

**Minutes of the 2nd Meeting in 2020 of the District Facilities Management and Culture,
Recreation and Sports Committee
of the Tai Po District Council**

Date: 24 April 2020 (Friday)

Time: 9:30 a.m. – 2:33 p.m.

Venue: Conference Room, Tai Po District Council

<u>Present</u>	<u>Time of Arrival</u>	<u>Time of Withdrawal</u>
<u>Chairman</u>		
Mr. YAM Kai-bong	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
<u>Vice-chairman</u>		
Mr. LIN Kok-cheung, Dalu	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
<u>Members</u>		
Mr. AU Chun-ho	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. AU Chun-wah	9:38 a.m.	End of the meeting
Mr. CHAN Chun-chit, Richard	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Ms. CHAN Wai-ka, Olive	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. HO Wai-lam	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. KWAN Wing-yip	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. LAM Ming-yat, Nick	9:39 a.m.	End of the meeting
Mr. LAM Yick-kuen	Beginning of the meeting	1:56 p.m.
Mr. LAU Yung-wai	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. LI Yiu-ban, BBS, MH, JP	9:36 a.m.	2:03 p.m.
Mr. MAN Nim-chi	9:36 a.m.	End of the meeting
Mr. MO Ka-chun, Patrick	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. SO Tat-leung	9:34 a.m.	End of the meeting
Mr. TAM Yi-pui	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. WONG Siu-kin	9:34 a.m.	2:12 p.m.
Mr. WU Yiu-cheong	9:36 a.m.	End of the meeting
Mr. YIU Kwan-ho	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting

Secretary

Miss NG Suet-yau, Sharon
Executive Officer (DC)4/
Tai Po District Office/
Home Affairs Department

Beginning of the meeting

End of the meeting

In attendance

Ms. CHAN Hau-man, Eunice, JP	District Officer (Tai Po), Home Affairs Department
Miss LEUNG Wing-yin, Tiffany	Assistant District Officer (Tai Po), Home Affairs Department
Ms. LIU Pui-wah, Stella	District Leisure Manager (Tai Po), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan	Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Tai Po, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr. NG Sik-hay, Eddie	Senior Executive Officer (Planning)34, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr. CHAN Kam-shing, Eddie	Senior Executive Officer (Planning)23, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Miss LO Wai-yin, Phoenix	Executive Officer (Planning)23, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms. SAM Fung-mei, Esther	Manager(NTE)Marketing & District Activities, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr. NG Chi-keung, Barry	Senior Librarian (Tai Po), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr. CHEN Wai-kuen	Administrative Assistant (Lands) (Atg.), Tai Po District Lands Office, Lands Department
Ms. CHAN Ho-shan, Susana	Architect (Works)9, Home Affairs Department
Mr. LEE Yu-sau, Terence	Senior Executive Officer (District Council)/Tai Po District Office, Home Affairs Department
Miss CHAN Sui-king, Madeline	Senior Executive Officer (District Management) /Tai Po District Office, Home Affairs Department
Ms. WONG Yu-hang, Anita	Senior Liaison Officer(2), Tai Po District Office, Home Affairs Department
Miss WONG Sin-man, Mabel	District Secretary (Atg.), Tai Po District Office, Home Affairs Department
Mr. SO Wing-kai	Senior Inspector of Works, Tai Po District Office, Home Affairs Department
Mr. LAU Chun-ming	Inspector of Works (3), Tai Po District Office, Home Affairs Department

Ms. YIP Lisa	Liaison Officer (7), Tai Po District Office, Home Affairs Department
Mr. MAK Cheuk-kai, Ryan	Senior Architect, Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited
Mr. CHU Bo-hei, Boris	Architect, Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited
Mr. CHOY Cheong-kin	Architect, Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited
Mr. TAM Yat-hei, David	Architectural Assistant, Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited
Mr. HO Yu-hong, Henry	Architectural Assistant, Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited

Opening remarks

The Chairman welcomed participants to this meeting of the District Facilities Management and Culture, Recreation and Sports Committee (“DFMC”).

2. The Chairman welcomed the following persons who would attend DFMC meetings from now on as standing departmental representatives:

- (i) Ms. CHAN Hau-man, Eunice, JP, District Officer (Tai Po), Tai Po District Office;
- (ii) Miss LEUNG Wing-yin, Tiffany, Assistant District Officer (Tai Po), Tai Po District Office;
- (iii) Mr. LEE Yu-sau, Terence, Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Tai Po District Office;
- (iv) Miss CHAN Sui-king, Madeline, Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Tai Po District Office;
- (v) Ms. WONG Yu-hang, Anita, Senior Liaison Officer(2), Tai Po District Office;
- (vi) Mr. SO Wing-kai, Senior Inspector of Works, Tai Po District Office;
- (vii) Mr. LAU Chun-ming, Inspector of Works (3), Tai Po District Office;
- (viii) Ms. YIP Lisa, Liaison Officer (7), Tai Po District Office;
- (ix) Ms. CHAN Ho-shan, Susana, Architect (Works)9, Home Affairs Department (Works Section);
- (x) Ms. LIU Pui-wah, Stella, District Leisure Manager (Tai Po), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”);

- (xi) Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan, Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Tai Po, LCSD;
- (xii) Mr. CHAN Kam-shing, Eddie, Senior Executive Officer (Planning)34, LCSD;
- (xiii) Miss LO Wai-yin, Phoenix, Executive Officer (Planning)23, LCSD;
- (xiv) Ms. SAM Fung-mei, Esther, Manager(NTE)Marketing & District Activities, LCSD;
- (xv) Mr. NG Chi-keung, Barry, Senior Librarian (Tai Po), LCSD;
- (xvi) Mr. CHEN Wai-kuen, Administrative Assistant (Lands) (Atg.), Tai Po District Lands Office.

I. Adoption of the “Tai Po District Council Standing Orders”

3. The Chairman advised that Tai Po District Council (“TPDC”) had endorsed at the meeting on 7 January 2020 the adoption of the “Tai Po District Council Standing Orders”. He requested that Members note and observe relevant requirements.

II. Adoption of the “Guidelines on TPDC Funds”

4. The Chairman indicated that TPDC had endorsed by circulation of paper the adoption of the “Guidelines on TPDC Funds” on 30 March 2020 with effect from 1 April 2020. All applications for TPDC funds were required to be submitted to the Administration and Finance Management Committee (“AFMC”) for vetting and approval. He requested that Members note relevant arrangements.

III. Issues to be followed up by DFMC

(TPDC Paper Nos. DFM 2/2020 and DFM 3/2020)

5. The Chairman welcomed Mr. Eddie NG, Senior Executive Officer (Planning)34 of LCSD, to the meeting for the discussion of this agenda item.

6. Mr. Eddie CHAN introduced the progress of leisure and cultural facilities and projects in Tai Po District contained in TPDC Paper No. DFM 2/2020.

7. Mr. Eddie NG introduced TPDC Paper No. DFM 2/2020 and reported to DFMC the progress of the Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre. He added that the said project belonged to capital works projects under public works projects, of which allocation

would need to be approved by Legislative Council (“LegCo”). Should everything go smoothly, LCSD expected to file funding application with LegCo end of this year or early next year and construction could begin in late 2021 should funding be granted.

8. The Vice-chairman raised the following views and questions as regards “Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre”:

- (i) While Tai Po Civic Centre and Tai Po Art Centre belonged to the same building compound, he enquired if LCSD, when designing the “Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre”, had communicated and worked together with representatives of Tai Po Art Centre to achieve consistency in architectural concepts.
- (ii) Art groups at Tai Po Art Centre were primarily oriented in performing arts, while venues at Tai Po Civic Centre were suitable for staging performances of such art groups. He therefore hoped that LCSD would take into account the said factor when making alterations to Tai Po Civic Centre.
- (iii) He enquired how Tai Po Civic Centre would operate in the future and hoped that LCSD would furnish interior structural design of the alteration works at Tai Po Civic Centre.

9. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai indicated in connection with “Football-cum-rugby pitch with Public Vehicle Park in Area 33, Tai Po” that last-term TPDC had recommended that a public car park be provided at the venue while the quantitative risk assessment (“QRA”) for the provision of public car park had already been completed. He wished to know the content and results of the QRA. Relevant government departments currently conducted technical feasibility study for public car park. He was of the view that there had hardly been any substantive progress since the project had been launched more than three years ago, while departments had been unable to provide any drawings so far. He therefore enquired when relevant departments could report to DFMC the progress of the public car park. Given the serious shortage of parking spaces in Tai Po District, he hoped that relevant departments would confirm the project concerned as quickly as possible.

10. Mr. SO Tat-leung raised the following views and questions as regards “Development of a Bathing Beach at Lung Mei, Tai Po”:

- (i) Civil Engineering and Development Department (“CEDD”) had in March 2020 advised that it would endeavour to open the bathing beach for the swimming season in 2020. He asked how likely Bathing Beach at Lung Mei, Tai Po could be opened for the swimming season in 2020, and if the project would be delayed.

- (ii) He had conducted an on-site visit with villagers in the neighbourhood, who held opposing views on the design of facilities at the Bathing Beach at Lung Mei such as the planters being too tall and the irregular shape of the beach building. He hoped that LCSD would arrange for an on-site inspection with him.

11. Mr. Eddie CHAN responded as follows:

- (i) “Development of a Bathing Beach at Lung Mei, Tai Po”: the project had initially been scheduled to complete substantially in early 2020. However, owing to the epidemic, there had been shortage or delays in supply of construction materials and other areas, the completion date was as a result deferred. Upon completion of the project, LCSD would still need to carry out preparation and inspect if the bathing beach conformed to the standard for opening, before the beach could be opened for public use. LCSD would report to DFMC relevant progress and timetable upon completion of the project. Besides, as far as the design of planters and surrounding beautification works were concerned, LCSD would check with Architectural Services Department (“ArchSD”) the details and arrange for an on-site inspection to facilitate Members’ understanding of the design of the bathing beach. Since construction was underway at the site, LCSD would arrange for an on-site inspection when it was safe and suitable for doing so.
- (ii) “Football-cum-rugby pitch with Public Vehicle Park in Area 33, Tai Po”: the lead department of the project was Transport Department (“TD”) and the QRA was a part of the technical feasibility study. Relevant departments currently followed up on the technical feasibility study of the project, including the QRA. Upon completion of the technical feasibility study, ArchSD would undertake the conceptual design which was expected to complete next year. LCSD would report relevant matters to DFMC shortly and would continue to actively follow up on this project.

12. Mr. Eddie NG responded in connection with “Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre” as follows:

- (i) LCSD had already consulted in November and December 2018 relevant groups including LCSD’s Committee on Venue Partnership, major performing groups, local art groups and main users of rental venues on the design of the project. LCSD had also sought views from disability groups and so on and would provide as far as practicable barrier-free facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre in accordance with standards of current legislation. LCSD would adopt views put forward by last-term TPDC and incorporate them in the design of Tai Po Civic Centre where financially and technically feasible.

- (ii) Tai Po Civic Centre would in the future operate in accordance with the established mode. LCSD would elaborate on relevant details to TPDC and groups hiring facilities of Tai Po Civic Centre when Tai Po Civic Centre was re-opened.
- (iii) As far as this DFMC meeting was concerned, LCSD intended to provide Members simple and easy to understand design drawings to facilitate Members' understanding of major facilities of Tai Po Civic Centre and their layout. LCSD had already expanded the area of the lobby and the auditorium as much as possible, and provided escalators and elevators inside Tai Po Civic Centre in response to requests made by last-term TPDC to provide convenience to members of the public. Moreover, upgrading works of the Black Box Theatre and Function Room had met the needs of user groups as much as possible. Since tendering procedures of project were involved, ArchSD would usually not make detailed design drawings public.

13. Mr. WONG Siu-kin indicated in connection with "Open space in Area 6, Tai Po" that since the construction site was located on a major pavement near Classical Gardens, Wan Tau Tong Estate, hoardings being erected during the construction period had narrowed the pavement and caused obstruction to access of members of the public. The project was expected to complete in Q1 in 2021 and he enquired if subsequent construction work of the project and the hoardings being erected there would cause even more obstruction to public access to the said pavement, and if the project would cause greater impact on residents in the surroundings.

14. Mr. LAU Yung-wai indicated as regards "Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre" that there was a bus-stop outside the proposed main entrance/exit where quite some people would wait for buses, he therefore recommended that the said main entrance/exit be moved slightly inwards to make more room available. Besides, there was currently no bench at the proposed main entrance/exit and he recommended that benches be provided for the convenience of members of the public waiting for buses and using facilities in the vicinity of Tai Po Civic Centre. In addition, he had put forward suggestions earlier concerning this project, such as installing revolving lanterns on the external walls of the Black Box Theatre and providing information boards to display details and arrangements of activities. He asked LCSD about the progress of the follow up of the above suggestions.

15. Mr. WU Yiu-cheong raised the following views and questions:

- (i) "Development of a Bathing Beach at Lung Mei, Tai Po": According to information provided by Environmental Protection Department ("EPD"), EPD would regularly conduct water quality testing of beach water. Taking into consideration the construction conditions at the site, EPD had not conducted any

water quality testing since March 2019. The project of the bathing beach at Lung Mei was expected to complete in Q2 in 2020 and he enquired when EPD would carry out water quality testing again.

- (ii) “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po”: Both “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po” and “Football-cum-rugby pitch with Public Vehicle Park in Area 33, Tai Po” had been incorporated in the “Five-Year Plan for Sports and Recreation Facilities” (“Five-Year Plan”) promulgated in the Policy Address in January 2017, but the progress of the two projects was miles apart. He considered the progress in taking forward “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po” slow and enquired if LCSD could complete the feasibility study in the next two years so as to achieve the goal of the Five-Year Plan. He also asked when LCSD would commence the said project.

16. Mr. YIU Kwan-ho said in connection with “Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre” that some art groups hiring venues at Tai Po Art Centre had suggested that facilities to assist the visually impaired be provided on the road connecting Tai Po Civic Centre and Tai Po Art Centre as well as the bus-stops nearby for the convenience of the visually impaired. Besides, as Tai Po Civic Centre and Tai Po Art Centre belonged to the same building compound, he recommended that the two have similar design style to create a synergy.

17. The Vice-chairman raised the following views and questions:

- (i) “Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre”: given that Tai Po Civic Centre and Tai Po Art Centre belonged to the same building compound, he enquired about the design concept of “Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre”. Besides, as LCSD had all along promoted Venue Partnership Scheme in the hope that users of venues could carry out activities at the same regular venues. He opined that the said Scheme not only satisfied the needs of venue users, but also helped create a role and an image for the venue. LCSD also endeavoured to enhance public participation. He enquired what plans and development directions LCSD had in this regard to increase the degree of public participation.
- (ii) As regards barrier-free access and facilities to assist the disabled, one of the art groups hiring venues at Tai Po Art Centre was called “Theatre in the Dark”, of which performers and target audience included visually impaired persons, for whom it was difficult to reach Tai Po Art Centre on foot from the bus-stop near Tai Po Art Centre. He reckoned that visually impaired persons would in the future encounter the same problem when going to Tai Po Civic Centre. Hence, he recommended that LCSD consider drawing up measures to tackle the said problem.

- (iii) He hoped that LCSD could provide more detailed floor plans for various leisure and cultural facilities and projects in Tai Po District to facilitate Members' understanding of the design concept of projects concerned.

18. The Chairman indicated as regards "Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre" that LCSD had during the last DC term invited DC Members to an on-site inspection at Tai Po Civic Centre and provided detailed drawings for their reference including floor plans of the first and second floors to illustrate the greening zone and locations of facilities such as elevators in the Auditorium and so on. He recommended that LCSD invite current term DC Members to an on-site visit and the term consultant elaborate on the project.

