District Office
Mr HO Kin-nam, David	Executive Officer I (District council)1, Sha Tin District Office
Ms CHENG Siu-ling, Katy	Chief Liaison Officer, Sha Tin District Office
Ms LEUNG Wai-shan, Cecilia	Senior Liaison Officer (West), Sha Tin District Office

Title**In Attendance**

Ms WONG Sau-kuen, Joe	District Leisure Manager (Sha Tin), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms CHAN Siu-kin, Ester	Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Sha Tin, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr HEUNG Kai-chung, Henry	Deputy District Leisure Manager (Sha Tin)1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms YEW Suet-yi, Mary	Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Sha Tin)3, Social Welfare Department
Ms TSANG Wai	Engineer/ Ma On Shan, Drainage Services Department
Ms HO Ka-wai, Rosseter	Senior Estate Surveyor/South East (Acting), District Lands Office, Sha Tin

Title**Absent**

Ms NG Ting-lam	DC Member	(Application for leave of absence received)
Mr CHAN Wan-tung	”	(No application for leave of absence received)
Mr HUI Yui-yu	”	”
Mr LAI Tsz-yan	”	”
Mr YIP Wing	”	”

Title**Action**

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives of government departments and organisations to the meeting. He informed Members that there were media taking photos, recording videos and voices in the public gallery.

2. The Chairman welcomed Mr Henry HEUNG, Deputy District Leisure Manager (Sha Tin)1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), to the meeting for the first time, in succession of Ms Ester CHAN, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Sha Tin, LCSD who was going to leave her post. He thanked Ms Ester CHAN for her dedication and efforts to Sha Tin District.

Application for Leave of Absence

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

Ms NG Ting-lam	Official commitment
----------------	---------------------

4. Members unanimously approved the application for leave of absence submitted by the member above.

5. The Chairman said that he had received a proposal from Mr SHEK William prior to the meeting to add an agenda item to discuss the suggestion on procedures for funding applications from local organisations. He opined that such agenda item could be discussed at the meeting of the Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee (CSCDC) while the actual procedures and rules could be discussed at the meeting of Finance and General Affairs Committee (FGAC). He asked Members whether they agreed to include procedures for funding applications from local organisations under the discussion item of funding application.

6. Members unanimously endorsed the above arrangement.

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meetings

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 16 June 2020
(CSCDC Minutes 4/2020)

7. Members unanimously endorsed the above minutes of the meeting.

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 2 July 2020
(CSCDC Minutes 5/2020)

8. Members unanimously endorsed the above minutes of the meeting.

Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 3 September 2020
(CSCDC Minutes 6/2020)

9. Members unanimously endorsed the above minutes of the meeting.

Matters Arising

Responses of Government Departments to Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting
(Paper No. CSCD 54/2020)

10. Mr Felix CHOW said that a representative of the Government Property Agency (GPA) had attended a meeting earlier and responded to issues in relation to the development of the Fo Tan Complex at Shan Mei Street. According to the written response of the GPA, it would consult the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) on combination of facilities in the second half of 2020. He said that this was the last CSCDC meeting of 2020. He was disappointed that GPA had not yet presented a preliminary version of the combination of the development. He said that tenants of Chun Yeung Estate were gradually moving in but the community facilities were not yet confirmed. He asked the Secretariat to relay this view and asked the GPA when it would consult the STDC on the preliminary version of the combination of facilities and provide the relevant development timetable.

11. The Chairman understood Members' concern on the development and a follow-up with GPA had been made prior to the meeting. He asked the Secretary to make a response.

12. Ms Helen WONG, Executive Officer (District Council) 2/ Sha Tin District Office (DO) said that the Secretariat had sent an enquire to the GPA prior to the meeting, which replied that in view

of technological and planning problems in consolidating the suggestions of combinations of facilities, the GPA was proactively studying solutions with relevant bureaux and departments and would consult the STDC, local parties and related stakeholders on the preliminary version of the combination of facilities as soon as possible.

13. The views of Mr MAK Tsz-kin were summarised below:

- (a) he said that DC Members of Fo Tan constituencies were disappointed that there was still no concrete plan for Fo Tan Complex at Shan Mei Street. He said that Tai Wai Complex had been in the exploration stage for years and worried that the same would happen to Fo Tan Complex. He hoped that GPA could provide a concrete timetable;
- (b) he said that community facilities were severely lacking as tenants of Chun Yeung Estate and Yuk Wo Court gradually moved in. Moreover, ancillary transport facilities near Fo Tan Complex needed improvement. He worried that the transport in the periphery of Fo Tan would be affected upon completion of the building, so he hoped that relevant departments like the GPA and the Transport Department (TD) could have frequent communications to improve all measures; and
- (c) he asked how many cases had been received by the Social Welfare Department (SWD) and other non-government organisations (NGOs) during the period when tenants of Chun Yeung Estate collected their keys. Moreover, he said that some NGOs providing services did not have a fixed office in Chun Yeung Estate and asked whether the SWD had discussed with these NGOs to see how tenants in need could directly seek help from these NGOs.

