

Minutes of the 4th Meeting of
the Commerce, Industry and Housing Committee of
the Tuen Mun District Council

Date: 6 June 2016 (Monday)

Time: 9:31 a.m.

Venue: Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC) Conference Room

<u>Present</u>		<u>Time of Arrival</u>	<u>Time of Departure</u>
Ms CHING Chi-hung (Chairman)	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr CHAN Manwell, Leo (Vice-chairman)	TMDC Member	10:13 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr LEE Hung-sham, Lothar, MH	TMDC Vice-chairman	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr TO Sheck-yuen, MH	TMDC Member	9:35 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms KONG Fung-yi	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr NG Koon-hung	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms WONG Lai-sheung, Catherine	TMDC Member	9:51 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr AU Chi-yuen	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms HO Hang-mui	TMDC Member	9:39 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr LAM Chung-hoi	TMDC Member	9:32 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr TSUI Fan	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms LUNG Shui-hing	TMDC Member	9:31 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr CHAN Man-wah, MH	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr HO Kwan-yiu	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	10:12 a.m.
Ms CHU Shun-nga, Beatrice	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr TSANG Hin-hong	TMDC Member	10:04 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms SO Ka-man	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr MO Shing-fung	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr YEUNG Chi-hang	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr YAN Siu-nam	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr TAM Chun-yin	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms MA LO Kam-wah, Virginia	Co-opted Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr FUNG Pui-yin	Co-opted Member	9:48 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr NG Ka-ho, Andrew	Co-opted Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr NG Kwok-yan, Akina	Co-opted Member	10:00 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr CHAN Tsim-heng	Co-opted Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr TSOI Shing-hin	Co-opted Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting

Ms CHOI Nga-ling, Angela
(Secretary) Executive Officer (District Council) 1, Tuen Mun District Office,
Home Affairs Department

Absent with Apologies

Mr CHEUNG Hang-fai TMDC Member
Mr KAM Man-fung TMDC Member
Mr CHEUNG Wing-kai Co-opted Member

By Invitation

Mr Samuel CHOW Senior Car Park Manager, Link Asset Management Ltd
Mr CHIU Kwan-suen Senior Community Relationship Manager,
Link Asset Management Ltd
Mr William CHOI Community Relationship Manager, Link Asset Management Ltd

In Attendance

Ms KOO Kit-ye, Angie Senior Liaison Officer (1), Tuen Mun District Office,
Home Affairs Department
Miss Maggie LEE Liaison Officer Town Centre (2), Tuen Mun District Office,
Home Affairs Department
Mr TAI Yuk-sum, Sam Senior Building Surveyor/E5, Buildings Department
Mr CHOW Chiu-leung Station Commander, Castle Peak Bay Fire Station,
Fire Services Department
Ms CHENG Chui-king, Christine Housing Manager/Tuen Mun 4, Housing Department
Mr CHOW Siu-lun, Brian Community Relations Department, Regional Office (New
Territories North West), Independent Commission Against
Corruption
Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, Kelvin Labour Officer (Workplace Consultation Promotion),
Labour Department
Mr MOK Hing-cheung Administrative Assistant/Lands, District Lands Office, Tuen Mun,
Lands Department

I. Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed all present to the 4th meeting of the Commerce, Industry and Housing Committee (“CIHC”).

2. The Chairman reminded Members that any Member who was aware of a personal interest in a discussion item should declare the interest before the discussion. The Chairman would, in accordance with Order 39(12) of the Tuen Mun District Council Standing Orders, decide whether the Member who had declared an interest might speak or vote on the matter, might remain in the meeting as an observer, or should withdraw from the meeting. All cases of declaration of interests would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

II. Absence from Meeting

3. The Secretariat had received no applications from Members for leave of absence.

III. Confirmation of Minutes of the 3rd Meeting Held on 11 April 2016

4. The above minutes were unanimously confirmed by the CIHC.

IV. Matters Arising

(A) Matters Relating to Request for Removal of Restrictions on Entering Estate

(Paragraphs 17 to 44 of Minutes of Previous Meeting)

(Written Response of Housing Department)

5. The Chairman welcomed Mr Samuel CHOW, Senior Car Park Manager; Mr CHIU Kwan-suen, Senior Community Relationship Manager; and Mr William CHOI, Community Relationship Manager of Link Asset Management Ltd (“Link”), to the meeting. Besides, the Chairman indicated that at its previous meeting, the CIHC had decided to invite the Housing Department (“HD”) to take the lead in exploring ways with Link to address the comments of Members and make a report at the this meeting.