19. Mr. Eddie CHAN responded in connection with "Open space in Area 6, Tai Po" that ArchSD would carry out construction works within the area where the hoardings were being erected currently and no further space on the pavement would be occupied with a view to minimising the impact on members of the public. The project had initially been scheduled to complete in Q4 in 2020, but was currently expected to complete in Q1 in 2021 owing to the epidemic. LCSD would maintain close contact with ArchSD and take forward this project as soon as possible. Besides, in terms of the project's impact on residents, there was a basketball court in "Open space in Area 6, Tai Po" where lighting facilities were installed and noise problems might arise too. He asked Ms. Stella LIU to provide supplementary information on the matter concerned.

20. Ms. Stella LIU advised that lighting systems of most basketball courts managed by LCSD were switched off at 11 p.m. As far as nuisance which the basketball court in Area 6, Tai Po might cause to members of the public was concerned, LCSD would adjust the lighting system at the said site as appropriate in accordance with local situation in a timely manner.

21. Mr. Eddie CHAN responded further as follows:

- (i) "Development of a Bathing Beach at Lung Mei, Tai Po: EPD had conducted water quality testing in March 2019 and would perform water quality testing anew once CEDD completed all works, so as to ensure that the water quality of the bathing beach conformed to the standard for opening.
- (ii) "Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po" and "Football-cum-rugby pitch with Public Vehicle Park in Area 33, Tai Po": LCSD had started to plan for "Football-cum-rugby pitch with Public Vehicle Park in Area 33, Tai Po" in early years, hence, progress of the said project was faster than that of "Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po". LCSD had initially planned to construct a football-cum-rugby pitch in Area 33, Tai Po. However, in response to the Government's "single site, multiple use" principle, TD had included a public vehicle park in the project and conducted a feasibility study currently. As

regards “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po”, LCSD now actively explored with relevant departments the feasibility to provide public parking spaces at the said site and hoped that it could consult DFMC within this year on the proposed facilities and public car park of the indoor recreation centre.

22. Mr. Eddie NG responded in connection with “Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre” as follows:

- (i) LCSD would follow up with ArchSD on the proposal to provide facilities to assist the visually impaired.
- (ii) The enclosing wall of Tai Po Civic Centre near On Cheung Road would be demolished and replaced by landscape. Besides, as regards the bus-stop and minibus-stop on On Cheung Road, LCSD had contacted TD earlier on to make more room available for members of the public waiting for buses, and would try to minimise the impact of the works on the public as far as possible.
- (iii) LCSD would consider installing information display screens at suitable locations inside Tai Po Civic Centre including the main entrance/exit on On Cheung Road. Given that the Black Box Theatre faced west and lacked space for installing information display screens, no information display screen could be provided there. LCSD would consider installing display screens at other suitable locations such that more members of the public could access relevant information.
- (iv) LCSD would discuss with ArchSD and consider providing floor plans of different levels in Tai Po Civic Centre for Members’ reference. Besides, owing to the epidemic, LCSD would discuss with relevant departments and arrange for on-site inspection at Tai Po Civic Centre with Members.

23. Ms. Esther SAM responds as regards “Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre” as follows:

- (i) Tai Po Civic Centre was an existing facility which had all along been available for members of the public/groups to hire. To implement the overall upgrading works this time, LCSD had meant to meet the needs of professional arts groups by optimising venue facilities. Upon completion of the “Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre”, LCSD would continue to be responsible for the operation of Tai Po Civic Centre and execute established rental and operation policies.
- (ii) Current hirers of venues at Tai Po Art Centre were all art groups which could hire venues at Tai Po Civic Centre for activities or performances. Should they meet the requirements for non-profit local groups, they might enjoy rent

reductions or waivers and so on. In addition, LCSD also maintained close liaison with Hong Kong Arts Development Council which was responsible for operating Tai Po Art Centre.

- (iii) Upon completion of “Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre”, LCSD would actively consider including Tai Po Civic Centre in the list of venue partners under the Venue Partnership Scheme.

24. Ms. Olive CHAN raised the following views regarding “Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre”:

- (i) She wished to know about the design of the domed top of Tai Po Civic Centre and hoped that LCSD could provide Members relevant design drawings.
- (ii) There was a bus-stop outside the proposed main entrance/exit. The said location was rather limited in space and many members of the public waited for buses there, while there were also members of the public pushing their bicycles through the said area from time to time. She therefore suggested that the main entrance/exit concerned be moved slightly inwards.
- (iii) She had an on-site inspection at Tai Po Civic Centre earlier and according to LCSD’s explanation at that time, the design concept of Tai Po Civic Centre was to “integrate arts into daily life” and it was hoped that through landscaping and open space design, more members of the public would be attracted to visit Tai Po Civic Centre to get in touch with arts. However, she opined that the current design fell short of attracting more members of the public to experience the artistic atmosphere. Hence, she recommended that LCSD optimise the design further, for instance, by providing a footpath on On Cheung Road and let arts group perform at open space to attract members of the public to enter Tai Po Civic Centre.
- (iv) Given its being located close to a bus-stop, more members of the public would walk by the Black Box Theatre. Hence, she recommended that publicity banners be put up there to give members of the public some information about the programmes so as to attract them to artistic performances.

25. Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang raised the following views:

- (i) “Ha Hang Village Playground in Area 31, Tai Po”: This project had been taken forward for years, but no works had commenced so far. He therefore enquired when construction would begin and complete. In addition, he also recommended that a volleyball court and pets park be provided at the main site.

- (ii) As regards facilities of Tai Po Art Centre, he recommended that arts groups be entrusted with the design of the facades of Tai Po Art Centre.

26. The Chairman raised the following views and questions:

- (i) “Football-cum-rugby pitch with Public Vehicle Park in Area 33, Tai Po”: LCSD had planned some years ago to build a heated swimming pool in Area 33, Tai Po. But two to three years after the said plan had been put forward, relevant QRA failed. Hence, he hoped that relevant departments would conduct the QRA for the public car park first to avoid delaying the progress of this project and wasting public money.
- (ii) Members had already voiced their views and questions regarding “Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre” just now. He recommended that LCSD arrange for on-site inspection as soon as possible once the epidemic slowed down, and explain details of this project such that Members could put forward their opinions.

27. Mr. Eddie CHAN responded as follows:

- (i) “Football-cum-rugby pitch with Public Vehicle Park in Area 33, Tai Po”: TD currently conducted a technical feasibility study on the provision of public vehicle park, which included the QRA. Once the project’s technical feasibility study was endorsed, TD and LCSD would follow up on matters concerning the conceptual design of Public Vehicle Park and Football-cum-rugby pitch to facilitate consultation with DFMC.
- (ii) “Ha Hang Village Playground in Area 31, Tai Po”: Owing to the constraint of construction site area, pets park could not be included in the scope of the project after building a basketball court. Besides, LCSD expected to consult DFMC on the project’s conceptual design within 2020 and the project was expected to commence in Q4 in 2020 and complete in Q2 in 2022.

28. Mr. Eddie NG responded in connection to “Upgrading works of facilities in Tai Po Civic Centre” as follows:

- (i) As far as the design of Tai Po Civic Centre was concerned, LCSD would adopt views put forward by Ms. Olive CHAN and last-term DC Members where practicable with a view to enhancing the artistic atmosphere of Tai Po Civic Centre. In addition, LCSD had discussed with TD matters concerning the bus-stop on On Cheung Road and planned to widen the said spot as much as

possible where feasible for the convenience of members of the public waiting for buses there.

- (ii) LCSD would relay Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang's opinion concerning the facades of Tai Po Art Centre to relevant groups for consideration.

29. Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang enquired regarding "Ha Hang Village Playground in Area 31, Tai Po" if LCSD had already completed the engineering drawings, or could not complete and consult DFMC until end of 2020. Since he had already sought views from local residents who had indicated that they hoped a volleyball court, basketball court and pets park could be provided in "Ha Hang Village Playground in Area 31, Tai Po", he therefore hoped that LCSD would tell him after studying the feasibility if it would be viable to provide the said facilities in the playground. Besides, he asked if the proposed garden path, artistic garden facilities and greening area belonged to the same facility.

30. Mr. Eddie CHAN responded that LCSD and relevant departments would complete the conceptual design of "Ha Hang Village Playground in Area 31, Tai Po" shortly. While there were more constraints for constructing a pets park, LCSD would relay Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang's opinions to ArchSD and explore if relevant suggestions could be incorporated into the scope of the project.

31. The Chairman said that before consulting DFMC on the conceptual design of "Ha Hang Village Playground in Area 31, Tai Po" in end of 2020, he hoped LCSD would actively consider incorporating Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang's suggestions into the project's design to optimise the facilities of the said site for the benefit of members of the public.

32. In connection with "Ha Hang Village Playground in Area 31, Tai Po", Mr. KWAN Wing-yip said he recommended that LCSD arrange for on-site inspection with Members as soon as possible such that LCSD could gain an in-depth understanding of Members' proposals, explain to Members while examining the feasibility of relevant proposals.

33. Mr. LAU Yung-wai recommended that LCSD conduct on-site inspections with Members at construction sites of leisure and cultural facilities in Tai Po District to understand details of each project.

34. The Chairman indicated that construction of certain leisure and cultural facilities in Tai Po District had not commenced yet and he was therefore of the view that design of projects could be modified slightly. He recommended that LCSD arrange for on-site inspection at sites of leisure and cultural facilities in Tai Po District with Members as soon as possible once the epidemic slowed down.

35. Mr. Eddie CHAN responded that LCSD would contact ArchSD and arrange for on-site inspection with Members as soon as possible to understand Members' views once the epidemic slowed down.

36. The Chairman advised that LCSD would regularly report on the progress of leisure and cultural facilities in Tai Po District at DFMC meetings, and requested that Members note the above report. He then continued to ask Members to note TPDC Paper No. DFM 3/2020 concerning the latest progress of "Development of a golf course at a closed landfill in Shuen Wan" ("Development of Shuen Wan golf course").

37. Mr. LAU Yung-wai said that during the last DC term, EPD and relevant departments had submitted progress reports to DFMC several times in connection with Development of Shuen Wan golf course. Nonetheless, DFMC had not endorsed the said project yet, nor resolved problems and impacts brought forth by the project, including the collared crows being affected and the feasibility of the non-in-situ land exchange mode.

38. The Chairman requested that the Secretariat invite EPD to attend the DFMC meeting on 15 May 2020 so that Members could gain understanding about Development of Shuen Wan golf course and ask EPD about relevant details.

(Post-meeting note: The next meeting of DFMC was rescheduled to 17 July 2020.)

39. Mr YIU Kwan-ho said that the Environmental Impact Assessment Report ("EIA Report") which Sha Lo Tung Development Company Ltd. ("Development Company") had released earlier on had no mention of the impact of Development of Shuen Wan golf course on the ecology of birds, but EPD had mentioned in TPDC Paper No. DFM 3/2020 that the project would have an impact on birds. Hence, he asked EPD what impact the project would have on birds. He also hoped that EPD would answer his question when attending the next DFMC meeting.

40. The Vice-chairman said that EPD was responsible for approving the EIA Report of Development of Shuen Wan golf course. He asked if the Development Company would implement the said project and carry out construction works in accordance with the requirements of EPD. Besides, he wished to learn about EPD's conservation measures of the birds at the said site, and hoped that EPD would listen to views of groups such as Hong Kong Bird Watching Society. Hence, he enquired if EPD had consulted relevant conservation groups.

41. Mr. TAM Yi-pui indicated that the Development Company had exchanged the restored site of Shuen Wan Landfill with a land which it had bought earlier. Since the restored site of Shuen Wan Landfill was larger in area, he was of the view that Members would need to

consider if the value of the two sites concerned was equivalent and if the non-in-situ land exchange arrangement was reasonable. Moreover, he agreed that EPD needed to consult Hong Kong Bird Watching Society on this project.

42. The Vice-chairman said that land in Hong Kong was limited and he understood that there was limited use for the restored site of Shuen Wan Landfill. However, he doubted if the Development Company should use the site for developing a golf course. Moreover, the golf course, when completed, would be open for public use for no more than 20% of time. He therefore opined that the project might cause public controversy.

43. Mr. WU Yiu-cheong said that Tai Po District Lands Office (“TPDLO”) had briefly explained in TPDC Paper No. DFM 3/2020 the verification of land titles of Sha Lo Tung. He hoped that TPDLO would explain in detail the verification work involved, such as why relevant verification work was more complicated and when all titles to the Sha Lo Tung site could be acquired. Given that the land titles of Sha Lo Tung were closely related to the Shuen Wan Landfill site, he hoped that TPDLO would furnish the aforementioned details for Members’ consideration and discussion.

44. The Chairman requested that the Secretariat record the above questions of Members in the meeting minutes and refer the questions to EPD and TPDLO for follow up. Since Development of Shuen Wan golf course involved issues of non-in-situ land exchange, land use planning and land justice, while EPD was primarily responsible for matters relating to site restoration of Shuen Wan Landfill, other departments were responsible for matters concerning non-in-situ land exchange, he therefore enquired if other departments, in addition to EPD and TPDLO, would need to be invited to attend the next DFMC meeting.

45. Members voiced no comments.

46. The Chairman advised that DFMC would invite EPD to attend meetings to elaborate on the Development of Shuen Wan golf course and once EPD responded, DFMC would follow up on this project further. He continued that according to the practice of last term DFMC, LCSD in general submitted progress reports of leisure and cultural facilities in Tai Po District once every six months to DFMC. As regards Development of Shuen Wan golf course, EPD and other departments usually submitted progress reports to DFMC every four months. However, since DFMC currently followed up on several projects of leisure and cultural facilities in Tai Po District, he recommended that LCSD report the progress of such projects to DFMC every four months.

47. Mr. Richard CHAN said that as there were quite a few of projects of leisure and cultural facilities in Tai Po District on which DFMC had to follow up, he recommended that LCSD report the progress of relevant projects at each DFMC meeting.

48. The Chairman requested that LCSD report the progress of projects of leisure and cultural facilities in Tai Po District at each DFMC meeting, whereas the arrangement of progress report of Development of Shuen Wan golf course would be decided at the next DFMC meeting.

IV. Position of the District Minor Works Funds and Progress Report on the Approved District Minor Works Projects

(TPDC Paper No. DFM 4/2020)

(I) Arrangement regarding current term Members to follow up on District Minor Works (“DMW”) projects

49. The Chairman indicated that since proponents of several approved DMW projects no longer served in the current term TPDC while new DC Members assumed office, pursuant to resolution of last term DFMC, an approved project would be followed up further by other proponents should the proponent no longer serve in the current term DC. Should the project have no other proponent, it would be followed up by the DC Member of the constituency concerned. Since DC Members of the last term had proposed cross-constituency DMW projects (“cross-constituency projects”), i.e., constituency to which a DC Member belonged was not the constituency where the project concerned would be carried out, he therefore requested that Members voice their views on the transitional arrangements for Members following up on cross-constituency projects and refer to Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 4/2020.

50. Mr. KWAN Wing-yip said that as far as arrangements for cross-constituency projects were concerned, he opined that DC Members of the constituencies where projects would take place (“local DC Members”) could follow up on the projects concerned, while the successors of the original proponents could choose as to whether or not to follow up on the cross-constituency projects further. Besides, he worried that local DC Members might have conflicting views on the projects with the successors of the original proponents, for instance, as to whether or not a project should be shelved. Hence, he recommended that Members consider if it was necessary to draw up relevant principles, such as non-local DC Members could not shelve projects concerned.

51. The Chairman requested that Members consider the following arrangements concerning cross-constituency projects:

- (i) Whether or not local DC Members had the power to follow up on the projects; ;
- (ii) Whether or not successors of the original proponents had the power to follow up on the projects; and

- (iii) Should there be conflicting views on cross-constituency projects between local DC Members and successors of the original proponents, how such cases should be handled and who would have the final say.