14. Mr LUI Kai-wing said that he once met with representatives of the GPA with other DC Members earlier and expressed in detail residents' views on their needs for community facilities. At that time, the GPA guaranteed that preliminary information would be submitted in late 2020 to the STDC for discussion and he expressed concerns about the GPA's response that more time was still needed to study the development. He hoped that the Chairman or the Secretariat could ask the GPA whether preliminary information on Fo Tan Complex could be submitted to the STDC for discussion early next year.

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

- (a) he hoped to know more about the planning of Fo Tan Complex and the future arrangements for Fo Tan Cooked Food Markets (East & West) as soon as possible. He said that Fo Tan had been developed into an area with public rental housing, home ownership scheme estates and private housing estates from a pure industrial area. While the local population increased, there were insufficient community facilities in the district;
- (b) as far as he knew, the TD intended to widen the junction of Sui Wo Road near the cooked food market. However, the works were constrained by the location of the public toilet of Fo Tan Cooked Food Market (West) and could not be commenced currently. Therefore, he would like to know whether the above location could be made vacant for road widening after redevelopment of the complex, so as to cope with the needs of Fo Tan District; and

- (c) he said that joint-user complex was currently the broad direction of the Government and opined that the development was not be complicated. He pointed out that joint-user complex was precisely the former municipal building, and he did not understand why the development would now face difficulties. He said that the members needed to know the progress of the development and the solutions of the departments, and that the Departments should attend the meeting to respond to the members' enquiries properly.

16. The Chairman said that the GPA had been asked repeatedly for the progress of the development prior to the meeting. He noted the members' views and would continue to follow up.

17. Ms Mary YEOW, Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Sha Tin)³, SWD said that two NGOs were currently launching projects funded by the Community Investment and Inclusion Fund in Chun Yeung Estate to help tenants adapt to the new community. The SWD did not maintain any figures for assistance sought by tenants of Chun Yeung Estate. She said that workers of the two NGOs would proactively contact tenants, distribute a community resources kit and refer them to services they needed when they were completing the intake formalities.

Discussion Items

Nomination of Members as "Football Club Members" of the Sha Tin Sports Association (Paper No. CSCD 55/2020)

18. The Chairman said that the Sha Tin Sports Association had written to DC Chairman for nomination of its Members to act as "Football Club Members" of the Sha Tin Sports Association and to assist in the planning and promotion of football in the district. As at the nomination deadline, the Secretariat had received a total of four nominations. He asked the members to consider the nominations and formulate a priority list of "Football Club Members" for the consideration of the Sha Tin Sports Association. He said that he had proactively contacted the Association to ask for an increase in the number of members to four when he knew that there were four nominations. He asked the Secretary to response to the reply of the Sha Tin Sports Association.

19. Ms Helen WONG said that the Sha Tin Sports Association preliminarily agreed to accept four nominations in view of the members' active participation.

20. The Chairman suggested endorsing two nominees to become Football Club Members before further discussion with the Sha Tin Sports Association on accepting the remaining two nominees.

21. Members did not object to the above suggestion.

22. The Chairman said that he had liaised with the nominees prior to the meeting and Mr SHEK William and Mr WONG Ho-fung agreed to be accorded with a later priority, so that Mr Billy CHAN and Mr HUI Lap-san could first become Members. The Chairman said that if no member objected, the priority would be as follows:

1. Mr HUI Lap-san
2. Mr Billy CHAN
3. Mr WONG Ho-fung
4. Mr SHEK William

23. Members unanimously endorsed the above nominations and priority.

Fund Application

Funding Application from Local Organisation

(Paper No. CSCD 56/2020)

24. The Chairman asked the members to consider an alternate funding application “Castello Xmas Carnival” submitted by the Owners’ Corporation of Castello. He said that the funding application had been endorsed by the Working Group on Screening of Funding Application (Ad Hoc) and the Working Group had also endorsed this alternate funding application. The Chairman asked members of the Owners’ Corporation of Castello to declare interests and noted that no present member declared to be its member.

25. Members unanimously endorsed the above funding application.

Procedures for Funding Application from Local Organisation

26. The Chairman said that he had received earlier Mr SHEK William’s comments on activities organised by local organisations with granted funding, which could be briefly discussed by the CSCDC. He said that part of the proposal on funding procedures and guidelines could be discussed in detail by the FGAC.

27. Mr SHEK William said that an activity funded by the STDC under Expenditure Head 10 was originally scheduled to be held in a hall in Lung Hang Estate Community Centre and was later changed to Shek Lei Community Hall in Kwai Tsing District. He opined that the guidelines stated in Sha Tin District Council Funding Application Procedures and Rules (Rules of Funds) were not clear enough and suggested that the members could consider revising the relevant rules. For example, when a local organisation stated the event venue as a community hall in Sha Tin District when submitting the funding application, in case of a change in venue, the new one also needed to be a community hall in Sha Tin District.

