

**Minutes of the 3rd Meeting in 2021 of the District Facilities Management
and Culture, Recreation and Sports Committee
of the Tai Po District Council**

Date: 16 July 2021 (Friday)

Time: 9:31 a.m. – 2:53 p.m.

Venue: Conference Room, Tai Po District Council

Present

Vice-chairman

Mr. AU Chun-ho

Time of Arrival

Beginning of the meeting

Time of Withdrawal

End of the meeting

Members

Mr. AU Chun-wah

10:40 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. HO Wai-lam

9:37 a.m.

End of the meeting

Mr. LAM Yick-kuen, MH

9:54 a.m.

2:26 p.m.

Mr. LAU Yung-wai

Beginning of the meeting

End of the meeting

Mr. LI Yiu-ban, BBS, MH, JP

Beginning of the meeting

12:40 p.m.

Mr. MO Ka-chun, Patrick

Beginning of the meeting

End of the meeting

Mr. SO Tat-leung

Beginning of the meeting

End of the meeting

Mr. TAM Yi-pui

Beginning of the meeting

End of the meeting

Mr. WONG Siu-kin

9:54 a.m.

End of the meeting

Mr. YIU Kwan-ho

10:09 a.m.

End of the meeting

Secretary

Miss TANG Lok-man, Julie

Beginning of the meeting

End of the meeting

Executive Officer (District Council) 4 /

Tai Po District Office /

Home Affairs Department

In attendance

Ms. CHAN Hau-man, Eunice, JP

District Officer (Tai Po), Home Affairs Department

Mr. HO Ching-yeung, Jonathan

Assistant District Officer (Tai Po), Home Affairs Department

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Mr. CHAU Chun-wing | Chief Leisure Manager (New Territories East), Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Ms. TAM Wai-chu | 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. CHAN Kam-shing, Eddie | Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 23, Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Mr. NG Sik-hay, Eddie | Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 34, 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 (New Territories East) Marketing & District Activities, Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Mr. NG Chi-keung, Barry | Senior Librarian (Tai Po), Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Mr. CHOY Kin-lun | Administrative Assistant/Lands (Atg.), District Lands Office, Tai Po, Lands Department |
| Ms. CHAN Ho-shan, Susana | Architect (Works) 9, Home Affairs Department |
| Mr. CHAN Kwan-hon | Architect (Works) 10, Home Affairs Department |
| Mr. SO Ka-yu, Tel | Senior Executive Officer (District Council) (Atg.), 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 |
| 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 |
| Miss YIP Lisa | Liaison Officer (7), Tai Po District Office, Home Affairs Department |
| Mr. CHU Po-hei, Boris | Architect, Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited |

Opening remarks

Mr. AU Chun-ho, the Vice-chairman (hereafter “the Acting Chairman”) welcomed Members and departmental representatives to the 3rd meeting of the District Facilities Management and Culture, Recreation and Sports Committee (“DFMC”) in 2021, and thanked Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang,

Mr. YAM Kai-bong, Mr. KWAN Wing-yip, Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai and Mr. MAN Nim-chi, who had already vacated office, for their contribution during their tenure.

2. The Acting Chairman advised that the Secretariat had received no notice for absence from Members, and asked Members to note.

I. Election of the Chairman of DFMC under the Tai Po District Council

3. The Acting-chairman reported as follows:

- (i) Owing to the resignation of Mr. YAM Kai-bong, elected Member of Yee Fu Constituency, his office had become vacant since 8 July 2021 according to Section 26(b) of the District Councils Ordinance (Cap. 547) (“the Ordinance”). As his resignation was also applicable to committees and working groups under Tai Po District Council (“TPDC”), the Chairman position of the DFMC had also become vacant on the same day.
- (ii) Pursuant to the resolution of the TPDC meeting on 7 January 2020, the election of Chairmen of committees under TPDC would be carried out according to the election procedures for TPDC Chairman and Vice-chairman, i.e., in accordance with the voting procedures set out in Schedule 5 to the Ordinance and the “Procedures for Electing the Chairman and Vice-chairman of the Tai Po District Council” contained in Annex II to TPDC Standing Orders (“Standing Orders”) which the Secretariat had issued earlier.
- (iii) Since he was a member of the DFMC who had the right to vote in the election, to ensure that the fairness and impartiality of the election would not be questioned, he would ask the Senior Executive Officer (District Council) (Atg.) to count the number of votes and decide if a ballot paper was valid on his behalf should voting be required.
- (iv) The Secretariat had already written on 8 July 2021 to invite Members to nominate candidates for DFMC Chairman. Nomination for the Chairman had already been closed one hour prior to this meeting (i.e. at 8:30 a.m.).
- (v) The Secretariat had received a total of one valid nomination form before the nomination closed. The nominee, relevant nominator and subscribers were as follows:

| <u>Nominated Candidate</u> | <u>Member making the nomination</u> | <u>Members subscribing the nomination</u> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Mr. MO Ka-chun, Patrick | Mr. AU Chun-ho | Mr. LAU Yung-wai and Mr. AU Chun-wah |

4. Since only one candidate had been nominated for the chairmanship of DFMC, in accordance with Section 5 of Schedule 5 to the Ordinance, the Acting Chairman announced that Mr. MO Ka-chun, Patrick was elected the Chairman of DFMC, and the term of office was from now on till 31 December 2021.