52. Ms. Lisa YIP gave the following examples to illustrate the situation of cross-constituency projects:

- (i) Project Item (40) “Improvement to existing walking trail at Pinehill, Tai Po”: the original proponent was Mr. Eric TAM and his successor was Mr. MAN Nim-chi. The project would take place in P17 Hong Lok Yuen Constituency and the local DC Member was Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang. Hence, Members were requested to consider if Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang should become the Member to follow up on the project and if Mr. MAN Nim-chi should continue following up on this project.
- (ii) Project Item (31) “TP-DMW216 Improvement of existing rainshelters cum sitting benches near Sung Tak Wong Kin Sheung Memorial School, Tai Po”: the original proponent was former ex officio Member Mr. CHEUNG Hok-ming and his successor was Mr. LAM Yick-kuen. The project site was located within P08 Kwong Fuk and Plover Cove Constituency and the local DC Member of the project was Mr. Dalu LIN. Hence, Members were requested to consider if Mr. Dalu LIN should become the Member to follow up on the project.
- (iii) Project Item (33) “TP-DMW233 Improvement works of footbridge at Ma Kwu Lam, Sai Kung North, Tai Po”: the original proponent was former ex officio Member Mr. TANG Kwong-wing. During the last DC term, local DC Member Mr. LI Wah-kwong had been responsible for following up on the project and Mr. TAM Yi-pui was his successor. Hence, Members were requested to consider if the current term ex officio Member Mr. LI Yiu-ban should be included to become the Member to follow up on the project.
- (iv) Project Item (23) “TP-DMW270 Provision of shelters at Po Nga Road connecting Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po”: the original proponent was Mr. CHAN Cho-leung and his successor was Mr. Richard CHAN. The project site was located within P14 Po Nga Constituency where the local DC Member was Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai. Besides, other original proponent of the project was Mr. Patrick TANG, whose successor was Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang. Hence, Members were requested to consider if Mr. Richard CHAN, Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai and Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang should become Members to follow up on the project.
- (v) Project Item (62) “Improvement to drainage channel at San Tau Kok, Tai Po”: the original proponent was Mr. CHENG Chun-wo and his successor was Ms. Olive CHAN. The project site was located within P18 Shuen Wan Constituency where the local DC Member was Mr. SO Tat-leung. Hence, Members were requested to consider if Mr. SO Tat-leung and Ms. Olive CHAN

should become Members to follow up on the project.

53. Mr. LAM Yick-kuen enquired if he, as Chairman of Tai Po Rural Committee (“TPRC”), could follow up with other DC Members on projects in rural areas of Tai Po. Besides, he asked whether or not he could follow up on projects in rural areas on which no other DC Members were willing to follow up.

54. Mr. TAM Yi-pui indicated that it was unreasonable for DC Member of Tai Yuen Constituency to follow up on a project of which the construction site was located in Shuen Wan Constituency. Hence, he recommended that the project concerned be followed up on by local DC Member. Besides, he had opposing views on DMW projects proposed by former DC Members of the constituency to which he belonged, such as Project Item (5) “TP-DMW227 Provision of sitting-out area and children's playground at Nai Chung, Tai Po” and Project Item (60) “Provision of pavilion near lamp post no. N2506 at Ko Tong, Sai Kung North, Tai Po”, but held an open attitude towards Project Item (33) “TP-DMW233 Improvement works of footbridge at Ma Kwu Lam, Sai Kung North, Tai Po”. He opined that either he himself or Mr. LI Yiu-ban could follow up on Project Item (33).

55. The Chairman said that while some Members had agreed to have projects followed up by local DC Members concerned, there were also Members who had indicated that successors of the original proponents could become Members to follow up on cross-constituency projects, for instance, for Project Item (62) “Improvement to drainage channel at San Tau Kok, Tai Po”, former DC Member Mr. CHENG Chun-wo had proposed to take forward the project in Shuen Wan Constituency, while Ms. Olive CHAN also had the power to follow up on the said project. He also summarised Members’ views mentioned above for Members’ consideration as follows:

- (i) Local DC Members followed up on projects in respective constituencies;
- (ii) Successors of original proponents could choose whether or not to follow up on cross-constituency projects; and
- (iii) Should a project be located in rural areas of Tai Po and on which no DC Member was willing to follow up, TPRC Chairman Mr. LAM Yick-kuen would be willing to take up the follow up of such project.

56. Mr. YIU Kwan-ho said that taking Project Item (31) “TP-DMW216 Improvement of existing rainshelters cum sitting benches near Sung Tak Wong Kin Sheung Memorial School, Tai Po” as an example, the original proponent was Mr. CHEUNG Hok-ming and his successor was Mr. LAM Yick-kuen, while there were three Members following on the said project. He asked if the successor of the original proponent or the local DC Member should have the final say should they have different opinions. He was of the view that the local DC Member concerned, i.e. Mr. Dalu LIN should have the final say on Project Item (31).

57. Mr. MAN Nim-chi cited Project Item (40) “Improvement to existing walking trail at Pinehill, Tai Po” as an example which was not located in his constituency. He asked how it should be handled if he did not agree to take forward the project further while Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang would like to continue taking forward the project.

58. Mr. WU Yiu-cheong indicated that projects proposed by ex officio Members might be located in constituencies of other DC Members, therefore he asked if the ex officio Member who proposed the project or local DC Members concerned should have the final say on the project. Taking Project Item (33) “TP-DMW233 Improvement works of footbridge at Ma Kwu Lam, Sai Kung North, Tai Po” as an example, which was followed up on by an ex officio Member and the local DC Member concerned, he opined that Members had to decide if ex officio Member or local DC Member concerned should have the final word on the project while he was of the view that local DC Member should have the final say.

59. Ms. Olive CHAN cited the examples of Project Item (53) “Improvement to access road and drainage channel near lamp post no. AE0656 to VE6907 at Lai Pek Shan San Tsuen, Po Sam Pai, Tai Po”, Project Item (54) “Improvement to drainage channel at Po Sam Pai, Tai Po”, Project Item (55) “Improvement to access road near lamp post no. V4743 to V4741 at A Shan, Tai Po” and Project Item (62) “Improvement to drainage channel at San Tau Kok, Tai Po”, former DC Member Mr. CHENG Chun-wo had put all resources of his constituency in Shuen Wan Constituency while residents of Tai Wo Estate could not benefit therefrom, which had caused dissatisfaction among residents. Being a TPDC Member, she hoped for a better development of Tai Po District too. Hence, she would neither ignore nor shelve relevant projects, yet, she was duty bound to understand the purpose and content of relevant projects such that she could explain to residents concerned. Moreover, she understood that Mr. SO Tat-leung would be willing to follow up on projects in Shuen Wan Constituency, but would need to know the details of the projects before entrusting them to Mr. SO Tat-leung for follow up, while she herself would become one of the other Members to follow up on the projects.

60. The Chairman said that to sum up views which Members had voiced above, local DC Members were required to follow up on projects in their constituencies. Successors of original proponents of projects might continue following up on cross-constituency projects if they wished to do so. As regards the right to decide on projects or to shelve projects, local DC Members should have the final say. Given that there might subsequently be conflicting views between local DC Members and successors of original proponents while local DC Members were duty bound to explain project details to residents in the future, he requested that Members consider if local DC Members should have more power in making decisions.

61. Mr. AU Chun-wah said that since local DC Members understood the needs of residents in the constituencies concerned, he agreed that local DC Members should have the final say.

Should a local DC Member decide to shelve a project, he might have to bear relevant political responsibility too.

62. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai indicated that the current term DC constituency boundary maps had been re-drawn and were different from those of the last term. While a DC Member had proposed a DMW project in the constituency to which the Member belonged during the last term, the location of the project concerned was in his constituency in the current term. He had visited the site of the said project during his tenure in the last DC term to understand details of the project. Hence, he asked Members to take into consideration the impact arising from the re-drawing of DC constituency boundary.

63. Mr. MAN Nim-chi enquired if similar complications had in the past occurred during transition of two DC terms, such as a DC Member of the last term no longer served in the DC while the project was located within or not within the constituency to which he belonged, how DFMC had at that time handled arrangements of relevant DC Members to follow up on such projects. For instance, former DC Member of his constituency had during the last DC term proposed two DMW projects, of which one was located in his constituency and he would therefore continue to follow up, whereas the other one was in the constituency of Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang. He enquired if, in accordance with the practice of last term DC, he would need to discuss with Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang who would be the Member to follow up on the project concerned, or Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang would follow up on the said project directly.

64. Mr. WU Yiu-cheong indicated that local DC Members could best understand the needs of residents in their respective constituencies, he therefore agreed that local DC Members should have the final say on projects in their constituencies and bear relevant responsibilities. Besides, during tenure of previous DC terms, ex officio Members had also proposed projects to be taken forward in constituencies of other Members. According the previous practice of TPDC, he asked if ex officio Members were required to seek prior consent of local DC Members before proposing cross-boundary projects. If yes, he opined that DFMC should also adopt the aforementioned principle now.

65. Ms. Lisa YIP responded that she had joined TPDO in 2016 and learned that former TPDC Chairman Mr. CHEUNG Hok-ming had raised that DMW projects would be followed up on by successors of the respective original proponents. Should there be other proponents for a project, the project should then be followed up on by other proponents. The said practice had been adopted during the previous two DC terms when there had rarely been Members who had proposed cross-constituency projects. There had neither been projects affected by redrawing of constituency boundary maps, nor projects put forward by original proponents' being opposed by succeeding Members at transition of DC terms.

66. Ms. Eunice CHAN raised the following views:

- (i) DFMC had already endorsed earlier by circulation of paper the arrangement regarding submission of DMW projects for 2020-2023, while each DC Member had a quota for proposing DMW projects and DMW Programme would operate according to the mechanism agreed upon by Members.
- (ii) Members currently discussed arrangements concerning the change of terms of Members to follow up on DMW projects which had been approved earlier. Relevant projects were being taken forward now while current-term Members had to be responsible for contacting residents of the constituencies concerned, or modify project proposals slightly and continue to follow up on relevant projects.
- (iii) As regards arrangements as to whether or not to shelve DMW projects, they were supposed to primarily affect projects Members would propose in the future. Nevertheless, she believed that Members would have completed communication and liaison work before proposing cross-constituency projects, she therefore opined that there would not necessarily be scenarios of projects' being shelved and relevant disputes.
- (iv) Each DC Member, including ex officio Member, had quotas for DMW projects, whereas there would bound to be local elected DC Members where projects proposed by ex officio Members were located. She was convinced that before proposing projects, ex officio Members would have already consulted local DC Members and relevant stakeholders of the constituencies concerned. Moreover, DMW Programme aimed to allow every DC Member to propose projects and the said idea also applied to DMW projects put forward by last term DC. Hence, she was of the view that projects proposed by former DC Members should be respected too.

67. The Chairman advised that while Members during the current DC term had quotas for DMW projects, they might have different views on handling projects proposed by their predecessors.

68. Ms Eunice CHAN said that each DMW project had different contents and former Members might have proposed to take forward projects in other constituencies due to various reasons. Hence, she considered it difficult to draw clear boundaries for current term follow up proponents of cross-constituency projects, such as requiring that successors of original proponents or local DC Members of the constituencies concerned become Members to follow up on projects in question. She recommended that Members consider first drawing up general principles such as successors of original proponents and local DC Members of the constituencies concerned would consider becoming Members to follow up on projects, and then, subject to circumstances of individual cases, allow them to discuss among themselves difficulties of following up on projects and decide who would become Members to follow up

on projects.

69. Mr. LAU Yung-wai raised the following views:

- (i) Incumbent Members could shelve projects put forward by former DC Members. He cited his personal experience as an example that he had during his tenure in the last DC term shelved a project proposed by predecessor DC Member owing to the project costs' being too high.
- (ii) There had been no comprehensive system in the last DC term to determine who would be the Member to follow up on projects. He cited Project Item (3) "TP-DMW211 Provision of sitting-out area outside Tai Po Sports Ground, Tai Po Tau Road, Tai Po" as an example, which had been proposed by former Member of Old Market & Serenity Constituency. During the tenure of last term DC, the two original proponents of the project no longer served in TPDC. The then local DC Member Mr. Patrick TANG had been responsible for following up on the said project without being included among other Members to follow up on the project. He found such arrangement unreasonable and therefore agreed that DFMC should set up a comprehensive mechanism to determine who could follow up on relevant projects.
- (iii) While the predecessor Member no longer served in current term DC and constituency boundary maps had been re-drawn, he opined that local DC Members should follow up on projects in their respective constituencies and become the principal Members to follow up on projects. While local DC Members were supposed to take into consideration wishes of residents in their constituencies, they should also have the power to shelve projects in their constituencies.

70. Mr. AU Chun-wah said that pursuant to the practice of last term DFMC, should the proponent of an approved project no longer serve in the current term DC, the project would be followed up on by other proponents. Should the project concerned have no other proponents, DFMC would decide who would be responsible for following up on the project. Any DC Members, including ex officio Members, who proposed cross-constituency projects were required to first seek consent of local DC Members of the constituencies concerned before official implementation.

71. Mr. TAM Yi-pui opined that the most important thing was not who the Member to follow up on the project was, but that Members should respect opinions of residents to ensure that projects were implemented according to residents' wishes. He quoted various examples such as the proposal of a former Member of Eastern DC to provide planters next to a highway, or music fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade, and pointed out that should there be diverging

opinions between former and incumbent Members, it should be left to residents of the district to decide whether the project should proceed or be shelved. Hence, he opined that DC Members and government departments should take forward project according to residents' wishes.

72. Mr. Richard CHAN said he agreed that DFMC should draw up general principles to clarify current term arrangements regarding Members to follow up on projects. He was of the view that projects should be followed up on by local DC Members of the constituencies concerned. He cited Project Item (23) "TP-DMW270 Provision of shelters at Po Nga Road connecting Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po" as an example, of which the original proponent was Mr. CHAN Cho-leung, while the project site was located within the constituency of Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai (P14 Po Nga). Since residents of his constituency (P13 Lam Tsuen Valley) also used the said bus-stop, the project would have an impact on residents in Lam Tsuen Valley Constituency. He had conducted an on-site inspection earlier on to learn the progress of the trial pit works. Nonetheless, he opined that the principal Member to follow on this project should be the local DC Member of the constituency concerned (Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai). Should other Members have other views on the project, they would be duty bound to persuade Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai and have the implementation of the project led by the local DC Member of the constituency concerned.

73. The Chairman said that to sum up Members' opinions above, local DC Members of the constituencies concerned could for sure follow up on projects, while successors of the original proponents could follow up on projects too. In addition, both parties would need to negotiate in accordance with residents' wishes and bear relevant responsibilities and consequences.

74. Mr. KWAN Wing-yip indicated he agreed that projects should be followed up on by local DC Members of the constituencies concerned. Should there be diverging opinions between local DC Members and successors of the original proponents, relevant matters should be openly discussed at and decided by DFMC. As regards projects which involved ex officio Members, such as Project Item (33) "TP-DMW233 Improvement works of footbridge at Ma Kwu Lam, Sai Kung North, Tai Po", while the constituency of TPRC Chairman was villages in Tai Po, he considered such arrangement unfair if only local DC Members could decide on the arrangements of projects. Hence, he opined that the aforementioned matter should be referred to DFMC for discussion and handling. Besides, some projects were close to completion and government departments were of the view that the impact would be very far-reaching should relevant projects be shelved. He opined that such cases should also be referred to DFMC for discussion and resolution, while it should also be discussed as to whether it was necessary to spend more resources to shelve projects.

75. The Chairman said that he agreed to have relevant matters referred to DFMC for discussion and final decision should there be diverging views between local DC Members of

the constituencies concerned and successors of the original proponents.

76. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai cited Project Item (23) “TP-DMW270 Provision of shelters at Po Nga Road connecting Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po” as an example that while Tai Wo was a traffic hub of Tai Po District, should other DC Members, including ex officio Members, propose to take forward projects in Tai Wo, members of the public who would benefit therefrom might also include residents of other constituencies and various departments or groups might be involved too. Hence, he opined that successor of the original proponent could continue following up on the project and become the principal Member to follow up on the project, while local DC Member of the constituency concerned could also follow up on relevant project and become one of the other Members to follow up on the project together. Hence, he respected the views of the successor of the original proponent that local DC Member of the constituency concerned did not necessarily have to become the principal Member to follow up on the project.