28. The Chairman agreed that there was room for improvement in Rules of Funds and said that he had contacted the Chairman of FGAC for discussion at future meetings of the FGAC or relevant Working Group.

Questions

Question to be Raised by Mr WAI Hing-cheung on Residents of the Sha Tin District Exercising at Home during the Epidemic and the Related Noise Nuisance

(Paper No. CSCD 57/2020)

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

- (a) he said that he had received cases seeking for help about noise nuisance under the epidemic recently. He would like to know whether other departments or persons had appealed for exercising at home, apart from the LCSD;
- (b) he was disappointed that the police did not send a representative to the meeting and opined that its reply was too simple. He hoped that the department could provide

concrete number of cases of individual months during the epidemic and opined that a compilation with more detailed categorisation by the department could help the Government tackle community problems;

- (c) he opined that the SWD's reply was rather short which could not show whether the cases seeking for help were related to noise problems; and
- (d) he suggested that the relevant government departments should inform the suitable types of exercising when asking the public to exercise at home, so as to avoid causing nuisance to neighbours.

30. Mr Felix CHOW enquired whether there were relevant guidelines or standards specifying the appropriate types of sports when the government departments encouraged the public to exercise at home. He opined that the Government should consider comprehensively when making publicity. Separately, he had received complaints about excessive noise of renovation or music in the neighbourhood which disturbed those who worked at home. He hoped that the Government could note those views.

(The following part of the meeting was chaired by Mr CHENG Chung-hang.)

31. Mr CHAN Nok-hang opined that it was hard to totally avoid noises when exercising at home. He hoped that the problem could be alleviated through communication as much as possible. He said that DC Members might need to seek help from the police when they received a complaint on noise nuisance. Therefore, he hoped to know how the police would deal with such cases.

32. Mr CHENG Chung-hang was disappointed that the police did not send a representative to the meeting and hoped that the police could provide supplementary information on the enquiries. He opined that there were different reasons for noise nuisance and the current statistics provided by the police was hard to be used for analysis. He hoped that the department would seriously answer the enquiries.

33. Ms Joe WONG, District Leisure Manager (Sha Tin), LCSD said that LCSD set up an one-stop online resources centre in April this year during the epidemic to encourage the public to view sports event and cultural activities that suit all ages at home online. In terms of sports, the department mainly shared videos on some simple and easy to learn stretching exercises suitable to be performed at home.

34. Mr CHENG Chung-hang said that some people might buy rather heavy sports equipment such as dumbbells for home workout. He opined that LCSD could enhance publicity to prevent members of the public from causing noises when doing home workout.

35. Ms Mary YEW said that the department had handled five cases of emotional distress due to noises caused by neighbours but none of them was related to home workout.

36. Ms Katy CHENG, Chief Liaison Officer, STDO said that the department did not have any information on whether famous persons or organisations making public appeals for exercising at home.

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

- (a) he enquired whether LCSD and other departments made public appeals for exercising at home via different media channels;
- (b) he enquired whether LCSD considered that nuisances would be caused to other members of the public when encouraging the public to exercise at home;
- (c) he enquired whether the Government would remind the public not to affect others if it encouraged the public to exercise at home due to the epidemic; and
- (d) he said that more concrete information provided by departments could help in analysis.

38. Ms Joe WONG said that some of the LCSD facilities might need to be closed during the epidemic, so the department uploaded some online sports videos for public reference to encourage the public to do some simple activities. Regarding whether nuisances would be caused, it highly depended on the types of sports or facilities chosen by individual persons.

39. Mr CHENG Chung-hang suggested that LCSD could propose some sports which were appropriate to be done at home when making such publicity, so as to avoid causing nuisances to neighbours.

40. Ms Katy CHENG said that STDO would remind the public of the possible noise problem when doing sports at home when carrying out publicity work in the future.

41. Mr WAI Hing-cheung hoped that STDO could relay the views to the Government and said that he was disappointed with the LCSD's response. He enquired whether the department would remind the public to avoid causing nuisances to others when encouraging the public to exercise at home.

42. Ms Joe WONG thanked and noted the members' views which would be relayed to the relevant section for reference and review.

Question to be Raised by Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael on Leasing out Government Sites as Football Training Centres and the Appointment of District Football Teams
(Paper No. CSCD 58/2020)

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

- (a) he said that STDO made a mistake in its consultation work by failing to timely inform DC Members;
- (b) he was sorry for the workload caused by his worry of failing to include his questions in the agenda or by failing to timely issue a paper to the Secretariat for latest progress;
- (c) he enquired whether Easyknit Charitable Foundation (Easyknit) had obtained written support for the project from the National Sports Associations. Based on his understanding, the land in question was not designated for sports use and he enquired how to determine whether a piece of land was for sports use;
- (d) he said that the District Facilities Management and Security Affairs Committee was responsible for managing local facilities and provide comments for government

departments' consideration. He enquired whether the STDC could discuss and provide comments regarding the items in the future;

- (e) he enquired about the objective criteria of the STDO in selecting targets and scope of consultation; and
- (f) he said that facilities could not be built within a designated area for drainage system. He enquired whether the Drainage Services Department (DSD) would be consulted when an organisation expressed its intend to develop the lot into a football training ground and whether professional advice would be sought on whether the lot was suitable to be developed into a football training ground.