6. A Member said that at the previous meeting, he had asked whether the HD had sold roads in On Ting Estate to Link and the HD’s representative had replied in the positive then, which was different from what was mentioned in the written response provided by the HD. He would like the HD to clarify this. Moreover, he was concerned that while Siu On Court was managed neither by the HD nor by Link, residents’ access to the court was restricted by a gate bar.

7. Another Member noted that the poor management of roads in On Ting Estate,

which were owned by the HD, had led to severe traffic congestion. She noted that the HD claimed in its written response that large goods vehicles no longer entered the housing estate at mid-night and the HD had received no complaints about this. Yet she argued that HD's claim was not true, because some residents had complained that many large goods vehicles entered the estate every Friday, Saturday and Sunday. She further said the above roads were located at the core of Tuen Mun and had a bearing on the neighbourhood, so she requested the estate manager to pay attention to road management in On Ting Estate.

8. In response to the Member's enquiry, Ms Christine CHENG of the HD said she had explained in the minutes of the previous meeting that the HD had merely sold parking spaces on the roads, rather than the entire roads, to Link. Incomes from the hourly rental of parking spaces on the roads went to Link, whereas incomes from management (e.g. impounding of cars and issuance of penalty tickets) fell under incomes from "common parts".

[Post-meeting note: the HD indicated that "common parts" referred to parts for which the ownership was jointly owned by the HD and Link.]

9. Mr Samuel CHOW of Link responded that for the matter concerning restriction to the access of Siu On Court residents going home, the owners' corporation ("OC") suggested following the arrangements adopted by Yan Oi Tong Madam Lau Wong Fat Primary School, under which smart cards (or magnetic stripe tickets) were issued to the people concerned so that they could enter the related areas without being subject to the 30-minute limit. He said Link and the management company would make arrangements for passers-by according to the agreement and owners in Siu On Court might also discuss and make similar arrangements with the HD and the relevant management company.

10. A Member said the HD representative had amended the minutes of the previous meeting, so the records about the ownership of roads in On Ting Estate in Paragraph 23 of the minutes were different from what the HD representative had said at the meeting. The Member further noted that for the sentence in Paragraph 43 of the minutes, which read "she indicated that the estate's manager was currently lining up a meeting between representatives of Link and the OC of Siu On Court to discuss the issue", the meaning carried by the words "was currently" was added only after the meeting. Moreover, he hoped Link's representatives would seriously discuss the above matter with the OC of Siu On Court.

11. Another Member hoped the HD would ask the relevant parties to tackle the problems of congestion and noise on roads in On Ting Estate. Besides, she suggested the HD and Link enhance the quality of road management to maintain smooth flow of road traffic.

12. Ms Christine CHENG of the HD apologised for the confusion that the unclear expression in Paragraph 23 of the minutes caused to Members, and said she had rectified the minutes accordingly. For the sentence “she indicated that the estate’s manager was currently lining up a meeting between representatives of Link and the OC of Siu On Court to discuss the issue” in Paragraph 43, it meant the estate manager of On Ting Estate was arranging a meeting between the owners of Siu On Court and representatives of Link at that time, but the meeting was called off since Link’s representatives gave notification of absence shortly beforehand. On car park management, while restriction was imposed on vehicles of 5.5 tonnes, there was no restriction on the time for vehicles’ entry or exit. Despite this, the HD had discussed with Link prohibition against heavy vehicles’ entry to the estate for loading or unloading of goods after 11:00 p.m., in order to avoid nuisance to residents.

13. The Chairman said the comments contained in the minutes of the previous meeting and the wording of the HD representative’s responses would be recorded in the minutes of this meeting. She further said Link’s representative had indicated that they were willing to make an appointment with the HD representative after the meeting for thorough discussion on the matter. For higher efficiency, the Chairman suggested passing the matter to the Working Group on Monitoring of Link for follow-ups.