77. Mr. LAU Yung-wai raised the following views:

- (i) He concurred with the views of the Chairman and Mr. KWAN Wing-yip put forward above. Should there be diverging views between local DC Members of the constituencies concerned and successors of original proponents, or any problems when projects were being taken forward, such matters should be referred to DFMC for arbitration. He also opined that it was relatively rare for the said situations to occur.
- (ii) He recommended that lead departments and project proponents send relevant information about the projects to all Members to follow up on the projects, local DC Members of the constituencies concerned, successors of original proponents and other proponents. He cited Project Item (3) “TP-DMW211 Provision of sitting-out area outside Tai Po Sports Ground, Tai Po Tau Road, Tai Po” and Project Item (12) “TP-DMW241 Provision of sitting-out area at San Wa On Lane, Tai Po Tau, Tai Po” as examples and indicated that he had so far not received project information from lead departments or works agents. He had once requested an on-site inspection but relevant departments had not made any arrangement.
- (iii) He believed that there might not be many opinion disputes over projects among incumbent Members. However, should there be some Members with different political ideas who would in the future join TPDC, he hoped that lead departments or works agents would disseminate project information to follow up Members of all projects in a fair manner.

78. Ms. Eunice CHAN advised that the project of music fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade which Mr. TAM Yi-pui had mentioned just now was a project under the Signature Project

Scheme and not a DMW project.

79. The Chairman indicated that DFMC endorsed the following arrangements for current term Members to follow up on DMW projects, and requested that lead departments contact current term follow up Members in accordance with the following principles to continue taking forward relevant projects:

- (i) Local DC Members of the constituencies concerned would become current term follow up Members of projects;
- (ii) Successors of original proponents also had the right to continue following up on projects; and
- (iii) Should there be diverging views between local DC Members of the constituencies concerned and successors of original proponents, such matters should be referred to DFMC for arbitration and decision.

(II) Position of the District Minor Works Funds and Progress Report on the Approved District Minor Works Projects

80. The Chairmen requested that Members note the position of the District Minor Works Funds and the Progress Report on the Approved District Minor Works Projects. He advised that the DFMC currently had an approved project estimates of \$85.95 million. He asked the representatives of the term consultant, the Tai Po District Office (“TPDO”) and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”) to report the progress of approved District Minor Works (“DMW”) projects. He welcomed Senior Architect Mr. Ryan MAK, Architects Mr. Boris CHU and Mr. CHOY Cheong-kin, Assistant Architects Mr. David TAM and Mr. Henry HO of Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited to the meeting for the discussion of this item.

(A) DMW projects with the term consultant Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited as works agent

(Items (1) to (26) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 4/2020)

81. Mr. Boris CHU reported the progress of projects as follows:

- (i) Project Item (1) “TP-DMW195 Provision of children's playground and elderly sitting-out area near the open space of Tai Po Centre Block 10 and 19, On Pong Road, Tai Po”: LCSD, Home Affairs Department (“HAD”) (Works Section), term consultant and ArchSD and so on had already held an advance handover

meeting on 22 April 2020. The term consultant currently carried out the remaining works which had not been finished and the project was expected to complete in Q2 in 2020.

- (ii) Project Item (2) “TP-DMW209 Provision of recreational and sports facilities near Ting Nga Court, Ting Kok Road, Tai Po”: the term consultant currently consulted Water Supplies Department (“WSD”) to clarify about responsibility to repair and maintain water pipes, now awaiting WSD’s reply.
- (iii) Project Item (3) “TP-DMW211 Provision of sitting-out area outside Tai Po Sports Ground, Tai Po Tau Road, Tai Po”: works had commenced on 11 October 2019 and construction was currently underway.
- (iv) Project Item (4) “TP-DMW215 Construction of covered walkway at Tai Po Tai Wo Road connecting footbridge NF97”: works had already commenced on 13 December 2019. The term consultant would submit vehicular flow reports to Transport Department (“TD”). At the present stage, TD (Road Traffic Unit) and Hong Kong Police Force (“HKPF”) carried out approval process of excavation permit application. Upon completion of the approval process, construction was expected to commence officially at the site in mid-May 2020.
- (v) Project Item (5) “TP-DMW227 Provision of sitting-out area and children’s playground at Nai Chung, Tai Po”: the term consultant had already received on 11 December 2019 relevant information about sewage pumping station facilities which Drainage Services Department (“DSD”) had proposed to build on the seaside vacant site at Nai Chung. The said facilities had an impact on the overall layout of the sitting-out area and the earlier site allocation application. The term consultant had replied to DSD on 29 January 2020 while DSD had also indicated that it had already cancelled the plan to construct sewage pumping station facilities. Sanfield-Gammon Construction Joint Venture Limited had indicated in its reply on 23 April 2020 that it would complete the bus-stop works on 29 April 2020. The term consultant was awaiting approval of the land grant application from TPDLO.
- (vi) Project Item (6) “TP-DMW228 Provision of rainshelters at Classical Gardens and Kam Shek New Village, Tai Po”: works had already commenced on 2 October 2019. The original proponent had put forward revision on 19 September 2019 to suggest that back panels be provided to rainshelters at Kam Shek New Village and rainshields be installed on both sides of the benches. HAD (Works Section) and the term consultant had indicated in their reply on 10 December 2019 that upon DFMC’s endorsement of the feasibility study report of this project, the term consultant had already asked the contractor to construct the rainshelters according to the design originally proposed in the feasibility study report. Addition of back panels and rainshields on both sides at this

stage would increase the project costs and affect the progress, it was therefore not advisable to revise the original design in the feasibility study report. TPDO had already arranged for the term consultant to have an on-site inspection with current term follow up Members on 10 January 2020 and brief Members on this project. Current term follow up Members had on 13 January 2020 requested that the backrests which had originally been proposed to be provided under the rainshelter works in Ma Wo be removed and the works were currently underway. Installation of rainshelter next to the minibus-stop of Kam Shek New Village had already completed and the term consultant currently carried out inspection procedures. The whole project was expected to complete in Q2 in 2020.

- (vii) Project Item (7) “TP-DMW230 Construction of Rain Shelter at Po Nga Road near Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po”: TPDLO had on 28 January 2020 granted an excavation permit on 28 January 2020 and excavation works had been carried out on 17 February 2020. The term consultant had completed the works to construct the rain shelter at this stage, pending inspection procedures. The whole project was expected to complete in Q2 in 2020.
- (viii) Project Item (8) “TP-DMW238 Provision of rainshelters at Tai Po Kau Constituency (Mayfair By The Sea, Wong Yi Au, Ta Tit Yan and Cheung Shue Tan)”: tender exercise had already been carried out for the project on 24 January 2020 and tenders were returned on 20 March 2020. TPDO had already briefed current term follow up Members on the project and would arrange for the term consultant to have an on-site inspection with current term follow up Members shortly to give Members an overview of this project.
- (ix) Project Item (9) “TP-DMW240 Extension construction works of existing covered walkway at Nga Wan Road near Uptown Plaza, Tai Po”: The term consultant currently prepared tendering documents and tender invitation of the project was expected to take place in Q2 in 2020.

82. Ms. Lisa YIP supplemented in connection with Project Item (9) “TP-DMW240 Extension construction works of existing covered walkway at Nga Wan Road near Uptown Plaza, Tai Po” that DFMC had endorsed at its meeting on 10 May 2018 the funding allocation of \$1.25 million for the advance work. The preliminary estimated construction cost for the whole project was \$7.1 million, including the cost for installing a lighting system. DFMC had subsequently endorsed at its meeting on 14 March 2019 the feasibility study report submitted by the term consultant and decided that it was not necessary to install any lighting system. The revised estimated construction cost was \$6.6 million. The latest revised construction cost provided by the term consultant on 8 April 2020 was \$3,035,000.

83. Mr. CHOY Cheong-kin reported the progress of projects as follows:

- (i) Project Item (10) “TP-DMW231 Provision of sitting-out area at CARE Village, Tai Po”: The term consultant currently carried out consultation and detailed design. Tender invitation was expected to take place in Q3 in 2020.
- (ii) Project Item (11) “TP-DMW232 Provision of sitting-out area at Po Sam Pai, Tai Po” and Project Item (12) “TP-DMW241 Provision of sitting-out area at San Wa On Lane, Tai Po Tau, Tai Po”: The term consultant currently carried out consultation and detailed design. Tender invitation was expected to take place in Q3 in 2020. Trial pit works had also commenced in April 2020 already.
- (iii) Project Item (13) “TP-DMW242 Provision of sitting-out area at San Uk Tsai, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po”: The term consultant at present carried out tree assessment and drafted the feasibility study report.
- (iv) Project Item (14) “TP-DMW252 Provision of Rainshelters in Tai Po Kau Constituency (Chong San Road, Deerhill Bay and Chung Tsai Yuen Lookout)” and Project Item (15) “TP-DMW253 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Hang House, Wan Tau Tong Estate at Tat Wan Road, Tai Po”: The term consultant currently carried out consultation and detailed design. Tender invitation was expected to take place in Q3 in 2020.
- (v) Project Item (16) “TP-DMW255 Provision of covered walkway at Tai Po Road Yuen Chau Tsai section near Kwong Fuk Estate, Tai Po”: The term consultant had already completed the report on trial pit works in December 2019. The initial study had indicated that it might be technically feasible only in parts of the selected site.
- (vi) Project Item (17) “TP-DMW256 Provision of sitting-out area at Tseng Tau, Sai Sha Road, Sai Kung North, Tai Po”: The term consultant currently carried out consultation and detailed design. Tender invitation was expected to take place in Q4 in 2020.
- (vii) Project Item (18) “TP-DMW260 Provision of shelter at Nam Wan Road near NF132 footbridge, Tai Po”: The term consultant currently carried out consultation and detailed design. Tender invitation was expected to take place between late Q3 and early Q4 in 2020. The term consultant had already submitted a tree felling or transplanting report in end of February 2020 to LCSD for approval, now awaiting LCSD’s reply.
- (viii) Project Item (19) “TP-DMW262 Provision of sitting-out area at San Tau Kok, Tai Po”, Project Item (20) “TP-DMW263 Provision of fitness equipment and elderly facilities near the morning trail at Wan Tau Tong, Tai Po” and Project Item (21) “TP-DMW264 Provision of elderly fitness equipment near Hing Wo House, Po Nga Court, Tai Po”: Tree and topographical survey report had already completed in November 2019. The term consultant currently conducted the feasibility study and drafted the tree felling or transplanting proposal.

- (ix) Project Item (22) “TP-DMW266 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Tau Tong Estate at Fung Wan Road, Tai Po” and Project Item (23) “TP-DMW270 Provision of shelters at Po Nga Road connecting Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po”: The term consultant had already arranged for the contractor to carry out trial pit works in December 2019. TPDO had already arranged an on-site inspection for current term follow up Members and given Members an overview of this project. The term consultant had completed in January 2020 relevant trial pit works report and the preliminary study indicated that it was feasible.
- (x) Project Item (24) “TP-DMW276 Construction of Taxi Stand and waiting facilities at Chung Nga Road, Tai Po”: The term consultant had already arranged for the contractor to carry out trial pit works in January 2020 and conducted an on-site inspection with current term follow up Members to explain the incident of discovering high voltage cable ducts when carrying out trial pit works and give an overview of underground facilities in the vicinity of the site. Should the high voltage cables need to be relocated, residents in the neighbourhood might be affected.

84. Ms. Lisa YIP supplemented in connection with Project Item (24) “TP-DMW276 Construction of Taxi Stand and waiting facilities at Chung Nga Road, Tai Po” that Highways Department (“HyD”) had updated in March 2020 the progress of works to provide a taxi stand that the said works were expected to commence in Q2 in 2020 and complete in Q3 in the same year. Current term follow up Members had indicated during the on-site inspection at the location of the shelter works with TPDO and the term consultant on 16 January 2020 that residents in the neighbourhood at present usually waited for taxis at the entrance of Fu Heng Estate. Besides, follow up Members were also concerned as to whether illegal parking on the road section would aggravate upon completion of the taxi stand, and indicated that they would decide after careful consideration as to whether or not continue taking forward the project to provide a taxi stand. Once follow up Members replied, TPDO would forward their decision to HyD for follow up.

85. Mr. CHOY Cheong-kin proceeded to report the progress of the following projects:

- (i) Project Item (25) “TP-DMW295 Provision of a sitting-out area at Pak Shek Kok”: The term consultant currently carried out the feasibility study and sought views from relevant departments on the project.
- (ii) Project Item (26) “TP-DMW296 Provision of a sitting-out area at Cheung Muk Tau Village”: The term consultant currently conducted the feasibility study and sought views from relevant departments on the project, while carrying out tree and topographical surveys.

86. Mr. AU Chun-wah, proponent of Project Item (1) “TP-DMW195 Provision of children’s playground and elderly sitting-out area near the open space of Tai Po Centre Block 10 and 19, On Pong Road, Tai Po”, indicated that the advance handover meeting had already completed. He hoped that relevant departments could provide him more information and enquired about arrangement of the project after Q2 in 2020.

87. Mr. LAU Yung-wai, follow up Member of Project Item (12) “TP-DMW241 Provision of sitting-out area at San Wa On Lane, Tai Po Tau, Tai Po”, indicated that relevant departments had not sought views from him yet. He had contacted relevant departments in December 2019 and requested that relevant departments provide him information but the departments had not contacted him so far, while trial pit works would commence shortly. Hence, he opined that relevant departments did not respect his opinions and requested that departments arrange for an on-site inspection with him as quickly as possible before relevant trial pit works would commence.

88. Ms. Susana CHAN responded that the term consultant was the works agent of Project Item (12) while LCSD was the lead department of the project. The term consultant was responsible for studying underground facilities and drainage at the project site and consulting TD or other relevant departments. The term consultant would report results concerned to the lead department LCSD while LCSD was responsible for consulting DC Members.

89. Mr. LAU Yung-wai indicated as regards Project Item (12) that he had enquired about the project design as early as in end of 2019, he asked why the lead department LCSD had not contacted him.

90. Mr. Eddie CHAN responded that LCSD would arrange for an on-site inspection with Mr. LAU Yung-wai as soon as possible and the term consultant would explain the design and progress of the project.

91. The Chairman requested that the lead department LCSD contact Mr. LAU Yung-wai as soon as possible and follow up on Project Item (12).

92. Mr. TAM Yi-pui raised the following views:

- (i) Project Item (5) “TP-DMW227 Provision of sitting-out area and children’s playground at Nai Chung, Tai Po”: He had opinions on this project. DSD had planned to construct a sewage pumping station at the project site concerned and he considered relevant facilities of utmost importance while residents in the area also opined that priority should be accorded to construction of sewage pumping station. Sewage pumping stations had already been built in Lam Tsuen, Shuen Wan and so on, he was therefore of the view that a sewage pumping station was

required in Sai Kung North too and was more important than building a sitting-out area. Moreover, the proposed project site was located far away from residential area and the construction cost was high. Hence, he said it might be more suitable to construct a sitting-out area on the lawn between Villa Rhapsody and Sai O Tsuen. He hoped that LCSD would communicate with DSD as soon as possible and seek view from DSD as to whether or not the said site was suitable for building a sewage pumping station.

- (ii) Project Item (17) “TP-DMW256 Provision of sitting-out area at Tseng Tau, Sai Sha Road, Sai Kung North, Tai Po”: He supported this project.
- (iii) Project Item (26) “TP-DMW296 Provision of a sitting-out area at Cheung Muk Tau Village”: Villagers of Cheung Muk Tau had indicated that a sitting-out area would need to be provided at the project site to serve the public. He also supported taking forward this project.
- (iv) Project Item (33) “TP-DMW233 Improvement works of footbridge at Ma Kwu Lam, Sai Kung North, Tai Po”: Both the village head and the villagers supported taking forward this project and he also agreed to have the project taken forward further.