(The following part of the meeting would be chaired by Mr Wilson LI.)

44. The Chairman opined that there was a need to fully understand the details of the project and the issue had never been discussed at a STDC Meeting. Therefore, he approved to accept questions from more than three Members.

45. Mr Billy CHAN enquired about the role of the STDO in the application for developing a football training ground in the lot, the scale of the football ground could be built on the lot and the relevant restrictions. He agreed to make use of the lot to build a football ground to improve the local football standard, but the current paper lacked information. Moreover, he enquired whether the Sha Tin Sports Association had sought help from the STDO in identifying a local football training ground in the district.

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

- (a) he appreciated that the Government was willing to allocate a lot for development of a football training centre but did not understand the reason for accepting Easyknit's application. He said that online public information did not enable an in-depth understanding of the team, and the information about the team was scarce. Not being clear about the plans and goals regarding the team for Easyknit to build a training centre, he found it hard to determine whether the lot should be granted to the football team;
- (b) he enquired why no football team of Sha Tin District had the priority to use the land or had been asked first whether they had the intention to make an application. He enquired about the reasons for accepting Easyknit's application; and
- (c) he would like to know the scale of the training ground, such as that of the football ground, whether public facilities would be available and whether it would be open for public use. He opined that the applicant organisation should submit a detailed development plan before granting the lot.

47. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) he opined that the consultation paper did not provide concrete content and failed to alleviate public concern. He would like to know the administrative procedures for handling the application and its current stage;

- (b) he enquired whether the Government had consolidated views of different departments, such as the TD's suggestion of parking issues of the training ground and the DSD's input on the designated area for drainage system;
- (c) he said that Easyknit Charitable Foundation was not a member of The Hong Kong Football Association (HKFA) and Easyknit registered to be an HKFA member in the name of Wing Yee Football Team. He enquired whether the Government treated this application as a project supported by the National Sports Associations; and
- (d) he would like know about the condition and procedure for obtaining policy support from the Government.

48. The views of Mr HUI Lap-san were summarised below:

- (a) he objected to the location of the football training ground as the LCSD just completed the improvement works to the lot in September 2020. He considered it unreasonable to allocate the lot for a football training ground at that moment;
- (b) he said that similar training grounds were mainly set up in industrial areas. The proposed lot was too close to residential areas. Problems such as traffic congestion, light pollution and noise pollution could be foreseen when such lot was developed into a football training ground;
- (c) he said that Jockey Club Kitchee Centre (Kitchee Centre) would open for use by Sha Tin residents in certain time slots, but it was not known whether similar arrangements were available in the Easyknit project; and
- (d) the STDO replied that it had consulted stakeholders such as DC Members of Chung On and Kam To constituencies. He said that as a DC Member of Kam To, he had learnt about the matter only upon the notice of the Owners' Corporation of Vista Paradiso and a proactive enquiry sent to the STDO. In this regard, staff of the STDO said that the consultation paper might be lost in postage which was re-sent via email and requested him to reply within four days. He hoped that the STDO could provide an explanation.

49. Mr Felix CHOW was concerned whether the lot was suitable for the said purpose. The lot was situated between two residential courts, and was rather narrow and long. The improvement works was also recently completed there. However, the relevant departments allowed organisations applications for using the lot. He hoped that the STDO could explain why local consultation on development of the football training ground was conducted without any policy support. He also enquired about the criteria for accepting applications, whether written support by the National Sports Associations alone sufficed to make an application, and whether the applicant organisations were not limited to football teams in Sha Tin District. He enquired District Lands Office, Sha Tin (DLO/ST) whether the lot was suitable for construction of the facilities.

50. Mr Ricardo LIAO said that considerable number of teams under Hong Kong Premier League still did not have a fixed training ground. In view of the precious land resources, he opined whether the lot should be reserved for use by local elite athletes. He opined that building a local football training ground was an important local affair which should be discussed by the STDC and Members' views should be sought. He said that the STDO could make presentation to DC Members after the

applicant responded to objections. He enquired whether Easyknit would include technology like sports medicine into its programme to motivate sports development and research and development. He opined that there was room for improvement in the consultation of the STDC. He hoped that future important issues or complex works could be discussed by the STDC, so that Members could raise views for consideration of the applicant and government departments.