5. The election of DFMC Chairman had completed, and Members extended their congratulations to the newly elected DFMC Chairman.

II. Elections for filling the vacancies of Chairmen of Working Groups

6. The Chairman advised that owing to the resignation of Mr. YAM Kai-bong, elected Member of Yee Fu Constituency, on 8 July 2021, his office of Chairman of the Working Group on District Works (“WGDW”) had also become vacant on the same day. Given the current uncertainties, he recommended that he temporarily take up the duties of WGDW Chairman until otherwise arranged.

7. As Members raised no objection, the Chairman announced that the aforementioned recommendation was endorsed.

8. The Chairman advised that owing to the resignation of Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai, elected Member of Po Nga Constituency, on 12 July 2021, his office of Chairman of the Working Group on Reviewing the Appointment of Tai Po District Football Team (“WGRATPDFT”) had also become vacant on the same day. He asked Members to elect someone among themselves to fill the vacancy of WGRATPDFT Chairman. Should there be no nomination, the position of WGRATPDFT Chairman would be vacant for the time being. He asked Members to note that the tenure of WGRATPDFT would end on 31 July 2021.

9. Mr. CHAN Chun-chit, Richard said that he would like to recommend himself for the position of WGRATPDFT Chairman should Members make no nomination.

10. Mr. LAU Yung-wai nominated Mr. Patrick MO to become WGRATPDFT Chairman.

11. Mr. AU Chun-ho indicated that given the current situation being pretty uncertain, he recommended that an election of WGRATPDFT Chairman be held at the next DFMC meeting when it would become clear as to whether Members would stay or leave, while multiple elections could also be avoided.

12. The Chairman said that since the current situation remained uncertain, he suggested first observing the situation and election of WGRATPDFT Chairman could be held at the next DFMC meeting if need be.

13. Mr. TAM Yi-pui indicated that as Mr. Richard CHAN had just now expressed his willingness to serve as WGRATPDFT Chairman, he asked if the Chairman would take reference from the opinion of Mr. CHAN before making any decision.

14. Mr. Richard CHAN said he opined that TPDC should not defer handling the work concerned. Members present at this meeting were still in office, and should therefore do their best to keep the District Council (“DC”) operating and not become timid because of the circumstances. Hence, he did not agree to defer the election of WGRATPDFT Chairman. He opined that the election procedures should continue should there be no other Members willing to take up the position of WGRATPDFT Chairman while he had made a self-recommendation for the said position. He was in no position to guarantee that he would still be alive after the meeting as he might die in an accident. He therefore asked why one should be afraid of risks which had all along existed. It had been a consensus which Members had reached prior to this meeting that DFMC Chairman temporarily acted as WGDW Chairman and the arrangement concerned should be followed. He was of the view that the arrangement for election of WGRATPDFT Chairman would not need to be queried because of the current situation. The agenda item concerned should be dealt with rigorously as long as there were Members present at the meeting. As such, he opined that election of WGRATPDFT Chairman could proceed.

15. Mr. HO Wai-lam said he was also interested in recommending himself for the position of WGRATPDFT Chairman, and indicated that he did not serve as Chairman in any working group and could therefore help share the workload of Members.

16. The Chairman indicated that given the varying opinions, he hoped that Members could take a simple vote on the arrangement for the election of WGRATPDFT Chairman, with the first option being the position of WGRATPDFT Chairman to be left temporarily vacant whereas the second option was to proceed with the election of WGRATPDFT Chairman.

17. Mr. LAU Yung-wai said since Members had indicated their willingness to serve as WGRATPDFT Chairman, it would be undesirable to leave the said position vacant. Hence, he recommended that the election continue to be carried out.

18. Mr. SO Tat-leung indicated that he supported carrying out the election further given the presence of Members who were willing to take up the position concerned.

19. Mr. LAU Yung-wai said that he had nominated Mr. Patrick MO to become WGRATPDFT Chairman just now.

20. The Chairman said that Members were welcome to put forward self-nominations or nominations of other Members for the position of WGRATPDFT Chairman, should there be any.

21. Mr. Richard CHAN nominated himself for the position of WGRATPDFT Chairman, and the nomination was seconded by Mr. TAM Yi-pui.

22. Mr. HO Wai-lam said that if Mr. Richard CHAN could manage the duties of Chairman of several working groups concurrently, he would not compete with him for the position of WGRATPDFT Chairman.

23. Mr. LAU Yung-wai said he had suggested just now that Mr. Patrick MO take up the position of WGRATPDFT Chairman, and enquired if Mr. Patrick MO accepted the nomination.