93. Mr. Eddie CHAN responded as follows:

- (i) Project Item (1) “TP-DMW195 Provision of children’s playground and elderly sitting-out area near the open space of Tai Po Centre Block 10 and 19, On Pong Road, Tai Po”: The advance handover meeting had already completed and the final repairs were underway. LCSD would follow up as to whether the playground met the requirements for opening and would conduct an on-site inspection with Mr. AU Chun-wah shortly to seek his views. It was hoped that the playground could be opened for public use as soon as possible.
- (ii) Project Item (5) “TP-DMW227 Provision of sitting-out area and children’s playground at Nai Chung, Tai Po”: LCSD had once sought views from DSD on the viability of taking forward the project at the site concerned. Based on the development of the said area and matters related to sewage pumping station, DSD had put forward opinions in connection with the project. DSD’s preliminary reply indicated that LCSD could continue taking forward the project at the said site and LCSD would keep following up on the aforementioned matter with DSD and maintain close contact with Mr. TAM Yi-pui.

94. Mr. TAM Yi-pui said in connection with Project Item (5) “TP-DMW227 Provision of sitting-out area and children’s playground at Nai Chung, Tai Po” that the OC and residents of Villa Rhapsody were very concerned about matters relating to the sewage pumping station. Hence, he requested that LCSD follow up on the issue as soon as possible.

95. Mr. YIU Kwan-ho raised the following views:

- (i) Project Item (8) “TP-DMW238 Provision of rainshelters at Tai Po Kau Constituency (Mayfair By The Sea, Wong Yi Au, Ta Tit Yan and Cheung Shue Tan)” and Project Item (14) “TP-DMW252 Provision of Rainshelters in Tai Po Kau Constituency (Chong San Road, Deerhill Bay and Chung Tsai Yuen Lookout)”: He had no comment on the projects. He would follow up on the projects together with Mr. Patrick MO and requested that relevant departments visit the sites with them to understand the sites of the projects and the impact being brought forth.
- (ii) Project Item (16) “TP-DMW255 Provision of covered walkway at Tai Po Road Yuen Chau Tsai section near Kwong Fuk Estate, Tai Po”: He wished to have an on-site inspection and gain some understanding about the project.
- (iii) Project Item (25) “TP-DMW295 Provision of a sitting-out area at Pak Shek Kok”: He considered the construction cost of the project too high to spend \$9.4 million on building a 20m x 20m park with only a few facilities. He preliminarily recommended that stone stairs be constructed to cover the nullah at the site and an open park be built. Moreover, since he would make a decision after an on-site inspection, he requested that relevant departments suspend the implementation of this project.

96. Mr. Richard CHAN raised the following views:

- (i) Project Item (12) “TP-DMW241 Provision of sitting-out area at San Wa On Lane, Tai Po Tau, Tai Po”: The term consultant had recorded in the progress summary of Project Item (12) that “term consultant currently carried out consultation and detailed design.....” while it was stated in the progress summary of Project Item (26) “TP-DMW296 Provision of a sitting-out area at Cheung Muk Tau Village” that “term consultant currently consulted relevant departments on the project.....”. He opined that wordings used in the progress summary of Project Item (12) were misleading and might make Members think that the term consultant currently sought views from all stakeholders while it in fact consulted only government departments. He suggested that the term consultant amend the wordings used in the progress summaries of projects.
- (ii) Project Item (23) “TP-DMW270 Provision of shelters at Po Nga Road connecting Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po”: Works to build a shelter at Tai Wo bus-stop near McDonald were underway and the said shelter overlapped with the original shelter of the bus-stop, whereas the proposed shelter under Project Item (23) did

not connect to the original shelter. Hence, rainwater might drip from the gap between the two shelters and the effect of blocking rainwater could not be achieved. He recommended that the shelter under Project Item (23) emulate the one of Tai Wo bus-stop such that the shelter could have rain blocking effect.

97. Mr. MAN Nim-chi, current term follow up Member of Project Item (24) “TP-DMW276 Construction of Taxi Stand and waiting facilities at Chung Nga Road, Tai Po”, indicated that according to residents’ opinions, the journey of most residents who took taxis in the morning was in the direction towards Tai Wo bus-stop via Ting Lai Road and residents changed to other means of transportation when they arrived at Tai Wo. Hence, residents would not make an extra trip to the proposed new taxi stand to wait for taxis. Besides, trees would need to be felled for the construction of taxi stand at the said location which might also aggravate the problem of illegal parking there. He was of the view that public opinion would need to be respected when implementing projects and therefore decided to shelve the project of constructing a taxi stand.

98. Ms. Lisa YIP responded in connection with Project Item (24) “TP-DMW276 Construction of Taxi Stand and waiting facilities at Chung Nga Road, Tai Po” that TPDO would relay to HyD Mr. MAN Nim-chi’s decision to shelve the construction of a taxi stand. As regards the project to provide a cover to the walkway, it was anticipated that the term consultant would submit the feasibility study report at the meeting of Working Group on District Works (“WGDW”) in June 2020.

99. Mr. Eddie CHAN responded regarding Project Item (25) “TP-DMW295 Provision of a sitting-out area at Pak Shek Kok” that LCSD noted Mr. YIU Kwan-ho’s views and would contact him for an on-site inspection shortly.

100. Ms. Susana CHAN responded in connection with Project Item (23) “TP-DMW270 Provision of shelters at Po Nga Road connecting Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po” that HAD had been concerned about the problem of rain-blocking effect mentioned by Mr. Richard CHAN too, and had communicated with Link Real Estate Investment Trust (“Link REIT”). While relevant site was not a government site and the term consultant could build a shelter only within the area of a government site, the proposed shelter of the walkway could therefore not be connected to the existing shelter of Link REIT. Besides, as far as progress summary was concerned, the term consultant would amend and standardise the wordings. The term consultant was responsible for communicating with and consulting government departments, and reporting relevant information to the lead department, but not for communicating with DC Members.

101. Ms. Lisa YIP indicated in connection with Project Item “TP-DMW270 Provision of shelters at Po Nga Road connecting Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po” that TPDO had in end of 2019

already explained to the then DC Member-designate Mr. Richard CHAN that the shelter under this project could not be connected to the existing shelter of Link REIT. Hence, there would be a gap between the two shelters and the rain-blocking effect would not be satisfactory. TPDO and the original proponent Mr. CHAN Cho-leung had negotiated with Link REIT which, however, refused to expand its existing shelter. As such, the shelter could only be constructed on the government site. Mr. CHAN Cho-leung also understood that the rain-blocking effect of the proposed shelter would be unsatisfactory and indicated that he would explain to the residents. At present, trial pit report of the project had completed and it was anticipated that the term consultant could submit the feasibility study report at the WGDW meeting in June 2020 and discussion of project details between the term consultant and Mr. Richard CHAN would be arranged in advance to consider if the project would be taken forward further. As regards Project Item (7) “TP-DMW230 Construction of Rain Shelter at Po Nga Road near Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po”, since the site concerned did not involve any site of Link REIT, the shelter could overlap with the existing one and there was no gap between the two.

102. Mr. WU Yiu-cheong raised the following views:

- (i) Project Item (6) “TP-DMW228 Provision of rainshelters at Classical Gardens and Kam Shek New Village, Tai Po”: Owing to the presence of a water main beneath the project site, corresponding foundation works were required while relevant measures would need to be drawn up to avoid affecting the said water main, progress of the project was delayed as a result. He enquired about the progress of relevant foundation works. Besides, the construction cost of the project as a whole was \$3.2 million, of which only \$30,000 was for the trial pit works. Since the scope of the trial pit works was too small, the water main beneath the project site had therefore not been detected and the whole project was affected. He considered the aforementioned arrangement unreasonable.
- (ii) Project Item (22) “TP-DMW266 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Tau Tong Estate at Fung Wan Road, Tai Po”: Since quite a lot of residents of his constituency would use the facility concerned, he was willing to act as current term follow up Member for this project. However, given the relatively high costs of the project, he requested that relevant departments conduct an on-site inspection with him and the local DC Member of the constituency concerned as soon as possible, such that he could gain some understanding about the project.

103. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai raised the following views:

- (i) Project Item (7) “TP-DMW230 Construction of Rain Shelter at Po Nga Road near Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po”: The project had substantially completed. Residents currently waited for minibuses at the minibus stop at the project site

where space was rather limited. He had therefore proposed this project at that time. TPDO would arrange for an on-site inspection and acceptance with him. He had also requested that TPDO invite representatives of TD and operators of minibus routes 21k, 25a, 25b and 25k to the site to discuss locations of relevant bus- and minibus-stops. He also recommended that Mr. Richard CHAN and Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang be invited to the on-site inspection.

- (ii) Project Item (21) “TP-DMW264 Provision of elderly fitness equipment near Hing Wo House, Po Nga Court, Tai Po”: There were several chess tables at the project site where some members of the public had long been gathering there to gamble. He had requested earlier that HKPF and Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (“FEHD”) take enforcement actions there, but the problem had not been eradicated. He understood that it took time to take forward relevant works while the term consultant currently prepared the feasibility study report. He recommended that relevant departments first tackle the problem of illegal gambling at the said site. Besides, adjacent to the project site, there was a vacant site enclosed by iron wire, of which the environmental hygiene was in an extremely poor condition. However, FEHD and TPDLO had not dealt with the hygiene problem there regularly. Hence, he enquired if the said vacant site could be included in the scope of this project so that relevant problems could be handled too.

104. The Vice-chairman, current term follow up Member of Project Item (16) “TP-DMW255 Provision of covered walkway at Tai Po Road Yuen Chau Tsai section near Kwong Fuk Estate, Tai Po”, indicated that the coverage of the said walkway, which spanned from Kwong Fuk Estate Yuen Chau Tsai section bus-stop to the subway there, was rather large. He opined that the project, though achieving a full rain-blocking effect, might have an impact on the environment perception there. Hence, he concurred with Mr. YIU Kwan-ho’s opinion and hoped that an on-site inspection at the project site could be conducted to facilitate his understanding of the concept of the project.

105. Ms. Lisa YIP responded as follows:

- (i) Project Item (7) “TP-DMW230 Construction of Rain Shelter at Po Nga Road near Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po”: TPDO would invite Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai, Mr. Richard CHAN, Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang and TD to an on-site inspection while TD would invite relevant minibus operators to the on-site inspection too.
- (ii) Project Item (22) “TP-DMW266 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Tau Tong Estate at Fung Wan Road, Tai Po”: TPDO noted that Mr. WU Yiu-cheong also wished to become a follow up Member of this project. The term consultant had already submitted the trial pit report to HAD (Works Section) for follow up

but the report was written in English. As per previous practice, should a trial pit report indicate that a project was infeasible due to various reasons, TPDO would request that the term consultant provide a Chinese version of the trial pit report for follow up Members' reference. TPDO would in the future forward the project's information and progress to Mr. WU Yiu-cheong for reference and record.

106. Ms. Susana CHAN responded in connection with Project Item (16) "TP-DMW255 Provision of covered walkway at Tai Po Road Yuen Chau Tsai section near Kwong Fuk Estate, Tai Po" that HAD (Works Section) had all along followed up on this project with HyD and relevant departments and conducted feasibility study. The elevator at the said site might need to be suspended from service for some time to facilitate the implementation of the project. HAD would be happy to have an on-site inspection with DC Members and TPDO.

107. Mr. CHEN Wai-kuen responded in connection with Project Item (21) "TP-DMW264 Provision of elderly fitness equipment near Hing Wo House, Po Nga Court, Tai Po" that TPDLO had received earlier on environmental hygiene related complaints concerning the government site enclosed by iron wire near the project site and currently followed up on relevant matters. He would contact Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: Contractor of TPDLO had completed the clearing up of the said enclosed government site on 5 June 2020.)

108. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai, proponent of Project Item (21), recommended that LCSD conduct an on-site inspection with TPDLO and relevant contractors, and hoped that the project could be implemented as soon as possible.

109. Mr. Boris CHU responded in connection with Project Item (6) "TP-DMW228 Provision of rainshelters at Classical Gardens and Kam Shek New Village, Tai Po" that the project had substantially completed and the term consultant currently performed inspection works and would arrange for a handover on-site with Mr. WU Yiu-cheong shortly. Besides, the term consultant had to carry out trial pit works in accordance with established procedures and engage contractors to perform relevant trial pit works, while large-scale trial pit works would not be conducted at construction sites which were relatively small. As regards the issue about the underground water main at the project site, the term consultant had in 2018 carried out trial pit works and the water main concerned had not existed at that time. Not until implementation of the project in 2020 had the term consultant realised the existence of an underground water main beneath the project site. Hence, the term consultant had requested that WSD provide relevant drawings and found out that WSD had laid the said water main in 2020 but relevant works had already completed.

110. Mr. WU Yiu-cheong indicated that the term consultant's remarks above deviated from the explanation given earlier during the on-site inspection. What they had said earlier was that the drawings WSD had provided were different from the actual situation. Hence, he hoped that there would be another on-site inspection with the term consultant and that the term consultant would have more prior communication with relevant departments and private companies so as to avoid having progress of projects affected by underground facilities.

111. Members noted the above report.

(B) DMW projects reported by the TPDO

(Items (27) to (74) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 4/2020)

112. Mr. LAU Chun-ming gave supplementary remarks to the following projects:

- (i) Project Item (27) "TP-DMW079 Provision of access road and drainage from Tai Hang Au Tsai to San Wai, Tai Po": The Works Section currently conducted topographical survey and tree assessment to facilitate engineering design.
- (ii) Project Item (31) "TP-DMW216 Improvement of existing rainshelters cum sitting benches near Sung Tak Wong Kin Sheung Memorial School, Tai Po": Works had already commenced on 9 April 2020 and were expected to complete in August 2020.
- (iii) Project Item (32) "TP-DMW226 Provision of footpath and lay-by at Tung Tsz Road, Tai Po": Works had already commenced on 5 December 2019 and were expected to complete in August 2020.
- (iv) Project Item (33) "TP-DMW233 Improvement works of footbridge at Ma Kwu Lam, Sai Kung North, Tai Po": Works had already commenced on 3 December 2019 and were expected to complete in July 2020.
- (v) Project Item (51) "TP-DMW283 Maintenance and improvement of facilities under Tai Po District Council Minor Works Programmes (2019-20)": Works had already commenced on 23 October 2019. The cost of the maintenance and improvement works currently underway was approximately \$2.3 million.

113. The Vice-chairman, current term follow up Member of Project Item (31) "TP-DMW216 Improvement of existing rainshelters cum sitting benches near Sung Tak Wong Kin Sheung Memorial School, Tai Po", indicated that he wished to have an on-site inspection despite the fact that the project had already commenced.

114. Mr. Richard CHAN said that many projects involved construction of rain shelters and pavilions which, however, were not equipped with any lighting system. He understood that

provision of lighting systems would involve the issue of power supply. Nevertheless, solar energy lighting systems were very common nowadays and installation was easy and not expensive. Hence, he recommended that the Works Section provide solar energy lighting systems next to rain shelters and pavilions for convenience of the public.

115. Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang raised the following views:

- (i) Project Item (27) “TP-DMW079 Provision of access road and drainage from Tai Hang Au Tsai to San Wai, Tai Po”: The former DC Member had in the year 2009/10 proposed this project, he asked why it had not commenced until now.
- (ii) Project Item (40) “Improvement to existing walking trail at Pinehill, Tai Po” and Project Item (45) “TP-DMW267 Improvement works of Wilson Trail Section 8 (near Hong Lok Yuen), Tai Po”: He wished to have on-site inspections with the department.
- (iii) Project Item (48) “TP-DMW284 Provision of systematic letter boxes in Tai Po District (2018-19)”: He wished to have an on-site inspection with the department. Besides, due to the absence of street lamps at some locations within his constituency and such locations were poorly illuminated, he concurred with Mr. Richard CHAN’s view and hoped that solar energy lighting systems could be provided next to the systematic letter boxes.