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

- (a) he enquired whether such programme involved a change in planning;
- (b) he pointed out that the progress of Tai Wai Complex was discussed in the fifth meeting of Development and Housing Committee (DHC) this year. A representative of the STDO said that investigation could not be commenced due to the epidemic. He asked why the STDO could still conduct consultation on development of the football training ground during the epidemic;
- (c) he enquired about the term of the short-term lease. He said that construction of the football training ground took time and asked whether it needed to be removed upon expiry of the lease; and
- (d) he enquired why other persons could not be notified when the consultation paper had already been issued.

52. Mr George WONG asked why the procedures for local consultation was different from the previous practice and asked about the criteria for submitting the item for the STDC discussion by the STDO. He enquired under the existing procedures of local consultation, whether the STDC Members would be the last to be consulted.

53. The Chairman said that the STDC Members should be notified of and discussed matters on overall planning of Sha Tin District at STDC meetings. He asked the department to respond on the member's question on standards in handling applications and hoped that Hong Kong football could be well developed with considerable competitiveness.

54. Ms Joe WONG said that the LCSD carried out greening works in the vacant government land between Vista Paradiso and Kam Fung Court in Ma On Shan in early 2019, the cost of which had been submitted to relevant departments for reference. Currently, the LCSD did not own the land rights of the lot. The LCSD was mainly responsible for gardening and plant maintenance and timely arranging for anti-mosquito and anti-rodent measures.

55. Ms Rosseter HO, Senior Estate Surveyor / South East (Acting), DLO/ST gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that the DLO/ST received Easyknit's application in July 2019, and the department noticed that the site had been handed over to the LCSD for greening works in February 2019. Currently, the LCSD was responsible for repairs of the site;
- (b) the department had also noticed the different local views on the land use and so it had sought views of relevant departments on the application, including the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB), the STDO, the Planning Department and the LCSD. The department understood the need for local consultation after consolidating views of various

departments. Therefore, the department entrusted the STDO to conduct local consultation. When the STDO conducted local consultation in August this year, DLO/ST had already relayed the views of local parties to the applicant, currently pending its response;

- (c) the department would review the content for revision after receiving the applicant's response. If the department considered the application valid, it would consult relevant departments according to existing procedures. Moreover, in case of revision of the content of the application, the department might entrust the STDO again for local consultation;
- (d) she said that the application was still at the stage of preliminary consultation. As regards land use restriction of the land, the department would collect views at the stage of consulting government departments. Conditions would be added in the application to reflect the requirements of government departments if necessary;
- (e) she said that the term of a short-term lease was usually fixed at three years and not more than seven years on a case-by-case basis; and
- (f) she said that taking the example of Kitchee Centre, the lease conditions stipulated that Kitchee Centre shall start operating one year after the lot was allocated. She said that it was too early to determine whether such condition was applicable to Easyknit's application. Currently, the department had to wait for information provided by the applicant and relay the relevant views to bureaux and departments for further review.

56. The Chairman pointed out that the lot was for leisure use and asked DLO/ST's view on the criteria of land use change and its role in approving short-term lease.

57. Ms Rosseter HO responded that DLO/ST was also responsible for managing unleased government lands. She said that direct grant of short-term lease must obtain support of bureaux, including whether to support the organisation to use the land and the rent, etc. After receiving an application for short-term lease of unleased government land, the department would follow existing procedures to consult departments, solicit local views through the STDO (if applicable) and submit the application for discussion in a District Lands Conference. Reasons for objections by local stakeholders would be considered in the conference. The District Lands Conference would consider whether to grant the land only after comprehensive consideration.

58. Ms Katy CHENG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she pointed out that when an applicant applied to the DLO/ST to use a vacant government land under a short-term lease, the STDO merely conducted a local consultation at the request of the DLO/ST;
- (b) she said that the written reply of HAB stated that it had not yet provided policy support;
- (c) she said that this consultation was no different from the previous ones. After the STDO was entrusted by the DLO/ST, the leading department would provide the necessary content of the consultation, and the STDO would conduct local consultation based on the affected area, available resources and previous experience in handling similar matters. Generally speaking, local DC Members, representatives of affected residents

and organisations would be consulted in local consultation. Regarding the possible postal loss of the consultation paper earlier, she took the chance to apologise to Mr HUI Lap-san;

- (d) she pointed out that the STDC had discussed Kitchee Centre's application for renting the land for a football training ground. At that time, it was the LCSD who proposed submission for the STDC discussion, but not the STDO. As regards whether the STDC would be consulted on this application, this would be decided by the leading department; and
- (e) she said that research on Tai Wai Complex was affected by the epidemic as mentioned in the DHC meeting. The reason was that the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) was conducting traffic assessment with the consultancy firm. A member stated in the meeting that such data might not be accurate as more people would stay at home during the epidemic. The STDO relayed the message to the ArchSD and the consultancy firm and they might conduct further research.