14. The Member who was also the Convenor of the Working Group on Monitoring of Link (“Working Group”) said the Working Group was handling this matter and had requested at its previous meeting that the HD should discuss with Link the matter about passage through the gate bar. She said that while the Working Group could further follow up on the matter, she hoped Link’s representatives could attend a meeting of the Working Group.

15. The Chairman enquired of Link’s representatives if they would attend a meeting of the Working Group in order to resolve the matters as soon as possible.

16. Link’s representative responded that they would attend the Working Group’s meeting for this issue.

17. A Member reckoned that a note should be made in the minutes to state that the

HD representative had amended her speech as recorded in the minutes of the previous meeting. In the Member's view, the HD representative should submit a supplementary paper if she wanted to amend her speech as recorded in the minutes of the previous meeting.

18. The Chairman indicated that minutes were very important, so any amendments thereto should be recorded in the part of "Post-meeting note" in future. In addition, she asked the Working Group to further follow up on the subject issue.

19. A Member would like to raise the matter concerning the progress of works for magnetic doors in H.A.N.D.S (the former On Ting Commercial Complex) for discussion before Link's representatives left the meeting.

20. The Chairman said this matter was beyond the scope of the current discussion item and suggested passing it to the Working Group for follow-ups as well.

21. The Member who was also the Convenor of the Working Group indicated that the Working Group had been following up on the matter. She hoped Link's representatives would give responses on the matter at the next meeting of the Working Group.

22. A Member noted that Link's representative had just said they would attend the Working Group's meeting for the subject issue only and therefore, he worried that the representatives would leave after discussing the subject issue.

23. Link's representative said they would also give responses on the works for magnetic doors in H.A.N.D.S at the meeting of the Working Group.

24. The Chairman asked the Working Group to further follow up on the issues. Working Group on Monitoring of Link

V. Discussion Items

(A) Repeated Request for Phased-in Redevelopment of Tai Hing Estate and In-situ Rehousing (CIHC Paper No. 13/2016) (Written Response of the HD)

25. A proposer of the paper said many residents in Tai Hing Estate had expressed the hope that the HD could redevelop Tai Hing Estate and rehouse the estate's residents in situ. He said buildings in Tai Hing Estate were aged nearly 40 and very dilapidated,

adding that some residents had complained that concrete spalling and water leakage often occurred in the buildings of the estate. Although it was mentioned in the HD's written response that the structure of Tai Hing Estate was generally safe, he worried that the estate would require frequent repairs and renovations after one or two decades and the maintenance costs would only be going up. He further pointed out that a vast area of land was covered by the shopping centre, car park and bus terminus in Tai Hing Estate and this was a considerable waste of land resources, adding that housing supply would rise significantly if the HD, the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") and the Development Bureau ("DEVB") could join together to study re-planning of the estate. In view of this, he believed there was a pressing need to study the redevelopment of Tai Hing Estate. He hoped the department would actively study it and make properly arrangements to rehouse the estate's residents in the same area.

26. Members' comments and enquiries in the first round of discussion are summarised as follows:

- (i) A Member noted that there were two phases in Tai Hing Estate, with buildings aged nearly 39 in phase one and nearly 37 in phase two, and there was particular concern about the structure of seven buildings in the estate. He asked whether the HD had any intention to undertake structural repairs to buildings in Tai Hing Estate and whether it had set new standards for the security, power supply and lift renovation in the estate. He believed that it would take much time for the HD to consult the Estate Management Advisory Committee, the area committee and the TMDC even if the department had the intention to redevelop or demolish Tai Hing Estate, which was comprised of buildings aged nearly 40. Furthermore, he pointed out that the dilapidated San Fat Estate had been demolished and its site had been redeveloped into the terminus of West Rail Link, and that Butterfly Estate, Wu King Estate, Yau Oi Estate and On Ting Estate were all built after Tai Hing Estate and all their buildings were aged nearly 35. He hoped the HD would give an account of the arrangements for redeveloping housing estates with buildings aged 35 or above;
- (ii) A Member noted from a report issued by the Government in March 2013 that 22 estates were on the list of "housing estates with a potential need for redevelopment". But actually, there was no urgency to redevelop the 22 estates and it just meant that they had the potential for redevelopment, and as stated in the current written response of the HD, the structure of buildings in these estates were fine. In his view, the