116. Mr. SO Wing-kai responded as follows:

- (i) In response to the arrangement for the change of terms of TPDC, follow up Members of some projects might change. Hence, the Works Section would carry out on-site inspections with current term follow up Members. Should Members wish to have on-site inspections arranged by the Works Section to understand the contents of projects proposed by Members of the previous term, they were welcome to contact the Works Section.
- (ii) As regards the suggestion to provide solar energy lighting systems next to rain shelters and letter boxes, lighting systems were not included in the scope of relevant projects. Despite the fact that solar energy lighting systems were very well developed nowadays and provided convenience to the public, the Works Section would need to consider if the locations of relevant rain shelters and letter boxes were suitable for installation of solar energy lighting systems, and examine if lasting and sufficient light was available at such locations to support power generation by solar panels. The Works Section currently considered looking for suitable locations and launching a pilot scheme on installing solar energy lighting.

117. Mr. Richard CHAN enquired about the Works Section's timetable for launching the pilot scheme on installing solar energy lighting such that he could communicate with residents.

118. Mr. SO Wing-kai responded as follows:

- (i) The Works Section had received a DC Member's proposal to provide solar energy lighting system near some letter boxes earlier on. The Works Section would first provide a solar energy lighting system there and carry out the pilot scheme.
- (ii) Project Item (27) "TP-DMW079 Provision of access road and drainage from Tai Hang Au Tsai to San Wai, Tai Po": After the former DC Member had proposed relevant project in the year 2009/10, government departments had carried out cycling track works at the said site. Hence, the Works Section had been unable to take forward this project at that time. Given that the cycle track works had completed, the Works Section could start taking forward the project now.

119. Mr. TAM Yi-pui raised the following views:

- (i) He concurred with the proposal of Mr. Richard CHAN and Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang to provide solar energy lighting systems, and recommended that solar energy fans and mosquito lamps be provided too.
- (ii) Project Item (42) "Improvement to access road near lamp post No. VE4433 to VA7345 at Nga Yiu Tau, Sai Sha Road, Sai Kung North, Tai Po Provision of passing place near lamp post no. EA 8180, Yung Shue O, Shi Sha Road, Sai Kung North, Tai Po": Traffic jams occurred frequently at the entrance to Yung Shue O Village and the project would be conducive to the access of ambulances to the said site, hence, he considered the project very important. He hoped that Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department and the [Country and] Marine Parks Board would give comments on this project as soon as possible. He wished to have an on-site inspection with the village head and villagers as well.
- (iii) Project Item (60) "Provision of pavilion near lamp post no. N2506 at Ko Tong, Sai Kung North, Tai Po Provision of rainshelter near lamp post no. VE8206 at Nai Chung, Sai Kung North, Tai Po": TPDLO had received nine cases of objection earlier, while he himself had also received views against the project. Members of the public considered it a waste of public money to take forward this project. He was of the view that the original proponent of the project would need to communicate with the village head and he did not support continuing to take forward this project either.

- (iv) Project Item (61) “TP-DMW287 Repair of solar lights at Tung Ping Chau and other miscellaneous repair items at Tai Po District”: He supported this project.

120. Ms. Olive CHAN indicated that as regards Project Item (53) “Improvement to access road and drainage channel near lamp post no. AE0656 to VE6907 at Lai Pek Shan San Tsuen, Po Sam Pai, Tai Po”, Project Item (54) “Improvement to drainage channel at Po Sam Pai, Tai Po”, Project Item (55) “Improvement to access road near lamp post no. V4743 to V4741 at A Shan, Tai Po” and Project Item (62) “Improvement to drainage channel at San Tau Kok, Tai Po”, she had so far not conducted any on-site inspection with Mr. SO Tat-leung yet. Hence, she hoped that the Works Section would arrange for on-site inspections with them as soon as possible so that they could gain some understanding about the projects and that the Works Section would carry out relevant trial pit works and tree assessment only after their on-site inspections.

121. The Chairman advised that DFMC endorsed the above report and lead departments would continue to follow up on the projects with proponents or follow up Members.

122. Ms. Lisa YIP gave supplementary remarks to the following projects:

- (i) Project Item (65) “TP-DMW275 Provision of benches at Fu Shin Estate Bus Terminus”: KMB had already completed on 30 September 2019 the works to provide two sets of benches. TPDO had already reported to the proponent and this project would be deleted from subsequent progress summaries of projects.
- (ii) Project Item (67) “Construction of Shelter at Chuen On Road near Tai Po Hospital, Tai Po”: The project scope proposed by the original proponent involved premises of Tai Po Hospital. TPDO had discussed with HAD (Works Section) and representatives of Tai Po Hospital and Tai Po Hospital had at that time promised to construct the shelter within the premises of Tai Po Hospital with the hospital’s resources, while HAD (Works Section) and the term consultant would be responsible for following up on the works to construct shelter outside the premises of Tai Po Hospital and the pre-feasibility study report was completed on 29 July 2019. The estimated construction cost of the overall project was \$2.9 million, of which \$ 461,000 was the advance work fees. TPDO had explained the content of the pre-feasibility study report to the original proponent Mr. YAM Man-chuen. Besides, Mr. YAM Man-chuen had indicated at the WGDW meeting on 26 August 2019 that he would consult residents of the area concerned again and consider the construction cost, and decided to suspend taking forward this project. TPDO had handed the pre-feasibility study report earlier on to Mr. HO Wai-lam for reference and would conduct an on-site inspection with Mr. HO Wai-lam to discuss the project content in detail.

- (iii) Project Item (68) “Provision of rain shelter and benches next to Tai Po Community Centre”: HAD (Works Section) had indicated on 18 March 2020 that according to the plans of underground facilities provided by China Light and Power Company Limited (“CLP”), it was preliminarily estimated that the cables were located near the project site. HAD (Works Section) expected to submit the pre-feasibility study report to WGDW in June 2020 and to apply for funding for advance work to carry out trial pit works to ascertain the location of underground facilities.
- (iv) Project Item (69) “Provision of Rainshelter at Tai Po Tai Wo Road near the lay-by outside Yata Department Store, Tai Po”, Project Item (70) “Improvement Works of Rainshelter at Tai Po Tai Wo Road near Yata Department Store, Tai Po” and Project Item (74) “Replacement Works of Seating Benches at Tai Po Tai Wo Road near Yata Department Store, Tai Po”: TPDO had already arranged for an on-site inspection with HAD (Works Section) and the proponent on 20 March 2020, but the proponent was unable to attend the on-site inspection on that day. TPDO would arrange for an on-site inspection again shortly.
- (v) Project Item (72) “Extension of Construction Works of Existing Covered Walkway at Nam Wan Road near Sun Hing Garden, Tai Po” and Project Item (73) “Provision of Covered Walkway at Nam Wan Road connecting the Lift of Footbridge NF 132, Tai Po”: TPDO had already arranged for an on-site inspection for HAD (Works Section) and the proponent on 20 March 2020. HAD (Works Section) currently followed up relevant projects.
- (vi) TPDO noted that current term follow up Members (including both local DC Members of the constituencies concerned and successors of original proponents) would like to have relevant information of projects for reference. Hence, once HAD (Works Section) and the term consultants submitted pre-feasibility study reports or feasibility study reports to TPDO, TPDO would forward relevant documents to all follow up Members of respective projects, and would arrange for HAD (Works Section) to meet all follow up Members to explain contents of the projects.

123. Mr. HO Wai-lam raised the following views and questions:

- (i) He enquired if the same term consultant was responsible for following up on the projects listed in the progress summary of projects. If not, he recommended that names of various term consultants be listed in the progress summaries of projects for Members’ reference.
- (ii) Project Item (67) “Construction of Shelter at Chuen On Road near Tai Po Hospital, Tai Po”: Construction cost of the project was very high. Comparing with Project Item (22) “TP-DMW266 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Tau

Tong Estate at Fung Wan Road, Tai Po”, construction cost of this project was \$1.1 million more expensive while comparing with Project Item (23) “TP-DMW270 Provision of shelters at Po Nga Road connecting Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po”, the rain shelter under this project was smaller in size but the construction cost was \$300,000 more expensive. Hence, he enquired about the reasons for this project to cost more and whether or not it was because of the materials used for the shelter, location of the project or other reasons.

124. Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang, follow up Member of Project Item (68) “Provision of rain shelter and benches next to Tai Po Community Centre”, indicated that Mr. Nick LAM had been notified by TD that TD would carry out roundabout optimisation works near the project site. Hence, he himself and Mr. Nick LAM currently considered suggesting TD to amend the location of bus-stop there while location of the proposed rain shelter cum benches would need to be amended too. He requested that relevant departments arrange for an on-site inspection. Given the low illumination at the said location, he recommended that a lighting system be provided near the rain shelter too.

125. Mr. Nick LAM, follow up Member of Project Item (68), indicated that TD had provided him design drawings of the roundabout optimisation works, on which he had opinions, while location of bus-stop and minibus-stop there might need to be amended as well to facilitate a smoother traffic flow. Since the rain shelter was primarily built for members of the public waiting for buses, the location of rain shelter cum benches might need to be adjusted too. Hence, he recommended that he himself and Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang first seek views from members of the public and look into the location of the rain shelter only after TD confirmed the roundabout optimisation works.

126. Mr. LAM Yick-kuen, proponent of Project Item (68), indicated that he had had an on-site inspection six months ago and would also like to visit the site with Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang and Mr. Nick LAM to examine this project again and consider amending the location of the rain shelter.

127. The Chairman requested that TPDO arrange for an on-site inspection for the term consultant, TD and relevant Members to gain some understanding about the roundabout optimisation works and to examine if the said optimisation works would affect the rain shelter project before further processing the latter, so as to avoid conflicts between the two projects.

128. Ms. Susana CHAN responded in connection with Project Item (68) that there was some distance between the proposed rain shelter cum benches and the roundabout there. Besides, the term consultant had discovered that there were many CLP cables and underground facilities beneath the project site. Hence, the term consultant might need to carry out trial pit works and detailed study subsequently. She therefore was of the view that underground facilities were a more important factor affecting the project while the term consultant currently

examined if it was feasible to construct a rain shelter there. However, she opined that this project might not be feasible.

129. The Chairman asked Mr. HO Wai-lam if he decided to shelve Project Item (67) “Construction of Shelter at Chuen On Road near Tai Po Hospital, Tai Po”.

130. Mr. HO Wai-lam indicated that the construction cost of Project Item (67) was expensive, he nonetheless would like to listen to responses of departments before making any decision.

131. Ms. Lisa YIP responded as follows:

- (i) Project Item (67) “Construction of Shelter at Chuen On Road near Tai Po Hospital, Tai Po”: She would have an on-site inspection with Mr. HO Wai-lam while HAD (Works Section) would explain how relevant construction costs had been calculated for Mr. HO Wai-lam’s reference.
- (ii) Project Item (68) “Provision of rain shelter and benches next to Tai Po Community Centre”: After Mr. LAM Yick-kuen had proposed the project, TPDO had consulted various government departments including TD which had raised no objection about the project site at that time. Nonetheless, according to the traffic development of the location concerned, TD currently intended to carry out roundabout optimisation works and planned also to remove the bus-stop and taxi stand there. TPDO would contact TD and carry out an on-site inspection with relevant Members.

132. Mr. LAM Yick-kuen, proponent of Project Item (68), indicated that he hoped the term consultant would carry out trial pit works to examine if the project was feasible.

133. Mr. Ryan MAK responded as follows:

- (i) Project Item (67) “Construction of Shelter at Chuen On Road near Tai Po Hospital, Tai Po”: Since the drainage outlet near the construction site was distant from the proposed shelter, an underground water main might need to be constructed or extended to connect the drainage outlet which was far away. Hence, this project to construct shelter cost more than other similar shelter construction projects.
- (ii) Project Item (68) “Provision of rain shelter and benches next to Tai Po Community Centre”: Despite the fact that there were many CLP cables beneath the project site according to relevant drawings, the term consultant could still carry out trial pit works to look into the actual underground facilities in detail to see if they were consistent with relevant drawings.

134. DFMC accepted the report of TPDO.

(C) DMW projects followed up by the Tai Po District Leisure Services Office of the LCSD

(Items (75) to (98) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 4/2020)

135. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan gave supplementary remarks to the following projects:

- (i) Project Item (76) “TP-DMW244 Provision and upgrading of drinking fountain facilities at the recreational and sports venues in Tai Po District”: Installation of drinking fountain facilities at Tai Po Waterfront Park and Tai Po Tau Playground had already completed. LCSD currently awaited WSD’s water testing results. Besides, LCSD was now waiting for WSD’s approval for drinking fountain installation at Tai Wo Sports Centre, Fu Heng Sports Centre and Fu Shin Sports Centre, and followed up with ArchSD and Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (“EMSD”) on matters relating to installation. As regards installation works of drinking fountain facilities at Tai Po Market Sports Centre, ArchSD currently drafted relevant drawings for provision of water pumps.
- (ii) Project Item (78) “TP-DMW269 Improvement works at Ting Tai Road Children’s Playground, Tai Po”: Venue handover of the project had taken place on 15 April 2020. However, owing to the epidemic, the children’s playground had not been opened to public use yet. LCSD would open the facilities to public use in due course once the epidemic slowed down.
- (iii) Project Item (79) “Improvement works at Tai Po Tau Playground”: LCSD had conducted an on-site inspection on 20 March 2020 with the proponent and discussed the updated works outline proposed by the proponent. LCSD currently conducted the feasibility study.
- (iv) Project Item (80) “Provision of elderly fitness equipment at Chuen On Road Garden”: LCSD had contacted Mr. HO Wai-lam earlier on and would have an on-site inspection with him shortly to explain details of the project. Once LCSD’s technical unit confirmed the engineering solution, the project would commence.
- (v) Project Item (93) “Provision of fitness equipment at Kwong Fuk Sitting-out Area”, Project Item (94) “Construction of covered walkway near footbridge outside Kwong Fuk Sitting-out Area connecting Kwong Wang Street”, Project Item (95) “Improvement works at Mui Shue Hang Playground”, Project Item (96) “Provision of sitting benches and arbours at Kwong Fuk Sitting-out Area” and Project Item (98) “Improvement works at Kwong Fuk Bridge Garden”:

LCSD would have on-site inspections with works departments and the proponents shortly to examine if the projects were viable.

136. Mr. Richard CHAN said in connection with Project Item (86) “TP-DMW282 Improvement works at Tai Po Waterfront Park” that Hong Kong’s construction industry was well-developed and bamboo scaffolds were required for construction. Once construction works completed, bamboo scaffolds concerned would be disposed of at landfills which was very wasteful. EPD had conducted a study earlier on to have bamboo scaffolds shredded to be used as filler to mend the soil. Doing so could not only prevent the growth of weeds, but also stop accumulation of water and sludge slides. He recommended that LCSD follow the aforementioned practice to use bamboo shreds, leaves or wood shreds as fillers so as to reduce pressure on landfills while protecting the ecological environment.

137. Mr. LAU Yung-wai raised the following views:

- (i) Project Item (76) “TP-DMW244 Provision and upgrading of drinking fountain facilities at the recreational and sports venues in Tai Po District”: As regards the works to provide drinking fountain facilities at Tai Po Tau Playground, LCSD currently encountered technical problems which he hoped LCSD would tackle as soon as possible. He also hoped that LCSD would draw up measures to prevent drinking fountains from being affected by exposure to the sun.
- (ii) Project Item (78) “TP-DMW269 Improvement works at Ting Tai Road Children’s Playground, Tai Po”: Works to provide parent-child swings had already completed while handover of the venue had also taken place a few days ago. Members of the public were very satisfied with the parent-child swings. He thanked LCSD for doing its best to facilitate and follow up on the project and members of the public were very happy with the parent-child swings.
- (iii) Project Item (79) “Improvement works at Tai Po Tau Playground”: Since constituency boundary maps had been re-drawn, the constituency to which he belonged was no longer limited to the section of Phase 2 Serenity Park. Hence, he wished to amend the project site by deleting “Phase 2 Serenity Park” such that the project scope could be expanded and upgrading works of facilities could be carried out together.

138. Mr. YIU Kwan-ho raised the following views:

- (i) Project Item (76) “TP-DMW244 Provision and upgrading of drinking fountain facilities at the recreational and sports venues in Tai Po District”: LCSD provided drinking fountain facilities in sports centres based on the principle of environmental protection, he therefore recommended that consideration be given

to reduce the number of automatic beverage vending machines in sports centres too.