59. Ms TSANG Wai, Engineer / Ma On Shan, DSD gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that at the stage of departmental consultation, the DSD proposed zoning the existing box culvert of 9.7 metres and areas of 3 metres at both sides of the culvert as designated drainage system area. No foundation works or construction of any structures was allowed inside as the area was reserved for emergency maintenance use;
- (b) she pointed out that if the land was developed into a football training ground, a football court could be set up within the area but no large-scale or overloaded building was allowed. For some removable structures such as changing room, the design needed to be submitted to the DSD for approval; and
- (c) in response to the question of Mr Billy CHAN, she said that the land had a rather high terrain with low flooding risk.

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

- (a) he opined that if the bureau first consulted the department and informed the applicant that the proposal was technically infeasible or there were certain land restrictions, he believed that the applicant might retrieve its application. He considered conducting a local consultation first a waste of time;
- (b) he asked whether there were sewage facilities near the site in question. He believed that other sewage disposal problems would arise in the future if there was no sewer at the site; and
- (c) he opined that the STDO could have done better in conducting the local consultation and he was dissatisfied about the postal loss of the consultation paper.

61. Mr CHAN Nok-hang was disappointed that departments could not send representatives to the meeting to answer the members' questions and he was disappointed by their responses. He opined that stakeholders should be invited to the meeting. For example, representative of Easyknit should attend the meeting to elaborate the reasons for applying for using the land. He was dissatisfied

that government departments did not tie in with the STDC work.

62. Mr Felix CHOW opined that there were shortcomings in the work and communication of the STDO in this consultation. He said that the department should contact the receiver to confirm receipt after sending out the consultation paper by mail.

63. Mr Billy CHAN was disappointed with the response of the STDO and opined that the STDO should coordinate departments but not shirk its responsibilities. He worried that this might deter potential applicants in future. He enquired whether HAB representative was invited to the meeting and why the bureau did not attend the meeting. He enquired whether the STDO had asked Sha Tin Sports Association if it intended to develop the football training ground and why it accepted Easyknit's application.

64. Mr Ricardo LIAO was dissatisfied that the STDO shirked its responsibilities and opined that the department did not fulfill its communication and consultation duties. He said that the department should actively remind departments of the possibility to submit the project for the STDC discussion as consultation at a local level was very important.

65. Mr CHAN Pui-ming asked whether Easyknit Charitable Foundation was eligible as it was not an HKFA member, although it might be the mother company of Wing Yee Football Team. He said that there were 4 criteria for land applications for sports purpose, based on which the bureau would consider whether to provide policy support. He enquired about the criteria for DC Members to obtain policy support in applying for a district office.

66. The Chairman opined that the consultation was rather partial and not comprehensive. He enquired about the leading department and the reason for choosing this consultation mode. He opined that it was more preferable to consult the STDC on this application.

67. The responses of Ms Rosseter HO were consolidated below:

- (a) she said that DLO/ST was the leading department in processing this application;
- (b) she said that the lot currently involved LCSD facilities, so preliminary assessment and solicitation of local views had been carried out with relevant departments. She said that the STDO was entrusted with the consultation as some departments proposed in their responses to conduct local consultation; and
- (c) she pointed out that departments knew that the LCSD had submitted the application of Kitchee Centre for renting the land for football training ground for the STDC discussion. Regarding this application, the department would relay the views together with the applicant's response to relevant bureaux and departments for further consideration, before deciding whether to consult the STDC.

68. The Chairman said that HAB had been invited to send a representative prior to the meeting. He invited the Secretary to elaborate.

69. Ms Helen WONG said that the Secretariat had invited the relevant departments to the meeting based on existing procedures. HAB replied earlier that no representative could be arranged due to work commitment.

70. Ms Katy CHENG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that departments had their own responsibilities and roles. She clarified that the department had fulfilled its organisation and coordination duties. Regarding this application, the department had already conducted consultation and relayed the views to the leading department based on existing procedures, after DLO/ST entrusted the office to conduct local consultation;
- (b) she said that contacting Sha Tin Sports Association to see if it intended to develop a football training ground was not within the terms of reference at a district level of the department; and
- (c) she said that HAB made itself clear that it welcomed HKFA and other interested organisations to develop a football training ground. Any eligible party could make an application, so the bureau did not have a fixed stance on the applicants.

71. The Chairman hoped that consultation could be more comprehensive and transparent. He consolidated Members' views that future regional or large-scale projects could be discussed in detail with the STDC. He understood that HAB considered all applications submitted by eligible parties and opined that all applications should be processed in a fair, just and open manner.

72. Ms Joe WONG said that in line with 2017 Policy Address, the Government allocated funds for the LCSD to carry out greening, with a view to optimising the use of unallocated vacant government land. She said that the land after greening was still unallocated and the LCSD would continue to follow up on greening and plants maintenance of the land.

73. Mr CHAN Nok-hang opined that the department failed to explain why the application of Easyknit was accepted.

74. Mr Ricardo LIAO opined that government departments could approach the Members proactively regarding their concerned issues. He proposed that apart from entrusting the STDO with a local consultation, the leading department could submit the issue to the STDC for discussion to learn about the views of the Members and the community.