24. The Chairman indicated that he did not accept the nomination.

25. Members made no other nomination. The Chairman announced that Mr. Richard CHAN was elected WGRATPDFT Chairman.

III. Confirmation of the minutes of the 2nd meeting in 2021 of the DFMC on 14 May 2021
(TPDC Paper No. DFM 22/2021)

26. The Chairman reported that neither had the Secretariat received any proposed amendments to the minutes prior to the meeting, nor had Members put forward any amendments at the meeting, the captioned minutes were thus confirmed.

IV. Government Departments and Term Consultants — Position of the District Minor Works Funds and progress report on the approved District Minor Works Projects
(TPDC Paper Nos. DFM 23/2021 and DFM 23a/2021)

27. The Chairman requested that Members note the position of the District Minor Works Funds and the progress report on the approved District Minor Works (“DMW”) Projects. He reported that the DFMC currently had an approved project estimates of \$131 million, of which around \$25.85 million was for 2021/22 and approximately \$105 million for 2022/23 and thereafter.

28. The Chairman indicated that at the DFMC meeting on 14 May 2021, Members had decided that in the event the position of the proponent or the follow-up Member of a project became vacant, DFMC Chairman would act as the follow-up Member of the project concerned temporarily to attend inspections and follow up on the project until a by-election took place, or DFMC appointed another Member or coordinated to have the project followed up by another follow-up Member. According to Paper No. DFM 23/2021 (Revised), there were currently 11 approved DMW projects in total, of which the positions of proponent or follow-up Member had become vacant. DFMC

Chairman would act as the follow-up Member of the 11 projects concerned should Members raise no comment.

29. Members raised no objection. The Chairman announced that the above proposal was endorsed.

30. The Chairman asked representatives of the term consultant, Tai Po District Office (“TPDO”) and Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”) to report the progress of projects, and welcomed Mr. CHU Po-hei, Boris, Architect 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 (24) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 23/2021 and TPDC Paper No. DFM 23a/2021)

31. Mr. CHU Po-hei, Boris briefly introduced the feasibility study report of Project Item (7) “TP-DMW241 Provision of sitting-out area at San Wa On Lane, Tai Po Tau, Tai Po” in Paper No. DFM 23a/2021. He supplemented that the expected project cost was revised to \$7.31 million. The project was expected to commence in Q4 in 2022 and would take 12 months to complete.

32. Mr. Richard CHAN said that just as he had mentioned in the meeting of the WGDW, he opined that the hooks coming out from the umbrella and hiking pole holders were of the height of children aged between two and three. Hence, he was worried that the hooks would pose a danger to children playing in the vicinity.

33. Mr. LAU Yung-wai indicated that given that there would be a pavilion cover next to the elderly fitness equipment, he enquired if the pavilion was equipped with a lighting system.

34. Ms. CHAN Wai-ka, Olive said that sitting-out areas recently built usually used transparent plastic panels for their covers. When doing exercise under the cover, residents would feel particularly hot owing to the greenhouse effect. Hence, she hoped that the design of this project could be improved such that the cover could block light and heat.

35. Mr. Boris CHU responded as follows:

- (i) The term consultant would improve the design of the handrail when working on the detailed design under the premise of preventing children from being injured. After revising the design, he would submit the design drawings again for Members’ reference.

- (ii) Four lamps would be installed at the top of the pavilion cover whereas it would be sufficiently illuminated beneath the cover so that the environment would not become dimmed at nighttime. The term consultant would look into the lighting design with the electrical and mechanical consultant during the preliminary and detailed design, and would submit the light design drawings to relevant departments for advice.
- (iii) The top of the pavilion cover would be covered by dark brown plastic plates and perforated aluminium plates to offer a rain and sun shading design. The term consultant would look into the design concerned with the structural engineer during the detailed design.

36. The Chairman reported that the project cost of Project Item (7) in the paper “TP-DMW241 Provision of sitting-out area at San Wa On Lane, Tai Po Tau, Tai Po” was revised from \$8.45 million to \$7.31 million.

37. Members raised no objection. The Chairman announced that the above feasibility study report and project costs were endorsed.

38. Mr. Boris CHU reported the progress of project items as follows:

- (i) Project Item (1) “TP-DMW209 Provision of recreational and sports facilities near Ting Nga Court, Ting Kok Road, Tai Po”: The project contractor had carried out trial pit works in late May 2021, and found out there were underground water pipes within the project area. The term consultant currently discussed with Water Supplies Department (“WSD”) matters concerning water pipe diversion. Arbour removal works had already completed in early June 2021, and the contractor had also completed tree replanting in mid-June 2021. The term consultant was arranging for inspection with the Tree Team of LCSD.
- (ii) Project Item (2) “TP-DMW227 Provision of sitting-out area and children’s playground at Nai Chung, Tai Po”: The term consultant had completed the tender invitation procedure on 7 May 2021, and the analysis of tenders had completed now. The term consultant would sign the contract with the project contractor on 27 July 2021.
- (iii) Project Item (3) “TP-DMW231 Provision of a Sitting-out Area in Care Village, Tai Po” and Project Item (4) “TP-DMW232 Provision of sitting-out area at Po Sam Pai, Tai Po”: Approval of the site allocation by District Lands Office, Tai Po (“TPDLO”) was being awaited at this stage, the date of tender invitation might as a result be delayed.
- (iv) Project Item (5) “TP-DMW238 Provision of rainshelters at Tai Po Kau Constituency (Mayfair By The Sea, Wong Yi Au, Ta Tit Yan and Cheung Shue Tan)”: Since all rainshelter works had already completed, the whole project would be removed from

the progress summary of projects.