- (ii) Project Item (93) “Provision of fitness equipment at Kwong Fuk Sitting-out Area”, Project Item (94) “Construction of covered walkway near footbridge outside Kwong Fuk Sitting-out Area connecting Kwong Wang Street” and Project Item (96) “Provision of sitting benches and arbours at Kwong Fuk Sitting-out Area”: The projects had been proposed by previous term Members and were of a relatively large scale. He supported the construction of rain shelter for the convenience of the public, but would like to know if the design of rain shelter would block the sunlight excessively or have an impact on the landscape of the site. Hence, he would like to have an on-site inspection with relevant Members to look into details of the project.

139. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan responded as follows:

- (i) LCSD would explore with relevant contractors Mr. Richard CHAN’s recommendations.
- (ii) Project Item (76) “TP-DMW244 Provision and upgrading of drinking fountain facilities at the recreational and sports venues in Tai Po District”: As regards provision of drinking fountain facilities at Tai Po Tau Playground, LCSD currently followed up on and studied relevant matters concerning installation of sunlight blocking devices.
- (iii) As regards Mr. YIU Kwan-ho’s suggestions, LCSD would conduct on-site inspections with relevant departments and follow up Members to explain details of projects and examine the feasibility of projects.

140. DFMC accepted the above report.

(D) DMW projects followed up by the Cultural Services Branch of the LCSD
(Items (99) to (101) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 4/2020)

141. Mr. Barry NG reported as follows:

- (i) Project Item (99) “Provision of a 24-hour self-service library station at Yuen Shin Park”, Project Item (100) “Provision of a 24-hour self-service library station at Tai Po Old Market” and Project Item (101) “Provision of 24-hour self-service library station at Tai Wo MTR station lobby”: LCSD’s third 24-hour self-service library station (“SSLS”) had already been put into service in Tai Wai on 15 January 2020. LCSD had already started to collect usage data and users’

opinions, studied the effectiveness of SSLs and made reference to relevant findings so as to explore if SSLs should be provided in the current format in other districts.

142. Mr. LAU Yung-wai indicated that LCSD had just provided in early 2020 a SSLS in Tai Wai. He had asked relevant Members of Shatin DC about the SSLS in Tai Wai and found out that many members of the public queued up to use the said SSLS. He was therefore of the view that the effectiveness of SSLs was obvious and that LCSD would not necessarily need to collect usage data again, nor have to wait for relevant reports to complete either, before it would begin to launch the project to provide SSLs in Tai Po District. As regards the suggestion of several TPDC Members to provide SSLs at different locations of Tai Po District, since a new library would be built near Tai Po Centre, members of the public could benefit from the provision of SSLs surrounding the library. Besides, he recommended that LCSD visit the SSLS at Tai Wai on-site to collect usage data directly and consult Shatin DC Members, so as to take forward the project in Tai Po District as soon as possible from which members of the public could benefit.

143. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai said that Tai Po District lagged behind other districts in terms of library services. There was only one library in Tai Po District, which failed to meet the requirement of *Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guideline*, while Tai Po District was not covered in LCSD's pilot scheme on SSLs. Since its commissioning in January 2020, the SSLS in Tai Wai had undergone a 4-month trial programme so far, he was therefore of the view that LCSD could see the preliminary effectiveness and usage rate, and asked if LCSD could collect preliminary data and provide relevant information as soon as possible. Moreover, he considered MTR stations suitable locations for providing SSLs given their relatively high pedestrian flow. He hoped that LCSD would examine the feasibility to provide SSLs at the proposed locations as soon as possible, such that Members could put forward back-up suggestions should the proposal be determined infeasible.

144. The Chairman advised that LCSD had carried out SSLS pilot scheme in Sai Wan Ho, Tsim Sha Tsui and Tai Wai to study the impact brought forth by SSLs on different groups. He had checked with Shatin DC Members earlier on and learned that the SSLS in Tai Wai was very well received by members of the public. Hence, he hoped that LCSD would collect relevant data as quickly as possible. In the meantime, he would like to make use of DMW funding to provide SSLs in Tai Po District so that no LCSD funding would be required. So he hoped that LCSD could cooperate as much as possible. He had followed up on this project for more than one year and now wished to invite LCSD representatives dedicated for SSLs to attend DFMC meetings to elaborate on SSLS operation.

145. Mr. Barry NG responded that the library system had been in use for years and the old library system had technical and updating problems. Hence, LCSD had already applied for

funding in 2019 to acquire a new library system and tender preparation was underway. Since system updates were involved, software of the new library system might not necessarily be compatible with the existing SSLs, while LCSD currently examined if any new library system software or SSL facilities were available on the market such that service quality could be further enhanced. Besides, the SSL in Tai Wai had been very well received when first introduced, but service was suspended due to the epidemic. LCSD therefore could not collect comprehensive data for the time being, and would do so as quickly as possible once SSL service resumed.

146. The Chairman requested that the Secretariat invite LCSD representatives dedicated for SSLs to attend the next DFMC meeting.

147. Mr. LAU Yung-wai enquired if relevant departments would take forward back-up proposals submitted by re-elected DC Members during their tenure in the last DC term, should the current first-choice proposals be considered infeasible.

148. The Chairman responded that if re-elected Members had submitted back-up proposals during their tenure in the last DC term, relevant departments would take forward such back-up proposals should the first-choice proposals be considered infeasible.

149. Mr. LAU Yung-wai said that library resources in Tai Po District were in serious shortage and provision of SSL was therefore required to serve members of the public. Even though the new library would soon be completed, Tai Po District still lagged behind other districts as far as library resources were concerned. For instance, the population of Shatin was 600,000 but the library resources Shatin residents used were intended for a population of 800,000. On the contrary, Tai Po District had a population of 300,000 of which the need for library services could just be satisfied even when the SSLs became available in the future. In addition, he recommended that LCSD, when launching SSL pilot programme in the future, give priority to concurrently providing SSLs at various locations in Tai Po District to facilitate the flow and sharing of library resources within the district. At the same time, he believed that TPDC would now be willing to make use of DMW funding to provide SSLs in order to significantly lessen the pressure on LCSD.

150. Mr. KWAN Wing-yip said that he had just found out on the internet that self-service automatic e-books borrowing and returning stations had become available on the market. He opined that physical or hard copies of books were subject to more constraints while each SSL could hold no more than 2000 to 3000 books. As a book lover himself, he was not so interested in hard copies of books either. Hence, he recommended that LCSD implement the project to provide SSLs as soon as possible, keep abreast of the times and follow the trend to enhance the reading culture and encourage the public to read more.

151. Mr. Barry NG supplemented that a SSLS could only accommodate some 300 books. He noted Members' views above and would relay them to colleagues dedicated for SSLs.

(E) DMW projects followed up by the Planning Section of the LCSD
(Item (102) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 4/2020)

152. Mr. Eddie CHAN gave supplementary remarks to the following project:

- (i) Project Item (102) "Provision of a Pet Garden at the Open Space near Block 10 and 19 of Tai Po Centre, On Pong Road, Tai Po": LCSD would arrange for the term consultant, HAD (Works Section) and the project proponent an on-site inspection and discussion of the project content.

153. DFMC noted the report of the Planning Section of LCSD.

V. Proposed allocation of central reserve under the District Minor Works Block Vote
(TPDC Paper No. DFM 5/2020)

154. The Chairman advised that just like the arrangements in the past three fiscal years, HAD recommended that \$4.2 million from the \$370.062 million of DMW Block Vote for the year 2020-21 be earmarked as central reserve to cope with emergency works and other unpredictable cash flow requirements of districts. Moreover, HAD would use \$20 million from the DMW Block Vote to pay the consultancy fees and expenses on resident staff at construction sites. Such arrangements were the same as those of the last fiscal year.

155. DFMC noted the above arrangements.

VI. Leisure and Cultural Services Department report on community programmes conducted between September 2019 and March 2020 in Tai Po District and proposals of community programmes to be held in April and May 2020 in Tai Po District
(TPDC Paper No. DFM 6/2020)

156. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan introduced Annex I to TPDC Paper No. DFM 6/2020 and reported that LCSD had from September 2019 to January 2020 organised a total of 457 recreation and sports activities, in which 55 400 persons had participated. To tie in with the response level under the "Preparedness and Response Plan for Novel Infectious Disease of Public Health Significance" being raised to Emergency Response Level and avoid people from gathering, LCSD had temporarily suspended all recreation and sports programmes starting

from 29 January 2020 to minimise the risk of the spread of novel coronavirus in the community and protect public health. LCSD had in February and March 2020 cancelled a total of 90 recreation and sports programmes with some 3 700 persons being affected. In April 2020, 76 activities had been cancelled in total, whereby affecting some 1 870 persons.

157. Ms. Esther SAM introduced Annex II to TPDC Paper No. DFM 6/2020 and reported that LCSD would continue to hold various kinds of cultural activities and audience building programmes at Tai Po Civic Centre and in the district. LCSD anticipated that that usage rate of Tai Po Civic Centre (Auditorium) in 2020/2021 would be 88%, including slots of programmes organised and sponsored by LCSD, while facilities would also be available for rental by various organisations. Local non-profit-making organisations including Tai Po District arts groups could apply for concessionary venue rental or venue subsidy when hiring Tai Po Civic Centre to hold activities promoting culture and arts, while activities organised by committees and working groups under TPDC also enjoyed rental waiver. Besides, in view of the response level under the “Preparedness and Response Plan for Novel Infectious Disease of Public Health Significance” being raised to Emergency Response Level and avoid people from gathering, LCSD had cancelled or postponed all activities to be held between 7 February and April 2020, and would follow up in a timely manner on arrangement of activities scheduled for May 2020 or later in accordance with the latest development of COVID-19 and the infection situation.

158. Mr. Richard CHAN enquired if instructors of activities would nonetheless be paid their remuneration after LCSD cancelled the activities due to the epidemic.

159. Mr. LAU Yung-wai indicated that according to Wong Tai Sin District Council, instructors of activities hired by LCSD would receive 50% of their remuneration. He enquired if such arrangement was standardised for all Districts, i.e. whether instructors of activities would be paid their remuneration. Besides, as regards the usage of the Black Box Theatre stated in Annex II to the paper, he enquired about the reason for its occupancy rate being rather low from October to December 2019, for instance, why the occupancy rate of the Black Box Theatre in October 2019 was some 50% only.

160. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan responded that LCSD understood that cancellation of activities would affect part-time instructors and relevant staff engaged, and would therefore issue them ex-gratia payments. Part-time staff hired who had been affected during the period between 29 January and 31 March 2020 would receive from LCSD 50% of the remuneration they were supposed to receive. Since administrative arrangements took time, LCSD expected to disburse relevant payments in early May 2020.

(Post-meeting note: In light of the ongoing serious impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on the livelihood of part-time staff it engaged, LCSD decided to increase the amount of ex-gratia

payment to the full amount that would have otherwise been payable and part-time staff concerned had already been issued the said payment in May 2020.)

161. Ms. Esther SAM said that as regards Mr. LAU Yung-wai's questions, she did not have detailed information at the moment but reckoned that one of the reasons for the Black Box Theatre's low usage rate in October 2019 was the temporary closure of venue as a result of social incidents. She would check with relevant colleagues and supplement later.

162. The Chairman requested that LCSD supplement the reasons later for the drop in occupancy rate of the Black Box Theatre in October 2019.

(Post-meeting note: After checking with colleagues of relevant units, the usage rate of the Black Box Theatre in October 2019 being no more than 50% reflected the temporary closure of venue due to social incidents and the actual occupancy of that month.)

163. Mr. Barry NG introduced Annexes I to III to TPDC Paper No. DFM 6/2020 and reported as follows:

- (i) To tie in with the Government's "Preparedness and Response Plan for Novel Infectious Disease of Public Health Significance", libraries had been closed in February and March 2020 while all activities had also been cancelled as a result. LCSD had already cancelled activities to be held in April and May 2020 in Tai Po Public Library too.
- (ii) As regards the arrangement to cancel activities to be held in February and March 2020, instructors of activities would be paid 50% of their remuneration. For activities initially scheduled to be held in May 2020, LCSD would arrange for the instructors to organise the same activities such as talks and children's story sessions in end of 2020 to enrich programmes concerned.
- (iii) Members of the last term had proposed to install drinking fountains in the library and WSD had completed the approval. LCSD had notified ArchSD recently to carry out wall drilling and floor works while the library was closed so as to avoid affecting members of the public when the library was opened again later.

164. Mr. LAU Yung-wai raised the following views and questions:

- (i) The Mobile Library at Shuen Wan would be moved to a new parking location. He enquired about the details of relevant arrangement, the reasons for the relocation of the Mobile Library and whether LCSD had already proposed a new parking location.

- (ii) As the original parking space had been occupied, service of the Mobile Library on On Ho Lane was suspended. He considered the said reason unacceptable. Given that Mobile Libraries had fixed service hours, he recommended that HKPF deal with illegal parking problems at the said location in advance so as not to affect the service of the mobile library concerned.

165. Mr. TAM Yi-pui said that Nai Chung Mobile Library had a rather low usage rate and recommended that LCSD step up publicity to make members of the public aware of the existence of Nai Chung Mobile Library.

166. Mr. Barry NG responded as follows:

- (i) As regards Mr. LAU Yung-wai's question, LCSD would in general communicate with relevant management office first to avoid mobile libraries' not being able to park due to illegal parking problems. The incident about On Ho Lane Mobile Library on 6 September 2019 had been an individual event on which LCSD would follow up so as to prevent similar incidents from happening again.
- (ii) Owing to road widening works, the Mobile Library at Nai Chung would be relocated to a temporary parking spot. In this connection, LCSD would notify residents nearby and step up publicity.
- (iii) As regards the Mobile Library at Shuen Wan, LCSD had in 2016 reported on relevant matters at TPDC meeting that the parking location initially proposed had been the Joint Village Office for Villages in Shuen Wan, but the said site had private uses and the Mobile Library van could therefore not be parked there. DC Members of the last term had planned to park the Mobile Library van at various locations including Ting Kok Tsuen, Lung Mei Tsuen and Tai Mei Tuk. LCSD had filed an application with TD to park the Mobile Library van at Tai Mei Tuk car park but TD had refused to approve the application. LCSD had subsequently explored the feasibility to park the Mobile Library van at various places in Shuen Wan. However, the van weighed as much as 9 tonnes and could not access some road sections. Besides, LCSD had in last year examined if it was viable to park the Mobile Library van in the vicinity of Lo Ping Road outside Education University of Hong Kong but the said site was under the purview of TD while ArchSD also considered it not suitable to carry out works there. Former DC Member Mr. LAU Chi-sing had arranged for a discussion with ArchSD but no meeting could in the end be held successfully. During service suspension of the Mobile Library at Shuen Wan, LCSD had explored the feasibility to park the Mobile Library van at Chim Uk Tsuen and Treasure Spot Garden, but found out that relevant locations were not really suitable for parking

the van due to various reasons, for instance, rural roads were narrow and the Mobile Library van might not be able to access such roads. LCSD would discuss the situation concerned with Mr. SO Tat-leung.

167. Mr. MAN Nim-chi said that some Mobile Libraries were located within premises of Housing Department. Hence, LCSD could contact public housing estates in advance so as to avoid the scenario where the Mobile Library van could not be parked at the locations initially proposed owing to illegal parking problems. However, the Mobile Library at On Ho Lane was located at a parking, he therefore recommended that LCSD request HKPF to take enforcement actions there in advance, so as to avoid the scenario that when providing service, the Mobile Library van could not be parked there because of vehicles illegally parked, whereby affecting members of the public. Moreover, the only library in Tai Po District was located in Tai Po South while residents of Chung Ting lived in Tai Po North, it was very inconvenient for them to go to Tai Po Public Library on foot. Hence, Mobile Library service was indeed required for Chung Ting area.