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

- (a) he enquired whether land rights of the lot could be transferred to the LCSD for its management through an implementation of minor works. He asked whether the problem of land rights was related to the designated area of drainage system; and
- (b) he enquired about views of the DSD on building a football court on the land, e.g. whether drainage system would suffer from irreversible impacts and whether the department had submitted a traffic and noise assessment to the DLO/ST for consideration.

76. Ms TSANG Wai gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she said that the site was an unallocated government land. Even a drainage system existed within the land area, the DSD would adopt an open-minded attitude towards its land use and would only define a specific area for drainage system for general

maintenance purpose. If the culvert required emergency repair after land development, digging would be avoided and entrance would be from outside the site as far as practicable; and

- (b) she said that there was also sewage system within the area of Kitchee Centre. Location of the sewage system required consideration when designing the football court and attention should be made to avoid construction of structures within the designated area of sewage system. Design of facilities such as small structures and changing rooms needed to be submitted to the DSD for approval.

77. Ms Rosseter HO said that the applicant did not attach reports of traffic and environmental impact assessment when submitting the application. The department did not have any comment on the members' suggestion of handing over the site for the management to the LCSD after implementation of minor works and greening works. If such application was received, it would be processed according to existing procedures.

78. The Chairman suggested that DLO/ST pay special attention to the traffic and environmental impacts on nearby residents caused by the application.

Information Item

Reports of Working Groups

(Paper No. CSCD 59/2020)

79. Members noted the above paper.

Information Paper

Report and Plan by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department on Organisation of Cultural Activities and Utilisation of Facilities in Sha Tin District (3rd Quarter of 2020 to 1st Quarter of 2021)
(Paper No. CSCD 60/2020)

80. Members noted the above paper.

Report and Plan by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department on Organisation of Recreation and Sports Activities and Management of Facilities in Sha Tin District (3rd and 4th Quarters of 2020)
(Paper No. CSCD 61/2020)

81. Mr Michael YUNG quoted from CSCDC information paper of 2007 that the department had consider setting up a pet garden along Ma On Shan Promenade but the plan was objected by local parties and finally a temporary pet garden was set up at Sai Sha Road instead. He said that residents worried that those who were afraid of dogs would have unpleasant experience if a pet garden was set up in the Promenade. He opined that it was currently hard for the LCSD to arrange staff for long-term stationing within the area of Ma On Shan Promenade Inclusive Park for Pets in Ma On Shan Promenade and to restrict dog owners from walking their dogs outside the inclusive area. Also, no driver-friendly arrangement was available nearby. He did not understand why the department raised this suggestion again after the STDC came up with the objection conclusion.

82. Mr CHAN Pui-ming said that residents' views on this issue had been sought and it was found that the views were at two extremes. He opined that current facilities and design of Ma On Shan Promenade were not for pets and Ma On Shan Sai Sha Road Pet Garden was nearby. Therefore, it was rather a rush to choose Ma On Shan Promenade as the location of the Inclusive Park for Pets. He suggested launching a trial in Pak Shek Kok - Sha Tin Section before reviewing whether Ma On Shan Promenade was a suitable location for an Inclusive Park for Pets, as there were far more people in Ma On Shan Promenade than Pak Shek Kok - Sha Tin Section. The need to add facilities such as fences and dog latrines should also be considered. Many STDC papers before 2011 had not yet been digitalised and could only be read in the STDC Library. He would raise questions on digitalisation of DC papers in FGAC later. He hoped that the department would not block such question by saying that it was not related to the STDC, as it was necessary to understand the history in past papers when discussing policies. He would request the Audit Commission to check whether the progress of digitalisation of the STDC papers was unsatisfactory.

83. Mr CHENG Chung-hang opined that allowing dogs to move without a leash was a feature of a pet park. Fences were also set up around the park to ensure pet safety. He believed that if Ma On Shan Promenade was decided to be the location of the Inclusive Park for Pets, pet owners would leash their pets with belts or ropes, as there would be considerable pedestrian flow with many exits. The park was also near roadside. He also said that the pedestrian path beside the Promenade was narrow and inconsistent. A cycling path was also found beside. Therefore, allowing pets to access the Promenade would bring convenience to pet owners. He opined that the department could request pet owners to leash their pets with belts or ropes within the Promenade area.

84. Mr Felix CHOW considered that inclusive park was a trend of society. If pet owners followed the rules by leashing their pets with belts or ropes within the Promenade area, he did not think that the plan of setting up an Inclusive Park for Pets in Ma On Shan Promenade would face much opposition. He said that new buildings nearby allowed households to keep pets. If pets were allowed to enter the Promenade area or have a walk, this could meet the needs of pet owners. He said that the trial result of Shing Mun River Promenade Garden No. 3 was positive with considerable referential value.