- (v) Project Item (6) “TP-DMW240 Extension construction works of existing covered walkway at Nga Wan Road near Uptown Plaza, Tai Po”: Installation of the cover had completed while installation of plastic plates was underway. The project was expected to complete on schedule in August 2021.
- (vi) Project Item (7) “TP-DMW241 Provision of sitting-out area at San Wa On Lane, Tai Po Tau, Tai Po”: Relevant feasibility study report and project cost had already been endorsed by DFMC. The revised overall project estimates were \$7.31 million and the revised construction site area was approximately 119 square metres.
- (vii) Project Item (8) “TP-DMW242 Provision of sitting-out area at San Uk Tsai, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po”: LCSD had arranged for the term consultant to have an on-site inspection again with the follow-up Member of the constituency concerned on 18 June 2021. Mr. LAM Yick-kuen and the village head had been present at the said inspection too to discuss matters such as the land boundaries of the project, the proposal for CLP cable diversion and arrangement for the existing pavilion. The term consultant had filed with TPDLO an application for permanent land boundaries, which was pending approval.
- (viii) Project Item (9) “TP-DMW252 Provision of Rainshelters in Tao Po Kau Constituency (Chong San Road, Deerhill Bay and Chung Tsai Yuen Lookout)”: Reply from Transport Department (“TD”) was being awaited currently, while works at the construction site were expected to commence in late July 2021. The term consultant would have an on-site inspection with the follow-up Member to elaborate on arrangements such as road closure during the project period.
- (ix) Project Item (10) “TP-DMW253 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Hang House, Wan Tau Tong Estate at Tat Wan Road, Tai Po”: Works at the construction site had commenced on 22 June 2021 and were underway currently.
- (x) Project Item (11) “TP-DMW255 Provision of covered walkway at Tai Po Road Yuen Chau Tsai section near Kwong Fuk Estate, Tai Po”: An application for excavation permit was being filed with Highways Department (“HyD”) while temporary road closure measures had been submitted to Hong Kong Police Force (“HKPF”) for approval. Preparation of contract documents was underway.
- (xi) Project Item (12) “TP-DMW256 Provision of sitting-out area at Tseng Tau, Sai Sha Road, Sai Kung North, Tai Po”: The term consultant had already completed the tender documents. Tender invitation had initially been expected to take place in Q2 in 2021. However, approval of the site allocation by TPDLO was being awaited currently, the date of tender invitation might as a result be delayed.
- (xii) Project Item (13) “TP-DMW260 Provision of shelter at Nam Wan Road near NF132 footbridge, Tai Po”: Reply from TD was being awaited currently, while works at the

construction site were expected to commence in mid-August 2021. The term consultant would have an on-site inspection with the follow-up Member to elaborate on arrangements such as road closure during the project period.

- (xiii) Project Item (14) “TP-DMW263 Provision of fitness equipment and elderly facilities near the morning trail at Wan Tau Tong, Tai Po” and Project Item (15) “TP-DMW264 Provision of elderly fitness equipment near Hing Wo House, Po Nga Court, Tai Po”: Approval of the site allocation by TPDLO was being awaited currently.
- (xiv) Project Item (16) “TP-DMW266 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Tau Tong Estate at Fung Wan Road, Tai Po”: The term consultant currently revised the design proposal in accordance with the comments of the follow-up Member on the colour of the rainshelter and model of the benches put forward during the on-site inspection, and would seek views from the follow-up Member again once the revision was completed.
- (xv) Project Item (17) “TP-DMW270 Provision of shelters at Po Nga Road connecting Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po”: An application for excavation permit was being filed with HyD while temporary road closure measures had been submitted to HKPF for approval. Detailed design was underway.
- (xvi) Project Item (18) “TP-DMW295 Provision of a sitting-out area at Pak Shek Kok”: The term consultant currently prepared the feasibility study report and sought views from relevant departments.
- (xvii) Project Item (19) “TP-DMW296 Provision of a sitting-out area at Cheung Muk Tau Village”: LCSD currently sought views from relevant departments.
- (xviii) Project Item (20) “TP-DMW309 Construction of Shelter at Chuen On Road near Tai Po Hospital, Tai Po”, Project Item (21) “TP-DMW310 Provision of covered walkway near Wan Tau Tong Estate entrance connecting lift of Uptown Plaza footbridge, Tai Po”, Project Item (22) “TP-DMW315 Extension of Construction Works of Existing Covered Walkway at Nam Wan Road near Sun Hing Garden, Tai Po” and Project Item (23) “TP-DMW316 Provision of Covered Walkway at Nam Wan Road connecting the Lift of Footbridge NF 132, Tai Po”: The term consultant prepared the feasibility study reports currently.
- (xix) Project Item (24) “TP-DMW322 Provision of Rainshelter at Tai Po Tai Wo Road near the lay-by outside Yata Department Store, Tai Po”: The term consultant currently arranged for the contractor to carry out trial pit works.