168. Mr. Barry NG advised that service of Mobile Libraries would not be affected by illegally parked vehicles, rather, the Mobile Library van would instead run back and forth in the neighbourhood as far as possible and look for owners of vehicles which were parked illegally. LCSD had already noted Members' opinions and would contact HKPF and continue to follow up of the aforementioned situation.

169. Mr. Richard CHAN said that TPDO was duty bound to coordinate affairs within the district, whereas the Mobile Library van parked at fixed locations in accordance with an established timetable, HKPF should therefore take enforcement actions in advance and solve the problem of illegal parking beforehand. He also requested that District Officer (Tai Po) assist in contacting HKPF.

170. DFMC noted the above report.

VII. Request to make future development plan and details of recurrent expenditure of Tai Po Waterfront Angling Corner publicly available
(TPDC Paper No. DFM 7/2020)

171. Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang introduced TPDC Paper No. DFM 7/2020.

172. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan responded as follows:

- (i) Tai Po Waterfront Angling Corner (“Angling Corner”) was located near the public pier at the end of the Tai Po Waterfront Park promenade with facilities

including fishing rod holders, benches, lighting facilities, signage and educational display panels on good practices and safety rules for leisure angling, so that members of the public could enjoy the beautiful scenery and pleasure of leisure angling.

- (ii) Given the Angling Corner's being adjacent to Tai Po Waterfront Park and not big in area, LCSD had since mid-2018 entrusted staff of Tai Po Waterfront Park with the inspection, cleaning and security work of the Angling Corner while routine expenses of the Angling Centre were also included in the recurrent operating costs of Tai Po Waterfront Park to facilitate effective use of resources.
- (iii) Since its opening, the Angling Centre not only provided members of the public facilities for leisure angling, but also served as a great place for members of the public, joggers and cycling lovers to take a break and enjoy the beauty of nature. Hence, just like other small venues managed by LCSD, the Angling Corner provided basic leisure facilities for members of the public to enjoy the facilities as they saw fit.
- (iv) LCSD had for the time being no new development blueprint for the Angling Corner.
- (v) The operating expenses of the Angling Corner had already been included in the recurrent operating costs of Tai Po Waterfront Park. LCSD had once checked with the works department if relevant expenses of the Angling Corner could be spun off from the recurrent operating costs of Tai Po Waterfront Park. However, the works department had indicated that it was difficult to spin off the repair and maintenance expenses of the Angling Corner because there were only four benches and some lamps in the venue, of which the annual expenses were modest. Besides, cleansing and security personnel did not need to spend much time to clean and inspect the venue each day, it was therefore difficult to spin off relevant cleaning and security expenses from the recurrent operating costs of Tai Po Waterfront Park too.
- (vi) The Angling Corner had its own electricity meter and the average monthly electricity tariff recorded was about \$600. The actual recurrent expenditure of the Angling Corner was not high.

173. Mr. WU Yiu-cheong said that according to LCSD's response just now, operating expenses of the Angling Corner had already been included in the recurrent operating costs of Tai Po Waterfront Park. He enquired why LCSD had in 2017 reported that the estimated annual recurrent expenditure of the Angling Corner was \$200,000 and how the amount of \$200,000 had been calculated. He also asked when LCSD had included the operating expenses of the Angling Corner in the recurrent operating costs of Tai Po Waterfront Park.

174. Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang raised the following views and questions:

- (i) LCSD had no new development blueprint for the Angling Corner, he asked if it would mean that LCSD had already given up the Angling Corner project proposed earlier. LCSD had spent \$1.8 million to construct two benches, one table, one drinking fountain and one wash basin, but venue users opined that the two benches were too far away from each other, while the fishing rod holders were located at the breakwater where water level was low and not suitable for angling. Hence, anglers would not angle at the Angling Corner.
- (ii) Bicycles were not allowed to enter the area of the Angling Corner and he wondered how cyclists could use the facilities there.
- (iii) A cleansing worker and a park attendant were on duty at the Angling Corner on a permanent basis. He was of the view that such arrangement would decrease the manpower of Tai Po Waterfront Park.

175. Mr. AU Chun-ho indicated that the Angling Corner had a low usage rate and was inconvenient to access. The Angling Corner was located at gaps between stones which in his opinion was unsuitable for angling while he himself would not go angling there either. As anglers mostly went angling on the other side near where the stairs of the pier were located and he was of the view that LCSD lacked thorough consideration about the location of the Angling Corner which resulted in the low usage rate of the facilities.

176. Mr. LAU Yung-wai raised the following views and questions:

- (i) He opined that the design of the Angling Corner was unsuitable for members of the public to go angling. The last term TPDC had already mentioned that the location of the Angling Corner was not suitable for angling too, and had pointed out that most members of the public went angling on the other side near where the stairs of the pier were located. Hence, last term TPDC Members had at that time recommended that LCSD build the Angling Corner near the stairs of the pier. However, as the said location was not a site managed by LCSD, LCSD had constructed the Angling Corner at the present location and led to the rather low usage rate.
- (ii) He was of the view that the drinking fountain at the Angling Corner had its uses while the benches there were available for members of the public to rest. But he did not agree to retain the lighting facilities there.
- (iii) He recommended that LCSD convert the current Angling Corner to a sitting-out area or other purposes and not name it as Angling Corner any longer.
- (iv) There was a gate next to the drinking fountain at the Angling Corner which

blocked joggers and cyclists from entering the Angling Corner and caused inconvenience to them. He therefore recommended that LCSD open the said gate to avoid obstructing members of the public from using the drinking fountain. LCSD had initially intended the said gate as a boundary between the Angling Corner and Tai Po Waterfront Park. However, since the management of the Angling Corner was now taken over by staff of Tai Po Waterfront Park, no more delineation was required.

177. The Vice-chairman indicated that the construction of angling corners had been proposed by the former Chief Executive. He opined that when planning for construction of similar facilities in the future, LCSD must take into consideration the location of relevant facilities and the needs of members of the public.

178. The Chairman said that he had conducted an on-site inspection with some Members at the Angling Corner and found out that the gate inside the Angling Corner was locked. Members of the public would need to take a detour to enter the area of the Angling Corner and the pier.

179. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan responded as follows:

- (i) Given that the Angling Corner was a new venue, LCSD had at that time calculated the estimated recurrent expenditure on the basis of an independent venue, whereby including the repair and maintenance costs estimated by the works department, security and cleansing personnel for daily operation, the estimated expenditure was estimated to be \$200,000 per year.
- (ii) LCSD had from 2017 to mid-June 2018 implemented the pilot scheme on angling corners, upon completion of which angling corners had been officially included among venues managed by LCSD. After reviewing staffing arrangements, LCSD had decided that management of the Angling Corner could be entrusted to staff of Tai Po Waterfront Park. Given the relatively small size of the venue, relevant arrangement had little impact on the manpower of Tai Po Waterfront Park, for instance, it took only a few minutes for security personnel to conduct routine inspection at the Angling Corner. Hence, LCSD considered the arrangement appropriate to have the Angling Corner managed by staff of Tai Po Waterfront Park.
- (iii) LCSD had at that time spent some \$1.1 million to construct the Angling Corner.
- (iv) Apart from the Angling Corner, the public pier next to Tai Po Waterfront Park had most of its public space there too. Even though members of the public could not cycle within the Angling Corner, there was a cycling track next to Tai Po Waterfront Park and cyclists could enter the public pier via the road at the

end of the cycling track and no issue of bicycle management was involved.

- (v) Fishing rod holders were available on railings inside the Angling Corner. LCSD had consulted TPDC during the last DC term and relevant plan had been considered feasible. The Angling Corner served not only anglers but also provided educational information about angling for members of the public to gain knowledge about angling.
- (vi) As regards the gate of Tai Po Waterfront Park near the Angling Corner, colleagues of Tai Po Waterfront Park had also looked into the feasibility of opening the said gate. It was anticipated that it would become more convenient for members of the public to access the Angling Corner once the gate was modified.
- (vii) LCSD would identify locations which were more suitable when constructing new venues and carry out venue planning properly.

180. Mr. AU Chun-ho said that he did not agree that the facilities of the Angling Corner could enhance members of the public's knowledge about angling. The Angling Corner was not a suitable place for members of the public to go angling while what the fish hooks often caught was rock rather than fish. He continued that LCSD must draw up relevant measures to improve the aforementioned situation.

181. Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang said that as the Angling Corner failed to attract members of the public to go angling there, he recommended that other facilities be provided to increase the uses of the public pier. He opined that the Angling Corner was a good place for members of the public to watch the sunset and the beautiful scenery of Tolo Harbour and Ma On Shan. He therefore recommended that LCSD carry out beautification works there such as providing benches and shelters so that members of the public could enjoy the scenery there. He asked if it was necessary for him to propose a DMW project in connection with the beautification works of the Angling Corner, or LCSD could arrange for relevant works itself. He also requested that LCSD arrange for an on-site inspection and explain to him project details of the Angling Corner.

182. Ms. Olive CHAN raised the following views and questions:

- (i) The educational display panel at the Angling Corner was so broken and tattered owing to exposure to sunlight that the information on it was intelligible to members of the public. She therefore opined that members of the public would not be able to learn any angling knowledge at the Angling Corner. Besides, since anglers would not go angling there either, she considered LCSD's angling corner project a failure.
- (ii) As it was rather dark at the Angling Corner, she was of the view that the lighting

equipment there could be retained while members of the public could use the benches to take a break. Hence, she opined that it was necessary to keep the benches and drinking fountain there.

- (iii) The pink gate in the Angling Corner could not be opened yet, while there was a blue and yellow step beneath the gate over which members of the public might stumble over when walking by. She therefore suggested that LCSD remove the said step as well if it intended to remove the gate.

183. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai indicated that he considered the location of the Angling Corner not suitable for angling while nobody angled there either. Notwithstanding, the facilities there could provide members of the public an open space. Hence, he recommended that LCSD carry out improvement measures at the said site. Besides, the floor of the Angling Corner was encircled by a fish-shaped curve and he enquired if the area beyond the said curve was under the purview of Marine Department or managed by other departments.

184. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan responded as follows:

- (i) As LCSD planned to construct the Angling Corner, it had also intended to build a rain shelter there as well. However, CEDD had not approved the installation of the rain shelter owing to considerations of the pier's structural factors, LCSD had therefore provided benches only at the said site.
- (ii) LCSD would follow up shortly on Members' suggestions regarding the educational display panel about angling and make improvement accordingly.
- (iii) Before opening the gate, LCSD would request that the works department paint the step with colours and signs to alert members of the public to pay attention and avoid tripping over the step.
- (iv) The area of the Angling Corner had already been clearly marked and the location was suitable, while the facilities could facilitate angling activities and leisure facilities were available, LCSD therefore had no plan to expand the Angling Corner.

185. The Chairman indicated that should LCSD intend to repair the educational display panel inside the Angling Corner, detailed consideration would have to be given to the choice of materials to prevent the display panel from becoming damaged as a result of sun exposure.

VIII. Formation of standing working groups

(TPDC Paper No. DFM 8/2020(Revised))

186. The Chairman advised that there had been two standing working groups under the last

term DFMC, namely, Working Group on District Works and Working Group on Facilities Management. He asked Members to consider:

- (i) whether or not the two aforementioned working groups and their terms of reference should be kept;
- (ii) whether or not it was necessary to consolidate working groups with similar terms of reference; and
- (iii) whether or not formation of new working groups was required.

187. Mr. AU Chun-wah said that he suggested retaining the two aforementioned working groups and their relevant functions.

188. Members endorsed to keep Working Group on District Works and Working Group on Facilities Management, and agreed to continue adopting the terms of reference contained in TPDC Paper No. DFM 8/2020(Revised). DFMC then proceeded to elect Chairmen of the two working groups mentioned above with the following details:

(I) Working Group on District Works

- (i) Mr. AU Chun-ho nominated the Chairman to become Chairman of the Working Group of District Works and the nomination was seconded by Mr. Richard CHAN.
- (ii) The Chairman accepted the nomination.
- (iii) Given the absence of other nominations, the Chairman announced he himself elected as Chairman of the Working Group on District Works.

(II) Working Group on Facilities Management

- (i) Mr. MAN Nim-chi nominated Mr. Dalu LIN to become Chairman of the Working Group on Facilities Management and the nomination was seconded by Mr. LAU Yung-wai.
- (ii) Mr. Dalu LIN accepted the nomination.
- (iii) Given the absence of other nominations, the Chairman announced that Mr. Dalu LIN elected as Chairman of the Working Group on Facilities Management.

189. The Chairman advised that the Secretariat would give out forms shortly to invite Members to join the two aforementioned working groups. He requested that Members complete the forms and return them to the Secretariat.

IX. Any other business

(I) DMW Projects Report 2016-2019

190. The Chairman indicated that the last term DFMC had decided to produce the DMW Projects Report 2016-2019 to record DMW projects taken forward by lead departments while the report would be compiled by the Working Group on District Works. He continued that the DMW Projects Report 2012-2015 had been tabled for Members' reference. The Report covered the site location, completion time and brief introduction of DMW projects. The last term DFMC had once applied for \$50,000 to produce the Report and he requested that Members voice their views on DMW Projects Report 2016-2019, and asked Members if it was necessary to publish the Report in printed copies or in other formats (such as online version).

191. Mr. TAM Yi-pui said that given the popularity of internet development nowadays, he opined that the DMW Projects Report 2016-2019 would not need to be published in printed format and members of the public could view the said report online so as to save paper.

192. The Chairman indicated that he agreed to publish the report in online version and detailed contents and production involved could be referred to working groups for discussion. Hence, he asked Members if the said matters should be referred to the Working Group on District Works or the Working Group on Promotion of Tai Po District Council for follow up.

193. Mr. Richard CHAN said he agreed to have the said matters referred to the Working Group on Promotion of Tai Po District Council for discussion and follow up.

194. Mr. Patrick MO enquired how previous DMW Projects Reports had been given out to members of the public.

195. The Secretary advised that in addition to giving out to DC Members, previous DMW Projects Reports had also been available at TPDO, the Secretariat and so on for members of the public.

196. The Chairman said that the above matters would be referred to the Working Group on Promotion of Tai Po District Council for follow up.

(II) Matters related to Tai Po Arts Centre ("TPAC")

197. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai said that he had had an on-site inspection at TPAC earlier and communicated with arts groups, which had indicated that they hoped TPDC would grant

funding to hold activities but they did not know much about the application procedures and eligibility for DC funding. Hence, he recommended that the Secretariat explain to arts groups the application criteria for DC funding once the epidemic slowed down.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat had already explained to relevant arts groups the application criteria for DC funding on 20 May 2020.)

198. Mr. Terence LEE said that the Secretariat would contact Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai shortly and follow up on relevant suggestion.

199. The Chairman indicated that he concurred with Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai's suggestion as arts groups at TPAC were new in the district.

200. The Vice-chairman said that he had discussed with arts groups at TPAC that owing to social movement and the epidemic in recent months, members of the public were not quite aware of the existence of TPAC. Hence, relevant departments and groups would need to consider promotion policy. Besides, as far as the operation of TPAC was concerned, arts groups did not have much freedom when using the venue of TPAC, for instance, no publicity materials could be put up on walls. He understood that ArchSD and relevant government departments had different factors to consider, but given that TPAC was an arts venue, relevant operational arrangements should be relaxed.

201. Ms. Tiffany LEUNG said that Hong Kong Arts Development Council ("HKADC") had planned to hold a TPAC Open Day in March 2020 to introduce arts groups at TPAC and facilities available for hiring by the public. The open day had been cancelled owing to the epidemic. TPDO would continue to discuss with HKADC relevant promotional activities in the community.

202. Mr. LAU Yung-wai indicated that he hoped TPAC Management Committee would hold a meeting as soon as possible to follow up on promotion of TPAC and Members' suggestions above.

X. Date of next meeting

203. The next meeting would be held at 9:30 a.m. on 15 May 2020 (Friday).

(Post-meeting note: The next meeting of DFMC was rescheduled to 17 July 2020.)

204. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:33 p.m.

Tai Po District Council Secretariat
June 2020