word “potential” implied that the plot ratios of these estates were not fully utilised, so the supply of public housing would rise if they were redeveloped. On the contrary, the plot ratio of Tai Hing Estate was almost fully utilised, so it might not be possible to provide more public housing units even if the estate was redeveloped. He believed this was why Tai Hing Estate was not listed together with the 22 estates. Given that Tai Hing Estate was the second estate completed in Tuen Mun, the Member would like to ask whether the HA would use age as a criterion in deciding whether there was a potential need for redevelopment. He believed that if the HA would do so, it would take a long time before any proposal was put up for discussion by the TMDC, so it was time to at least take the first step and provide a timeframe. Moreover, as most estates in Tuen Mun were completed between 1977 and 1983, any redevelopment of these estates would start at almost the same time. Therefore, he hoped Tai Hing Estate could serve as an example, so as to let Tuen Mun residents know the redevelopment plans and arrangements for in-situ rehousing;

- (iii) A Member hoped this issue would be carried over to another meeting, to which representatives from the relevant bureau would be invited to explain the redevelopment plan and answer Members’ questions. A Member considered that the information provided in the HD’s written response was insufficient because it gave no account of how the situations were in different estates and what the criteria were for putting an estate on the list of “housing estates with a potential need for redevelopment”. The Member hoped the HD could provide more details; and
- (iv) A Member opined that actually the Government had no intention to find land for public housing development, but excused itself by arguing that housing development was thwarted by locals. She said that with large vacant land available for further development, Tai Hing Estate could serve as an example for other estates. Taking Kwai Shing Estate as an example, she pointed out that the residents of the estate were rehoused in situ after it had been demolished and redeveloped, and as a result, not only were the residents provided with more space, but the supply of public housing also increased. Given this, she hoped the HA and the DEVB would examine plot ratios in planning the redevelopment of Tai Hing Estate or other estates.

27. The Chairman was dissatisfied with the HD for giving a too brief written response which started only with the words “The Housing Department responded that” and did not show the sender’s name at the bottom. Besides, she said this issue would be carried over to another meeting and invited the HD to send representatives relevant to the issue to attend it.

28. Ms Christine CHENG of the HD indicated that the department had been implementing the holistic Responsive In-flat Maintenance Services to provide in-flat maintenance services for housing estates, and for outdoor maintenance (e.g. external walls and common parts), its work section had been carrying out “planned maintenance works” on and on. She also said that lift modernisation had been completed in Tai Hing Estate years before, and Butterfly Estate would also be included in the lift modernisation programme. The HD had no plan to redevelop Tai Hing Estate at the moment, and she would convey Members’ views to the “estate representative” in the hope that the “estate representative” could attend the next CIHC meeting. She further said the DEVB had sought, through an enquiry system, the HD’s response to the paper and the HD had provided its response for the DEVB, adding that the HD would have discussion with the DEVB in a bid to provide more details at the next meeting.

29. The Chairman said the “estate representative” might not be able to make decisions and decide whether to include Tai Hing Estate among the housing estates with a potential need for redevelopment. As decision making was within the scope of work of the bureau concerned, she hoped the bureau could send representatives to the meeting.

30. Members’ comments and enquiries in the second round of discussion are summarised as follows:

- (i) A Member requested explanation as to what the “estate representative” was. Moreover, he expected that more buildings could be constructed for in-situ rehousing of residents as there was much space in Tai Hing Estate. He would like the DEVB to examine whether the plot ratio was fully utilised, and the bureau and the District Lands Officer, Tuen Mun (“DLO/TM”) to provide the relevant information for discussion at the next meeting;
- (ii) A Member opined that the goal of redeveloping Tai Hing Estate and rehousing residents in situ was fine, but nothing would be achieved even in 20 years’ time if there were discussions with the HD. He pointed out