39. Mr. TAM Yi-pui indicated that as regards Project Item (12) “TP-DMW256 Provision of sitting-out area at Tseng Tau, Sai Sha Road, Sai Kung North, Tai Po”, TPDO and LCSD might have received complaints from the villagers earlier that the gate and water main which had been installed in the park concerned were removed owing to this project. He considered the said arrangement

disturbing to the public. Given that the tender invitation date would be deferred, he enquired if items such as installation of the gate and other facilities could be included in the tender invitation document. He had once sought views from TPDLO, which had replied that relevant suggestions fell beyond its purview. As such, he asked LCSD and TPDO (Works Section) how gate installation could be arranged to resolve residents' disputes.

40. Mr. YIU Kwan-ho raised the following views and questions:

- (i) As regards Project Item (5) "TP-DMW238 Provision of rainshelters at Tai Po Kau Constituency (Mayfair By The Sea, Wong Yi Au, Ta Tit Yan and Cheung Shue Tan)", after inspecting the rainshelter at the minibus stop of Mayfair By The Sea, it had originally been proposed to relocate the minibus stop to the location of the existing rainshelter, and intervention of HyD was required because of the hatched markings at the said location. However, HyD had taken no action so far. He hoped that TPDO would help coordinate and urge HyD to handle the case should similar situation arise in the future, so that more members of the public could use the rainshelter.
- (ii) Regarding Project Item (18) "TP-DMW295 Provision of a sitting-out area at Pak Shek Kok", he had looked closely at the design proposal concerned with the then DFMC Chairman on 6 May 2021, and asked at which stage the feasibility study report of this project item was, and enquired about the progress of the term consultant's consultation with relevant departments and why there had been no final proposal so far. He said he supported the design proposal back then and hoped that it would not be altered.

41. Mr. WONG Siu-kin raised the following views and questions:

- (i) As far as Project Item (10) "TP-DMW253 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Hang House, Wan Tau Tong Estate at Tat Wan Road, Tai Po" was concerned, the rainshelter had initially been located at the pick-up/drop off point of the residents' service heading towards Lai Chi Kok area during the morning peak hours. He enquired if the existing residents' service had been affected since the commencement of this project on 22 June 2021, if yes, whether or not the said residents' service stop had been relocated.
- (ii) As regards Project Item (14) "TP-DMW263 Provision of fitness equipment and elderly facilities near the morning trail at Wan Tau Tong, Tai Po", he had an on-site inspection last year but failed to understand the details of the project so far. Hence, he enquired about the details and progress of the project.

42. Ms. CHAN Ho-shan, Susana indicated that regarding Project Item (12) “TP-DMW256 Provision of sitting-out area at Tseng Tau, Sai Sha Road, Sai Kung North, Tai Po”, TPDLO would arrange for removal of objects on the site concerned and TPDLO’s approval of the site allocation application was currently pending. The project could commence upon the said approval while the term consultant could install a gate in subsequent works.

43. Mr. Boris CHU responded as follows:

- (i) As regards Project Item (10) “TP-DMW253 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Tau Tong Estate at Fung Wan Road, Tai Po”, the works were underway without causing any obstruction to the residents’ service. An area within the construction site of the project was reserved for residents to get on or off the coaches at the existing residents’ service stop such that passengers were not affected.
- (ii) Regarding Project Item (14) “TP-DMW263 Provision of fitness equipment and elderly facilities near the morning trail at Wan Tau Tong, Tai Po”, the term consultant currently worked on the detailed design and checked the proposal concerned with the play equipment supplier, while advice of departments concerned was being sought.
- (iii) As far as Project Item (18) “TP-DMW295 Provision of a sitting-out area at Pak Shek Kok” was concerned, the feasibility study report was being prepared while departments concerned were being consulted. Advice of the play equipment supplier was being sought too. The feasibility study report was expected to be submitted at the WGDW meeting in August 2021.

44. Mr. CHAN Kam-shing, Eddie indicated that in connection with Project Item (18) “TP-DMW295 Provision of a sitting-out area at Pak Shek Kok”, LCSD had received views from the owners’ committee of The Graces - Providence Bay which opposed the construction of a sitting-out area at the leisure green belt zone. LCSD had already replied to the said owners’ committee regarding the progress of the project, and the reply had also been carbon-copied to the follow-up Member in the hope that the follow-up Member would confirm that the aforementioned owners’ committee had been consulted on the project proposal.

45. Mr. TAM Yi-pui said that regarding Project Item (12) “TP-DMW256 Provision of sitting-out area at Tseng Tau, Sai Sha Road, Sai Kung North, Tai Po”, he hoped that LCSD, TPDLO and TPDO would give a written reply concerning the matter about the gate of the sitting-out facility of Tseng Tau Tsuen as soon as possible. The original principal proponent, the follow-up Member and the villagers had in the beginning not expected that the gate would need to be removed when carrying out this project. Hence, he hoped that relevant departments would respond as to whether or not they would be responsible for building the gate, while TPDO (Works Section) might need to consider sending staff to clear up animal excreta within the project area.