85. The Chairman said that the LCSD had been identifying a suitable place for pet garden for years and hoped that the department could explain the reason for setting up an Inclusive Park for Pets in Ma On Shan Promenade. He said that following completion of new buildings which allowed pet keeping, the number of people and pets continued to increase. He opined that more attention should be paid to ancillary facilities for pet.

86. Mr CHENG Chung-hang said that as some of the places managed by the LCSD forbade pet entry, pet owners needed to detour to get to their destination. He opined that the LCSD needed to look into that problem.

87. Ms Joe WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) a number of residents proposed opening some parks for pets in recent years so that they could enjoy park facilities in an inclusive environment. In response to public needs, the LCSD selected suitable locations for launching the trial scheme of Inclusive Park for Pets in six districts in January 2019, which included Shing Mun River Promenade Garden No. 3 (Area B) in Sha Tin District;

- (b) the LCSD conducted a survey on the trial scheme of Inclusive Park for Pets in late 2019. Upon review, it was shown that the plan was feasible with widespread public support. Therefore, the department further chose more suitable locations to be Inclusive Parks for Pets;
- (c) regarding arranging Pak Shek Kok - Sha Tin Section, Ma On Shan Promenade or other venues as Inclusive Parks for Pets, she said that the department had an open-minded and active attitude. She stressed that the department would ensure improvement of ancillary facilities to tie in with the implementation of the plan; and
- (d) the LCSD noted the Members' views and would study further.

(Post-meeting note: Due to the latest development of COVID-19, the LCSD was now reviewing the timetable for setting up more Inclusive Parks for Pets. It would closely monitor the situation and timely update the specific arrangements for the scheme of Inclusive Park for Pets.)

(The following part of the meeting would be chaired by Mr CHENG Chung-hang.)

88. Mr Michael YUNG opposed allowing dogs to enter Ma On Shan Promenade as residents would be disturbed by dog walkers. He opined that Ma On Shan Promenade was not a suitable location for Inclusive Park for Pets as it was close to residential area and residents might hate noise of dogs or odours of faeces and urine of dogs. This might cause conflict between park users and pet owners.

89. Mr CHAN Pui-ming had reservation about allowing dog walking in Ma On Shan Promenade. He understood that most pet owners were self-disciplined and leashed their pets with belts or ropes. However, breaking free of the leash were not uncommon and the Promenade was close to roads which was worrying. He understood that there were not many facilities for pets in Sha Tin District but Ma On Shan Sai Sha Road Pet Garden and Shing Mun River Promenade Garden No. 3 were relatively distant from residential area which were more suitable than Ma On Shan Promenade. He would raise a provisional motion, hoping that the LCSD could look into the possibility of setting up more pet parks in Ma On Shan.

90. Mr CHENG Chung-hang said that pets were different in personalities and they might not be able to get along. Therefore, most of the pet owners would not choose to go to a pet park. He opined that the public needed a place to walk their dogs and hoped that Ma On Shan Promenade could be open to pets so that owners could bring their pets inside and access more places via different exits. He agreed that the LCSD could look into how to balance public concern in this regard.

91. Mr CHENG Chung-hang said that he received the provisional motion of Mr CHAN Pui-ming and agreed to address it. He asked whether Members agreed.

92. Members unanimously agreed to address the above provisional motion.

93. Mr CHAN Pui-ming proposed a provisional motion as follows:

“Background

The Leisure and Cultural Services Department proposes to set up Inclusive Park for Pets in

Ma On Shan Promenade and Pak Shek Kok - Sha Tin Section in Sha Tin District. Sha Tin District Council requested to relocate the original Area for Dogs when discussing the design of Ma On Shan Promenade in 2007. Some sections of Ma On Shan Promenade are rather narrow and very close to residential area. The original design is not for pets which fails to balance the needs of residents and pets.

Motion

The Culture, Sports and Community Development Committee of Sha Tin District Council requests the Leisure and Cultural Services Department to suspend its plan of setting up an Inclusive Park for Pets in Ma On Shan Promenade and review whether current facilities were suitable for an Inclusive Park for Pets. At the same time, residents reflect that there is insufficient space for pets in the district. The Committee urges the department to look into the possibility of setting up more pet parks after gaining widespread support from the residents.”

Mr Michael YUNG seconded the motion.

94. Members objected the provisional motion in paragraph 94 by 2 affirmative votes, 3 negative votes, 17 abstention votes.

Report and Plan on Public Libraries Promotion Activities Organised by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department in Sha Tin District (3rd and 4th Quarters of 2020)
(Paper No. CSCD 62/2020)

95. Members noted the above paper.

Progress Report of the Sha Tin Sports Association
(Paper No. CSCD 63/2020)

96. Members noted the above paper.

Date of Next Meeting

97. Mr CHENG Chung-hang announced the meeting adjourned at 5:42 pm. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 2:30 pm on 7 January 2021.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat
STDC13/15/25

December 2020