that the lifespan of buildings in Hong Kong was 50 years and with repairs and maintenance, it could be extended for about 10 to 20 years (buildings in Tai Hing Estate still had a lifespan of more than 20 years). Redevelopment was in no way easy because in early years, public housing development was a huge investment that involved a wide range of issues. For instance, it was difficult to redevelop Choi Hung Estate, Ma Tau Wai Estate and Chun Seen Mei Chuen, which were comprised of 10-odd-storey buildings aged over 60. Besides, he believed there would be difficulty in rehousing residents in-situ, as there had been much voice of discontent over the in-situ rehousing arrangements implemented for San Fat Estate back then. In view of this, he reckoned that Members should consider how to repair and maintain estates in Tuen Mun and how to open up more space. He further pointed out that the land for Tai Hing Estate was created by reclamation of Por Lo Shan in early years, and asked whether it was possible to further reclaim Por Lo Shan to get more land resources; and

- (iii) A Member held the view that the Government should consider finding land for public housing development, and questioned why it did not consider building another public housing block on the vacant land at the bus terminus of Tai Hing Estate. She also opined that it was also fine to study the redevelopment of one estate first. In addition, she hoped this issue would be carried over to the next meeting.

31. The Chairman said this issue would be carried over to the next CIHC meeting. She would like the HD to have discussion with the relevant bureau and ask the bureau to send representatives to attend the meeting. As the matter concerning plot ratio might fall within the purview of the DLO/TM, she hoped the DLO/TM would check the plot ratio concerned and provide further information at the next meeting.

32. A Member reckoned that the contents of the paper submitted were correct and it was not necessary for Members to give a response for the Government as to whether the plan was feasible. Moreover, he enquired who the “estate representative” was and opined that department representatives must speak precisely, otherwise the preparation of minutes would be affected.

33. Ms Christine CHENG of the HD responded that the “estate representative” referred to the estate manager or assistant estate manager of Tai Hing Estate, who was the representative of the estate.

34. The Chairman said the issue would be carried over to the next CIHC meeting. She invited the relevant bureau to send representatives responsible for housing redevelopment to the meeting to answer Members' questions. She would also like the DLO/TM to provide more details about the plot ratio.

VI. Reporting Items

(A) Work Reports by Working Groups under CIHC
(CIHC Paper No. 14/2016)

(i) Working Group on Occupational Safety and Health

35. Members noted the above work report.

(ii) Working Group on Economic Development in Tuen Mun

36. Members noted the above work report.

(iii) Working Group on Building Management

37. Members noted the above work report.

(iv) Working Group on Monitoring of Link

38. The Convenor indicated that as there had been no representative from Link present at the working group's meeting held on 27 April, the views of the working group's Members had been relayed to Link and the HD had had discussion with Link. She was glad that Link's representative said they would attend the next meeting of the working group, and hoped all relevant representatives would attend the meeting to forge ahead with the projects being followed up.

39. A Member expressed gratitude to the Convenor for her dedicated efforts in handling issues about the livelihood of people in the district. She said views could only be relayed to Link at the previous two meetings whereas, to her delight, there would be Link's representatives present at the meeting of the working group. She hoped Link would follow up on the issues concerned and the working group would do a better job.

40. The Chairman announced that the reports of the above four working groups were endorsed.

(B) Work Report on Private Building Management in Tuen Mun District
(CIHC Paper No. 15/2016)

41. Members noted the above work report.

(C) **Report by Buildings Department**
(CIHC Paper No. 16/2016)

42. Members noted the above work report.

VII. Any Other Business and Date of Next Meeting

43. A Member indicated that the problem of water dripping from air-conditioners was rampant and asked whether the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (“FEHD”) could help advise residents in housing estates to ameliorate the problem.

44. The Chairman said this matter came under the purview of the FEHD, adding that for water dripping from air-conditioners in private buildings, complaints could be lodged with management offices for referral to the FEHD. As there was no FEHD representative present at CIHC meetings and the problem was related to the Environment, Hygiene and District Development Committee (“EHDDC”), the Chairman suggested the Member submit a paper to the EHDDC for discussion.

45. There being no other business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 10:19 a.m. The next meeting would be held on 1 August 2016.

Date: 8 July 2016

File Ref: HAD TM DC/13/25/CIHC/16