46. Mr. CHOY Kin-lun advised that the project site at Tseng Tau Tsuen was a temporary allocation for which TPDLO was responsible temporarily. As regards LCSD's application for permanent site allocation, TPDLO had already sought LCSD's view on the surveying in June 2020, now pending LCSD's reply. Approval could proceed only upon receipt of the said reply.

47. Mr. SO Wing-kai said that since repair and maintenance of the project site at Tseng Tau Tsuen were still the responsibility of TPDO (Works Section) for the time being, TPDO would send staff to clean up on-site should animal excreta be spotted there. Besides, the aforementioned gate was not built by TPDO (Works Section), and TPDO had no record about the said gate having been built by which party. As regards whether or not a gate would be included in the project design in the future, it could be referred to Home Affairs Department ("HAD") (Works Section) and the term consultant for follow up.

48. DFMC endorsed the above report.

(B) DMW projects reported by TPDO

(Items (25) to (54) and (55) to (59) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 23/2021)

49. Mr. LAU Chun-ming reported the progress of projects as follows:

- (i) Project Item (27) "TP-DMW249 Improvement and widening to footpath at Yuen Leng, Kau Lung Hang and Tai Wo": Works had commenced on 9 February 2021 and completed by and large in mid-July 2021.
- (ii) Project Item (36) "TP-DMW308 Maintenance and improvement of facilities under Tai Po District Council Minor Works Programmes (2020-21)": Works had already commenced on 25 December 2020, and the costs of the maintenance and improvement works currently underway were approximately \$1.9 million.
- (iii) Project Item (37) "TP-DMW314 Replacement Works of Seating Benches at Tai Po Tai Wo Road near Yata Department Store, Tai Po": Works had already commenced on 20 April 2021 and were expected to complete in late July 2021.
- (iv) Project Item (45) "Provision of passing place and improvement to access road at Wai Tau Tsuen": The Works Section currently filed an application with DFMC for allocating \$1.5 million to carry out this project.
- (v) Progress of Project Items (25), (26), (28) to (35), (38) to (44), and (46) to (54) had already been enumerated in the progress summary of projects for Members' reference.

50. The Chairman reported that the project cost of Project Item (45) “Provision of passing place and improvement to access road at Wai Tau Tsuen” was \$1.5 million.

51. Members raised no objection. The Chairman announced that the above report and project cost were endorsed.

52. Ms. Lisa YIP gave supplementary remarks on the following projects:

- (i) Project Item (55) “Provision of rain shelter and benches next to Tai Po Community Centre”: TD had indicated on 31 May 2021 that a trade consultation was being conducted in connection with the proposal to re-assign the green minibuses and taxi stops on Po Heung Street near Tai Po Community Centre. TD would carry out district consultation on the proposed arrangement after summarising and considering relevant views. At the WGDW meeting on 21 June 2021, Mr. YAM Kai-bong, the then Chairman, had asked TD about the progress of its trade consultation, and requested that TD submit a reply regarding the proposed location of the minibus stop at the WGDW meeting in August 2021, and furnish the timetable for district consultation. TD’s reply was pending. TPDO would report to the principal proponent Mr. LAM Yick-kuen should there be any progress.
- (ii) Project Item (56) “Provision of covered walkway connecting lift NF444 near entrance of Wan Tau Tong Estate and intersection of Tat Wan Road/Nam Wan Road”: This project aimed to connect to the cover of the lift at the bridge leading to Uptown Plaza at the entrance of Wan Tau Tong Estate and was interrelated with the site of another project, namely, “TP-DMW310 Provision of covered walkway near Wan Tau Tong Estate entrance connecting lift of Uptown Plaza footbridge, Tai Po”. Key positions of the foundations and pillars of both projects to provide cover involved the pavement location next to the cover of the lift at the bridge leading to Uptown Plaza. The term consultant had completed the feasibility study report of “TP-DMW310 Provision of covered walkway near Wan Tau Tong Estate entrance connecting lift of Uptown Plaza footbridge, Tai Po” on 15 July 2021, which was expected to be submitted to WGDW in August 2021. Given that the foundations of both projects involved the same pavement location, the term consultant would submit the initial feasibility study report of this project too at the same time, while TPDO would arrange shortly for the term consultant and HAD (Works Section) to explain to the follow-up Member of the constituency concerned content of the said two reports in detail.
- (iii) Project Item (57) “Provision of Rain Shelter at Wan Tau Square, Tai Po”: Progress of the project had been enumerated in the progress summary of projects for Members’ reference.
- (iv) Project Item (58) “Provision of rain shelters at Pak Shek Kok (Chong San Road, Fo

Yin Road and Fo Chun Road)”: TPDO had already checked with TD relevant information about the minibus stops on Fo Chun Road and next to Chong San Road rainshelter, now pending TD’s reply. Mr. YIU Kwan-ho, the principal proponent, had included Mr. HO Wai-lam and the then Member Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai as other proponents on 16 June 2021. TPDO would report to Mr. HO Wai-lam and Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai the progress.

- (v) Project Item (59) “Provision of rain shelter at Chung Nga Road near Ting Kok Road, Tai Po”: TPDO currently sought preliminary views from relevant departments on the rainshelter project, now awaiting replies from TD and Drainage Services Department.

53. DFMC endorsed the above report.

(C) DMW projects followed up by the Tai Po District Leisure Services Office of the LCSD (Items (60) to (71) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 23/2021)

54. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan gave supplementary remarks on the following projects:

- (i) Project Item (60) “TP-DMW244 Provision and upgrading of drinking fountain facilities at the recreational and sports venues in Tai Po District”: Installation of drinking fountains at Fu Heng Sports Centre, Fu Shin Sports Centre, Tai Wo Sports Centre, Tai Po Sports Centre and Tai Po Hui Sports Centre had already completed, now awaiting relevant departments to carry out final water sampling test procedures. The whole project was expected to complete in Q3 in 2021.
- (ii) Project Item (61) “TP-DMW301 Contingency fund for urgent and minor improvement works for leisure venues in Tai Po District”, Project Item (62) “TP-DMW303 Provision and improvement of the drinking fountains at Tai Po Waterfront Park” and Project Item (63) “TP-DMW304 Provision of elderly fitness equipment at Chuen On Road Garden”: Progress had already been enumerated in the progress summary of projects for Members’ reference.
- (iii) Project Item (64) “TP-DMW305 TP-DMW305 Improvement works at Mui Shue Hang Playground”: Upon completion of the funding allocation procedure, LCSD would ascertain the project commencement date with Architectural Services Department (“ArchSD”) and the Technical Section.
- (iv) Project Item (65) “TP-DMW313 Improvement Works of Toilets and Changing Rooms for Leisure Venues in Tai Po District”, Project Item (66) “TP-DMW318 Provision of arbours for existing sitting benches at Kwong Fuk Sitting-out Area” and Project Item (67) “TP-DMW319 Improvement works at Kwong Fuk Bridge Garden”: Progress had already been enumerated in the progress summary of projects

for Members' reference.

- (v) Project Item (68) "TP-DMW320 Improvement works at Tai Po Tau Playground": Upon completion of the funding allocation procedure, LCSD would ascertain the project commencement date with ArchSD and the Technical Section.
- (vi) Project Item (69) "TP-DMW321 Provision of fitness equipment at Kwong Fuk Sitting-out Area", Project Item (70) "Improvement Works for the Elderly Fitness Equipment at Yuen Shin Park" and Project Item (71) "Improvement Works for Kau Lung Hang Playground": Progress had already been enumerated in the progress summary of projects for Members' reference.

55. DFMC endorsed the above report.

(D) DMW projects followed up by the Cultural Services Branch of the LCSD
(Items (72) to (74) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 23/2021)

56. Mr. NG Chi-keung, Barry reported that regarding Project Item (72) "To set up a 24-hour self-service library station at Yuen Shin Park", Project Item (73) "To set up a 24-hour self-service library station at Tai Po Old Market" and Project Item (74) "To set up a 24-hour self-service library station at Tai Wo MTR station lobby, since the epidemic continued to stabilise, LCSD had already commenced the review concerned and conducted a three-week opinion survey in May 2021 to gather readers' views on services of self-service library stations ("SSLs"). 2 673 questionnaires had been returned during the said opinion survey, of which 66% respondents indicated that they had used the services of SSLs, with an average usage of one to three times per month to borrow and return books primarily. Overall, 74% of the respondents were satisfied with the services of SSLs. The working group concerned had used the data collected during the said opinion survey for study and analysis of the SSL pilot scheme. Subject to the review outcome, LCSD would examine if SSL services would be provided in other districts in the existing format while additional funding would be applied for if need be.

57. Mr. LAU Yung-wai indicated that 74% of the respondents in this opinion survey were satisfied with the services of SSLs. He enquired whether or not LCSD had asked if the respondents would support the provision of SSLs in the future.

58. Mr. Barry NG advised that this opinion survey had aimed to find out why members of the public used SSLs, and the respondents had indicated that the convenient location of SSLs was one of the major reasons.

59. Mr. LAU Yung-wai asked if LCSD headquarters was aware that three constituencies in Tai Po District wished to have SSLs provided. He hoped that the departmental representative would

relay the opinion to the headquarters so as to accord priority to the aforementioned constituencies when considering the provision of SSLs.

60. Mr. Barry NG thanked Members for their views. As regards the opinion which Mr. LAU Yung-wai had put forward at the last meeting, he had already relayed the opinion to the working group concerned, and would also reflect views which Members expressed at this meeting to the working group concerned for follow up.

61. DFMC endorsed the above report.

(E) DMW projects followed up by the Planning Section of the LCSD
(Items (75) to (76) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 23/2021)

62. Mr. CHAN Kam-shing, Eddie gave supplementary remarks on the following projects:

- (i) Project Item (75) “Provision of a Pet Garden at the Open Space near Block 10 and 19 of Tai Po Centre, On Pong Road, Tai Po”: LCSD currently arranged for an on-site inspection with TD to follow up on matters concerning the relocation of parking spaces for bicycles.
- (ii) Project Item (76) “Provision of Fitness Equipment near Hang Wo House, Tai Wo Estate, Tai Po”: The proponent had already put forward new proposal earlier, and LCSD would discuss and follow up on the revised project proposal with the proponent.

63. DFMC endorsed the above report.

V. Leisure and Cultural Services Department — Progress of leisure and recreation facilities works projects in Tai Po District
(TPDC Paper No. DFM 24/2021)

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

65. Mr. Eddie CHAN introduced Paper No. DFM 24/2021 about the progress of the leisure and recreation facilities works projects in Tai Po District. At present, there were seven leisure and recreation facilities works projects in Tai Po District, including two which had already been completed and opened for use, and five were either under construction or under planning. The two project items which had completed were namely Development of a Bathing Beach at Lung Mei, Tai Po (“Lung Mei Beach” / “the Beach”) and Open space in Area 6, Tai Po (i.e., Ma Wo Road

Garden), which had been opened for public use on 23 June and 30 June 2021 respectively. As regards projects under construction or under planning, the project of Sports centre, community hall and football pitches in Area 1, Tai Po was expected to complete by and large in Q4 in 2021, whereas the project of Ha Hang Village Playground in Area 31, Tai Po was expected to commence in Q3 in 2021 and complete in mid-2023.

66. Mr. NG Sik-hay, Eddie introduced the progress of the Facility upgrading of Tai Po Civic Centre in Paper No. DFM 24/2021. He reported that funding application for this project had been approved by the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council on 11 June 2021 while ArchSD currently carried out tender invitation for this project. The project was expected to commence in end of 2021 and would take some two and a half years to complete. He thanked Members of the last term and current term for providing valuable views to LCSD which would adopt the views concerned as far as practicable where availability of resources and technical feasibility would permit. LCSD would remain in close liaison with ArchSD to implement the facilities in accordance with the project proposal as far as possible. Upon completion of the project, quality performance venues would become available for use by Tai Po residents and members of the public from other districts, while users of relevant trades welcomed the implementation of the facilities concerned. As the project would soon commence, LCSD would report to Members the progress again where necessary. He would be happy to answer any questions regarding the aforementioned project at future meetings should Members have any.

67. Mr. Eddie CHAN introduced the progress of the remaining leisure and recreation facilities works projects under planning in Paper No. DFM 24/2021. As far as the project Football-cum-Rugby Pitch with Public Vehicle Park in Area 33, Tai Po was concerned, the whole project was led by TD as the public vehicle park took up a major part of the project, while LCSD and TD would continue to take forward the project. The technical feasibility study had already completed and the departments would report to DFMC the progress in a timely manner. As regards Sports Centre in Area 6, Tai Po, the department had sought views from Members on the proposed facilities on 13 November 2020. Members were concerned about the height of the main building and the proposed social welfare facilities, and suggested that an indoor jogging track be built inside the sports centre. In response to Members' views, LCSD and relevant departments would review the proposed facilities of the project and report to Members in a timely manner.

68. Mr. Richard CHAN said that the project of Sports centre, community hall and football pitches in Area 1, Tai Po would complete substantially, and he hoped that LCSD would arrange for an on-site inspection such that Members could enter the construction site to see the current condition.

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

- (i) As regards the two projects under planning (i.e. Football-cum-Rugby Pitch with Public Vehicle Park in Area 33, Tai Po and Sports Centre in Area 6, Tai Po), he

enquired if the projects concerned covered only preliminary information such as construction sites, and whether or not more concrete details would be provided. He also asked when architectural drawings would be furnished to facilitate Members' understanding of the concrete projects' content.

- (ii) He thanked LCSD for adopting his views and those of other Members to provide an indoor jogging track in the sports centre in Area 6. Given that planning of the project concerned had commenced in 2017 already, he enquired when more progress of the project could be furnished.

70. Mr. Eddie CHAN responded as follows:

- (i) As far as the project of Sports centre, community hall and football pitches in Area 1, Tai Po was concerned, since works were still being carried out at the construction site, an on-site inspection would be arranged later owing to safety considerations. If need be, LCSD might contact ArchSD to arrange for Members to first take a look at the location of the proposed facilities from the surrounding of the construction site, and report on the project progress.
- (ii) As regards the project item Football-cum-Rugby Pitch with Public Vehicle Park in Area 33, Tai Po, ArchSD and TD had indicated at the meeting of the District Facilities Management Committee in November 2018 that the public vehicle park concerned would provide some 300 parking places and a study was underway. LCSD and ArchSD would continue to follow up and report to Members shortly.
- (iii) For Sports Centre in Area 6, Tai Po, LCSD noted Members' views and would review the proposed facilities with ArchSD and relevant departments with a view to reporting to DFMC and listening to Members' comments by the end of 2021.

71. Mr. LAM Yick-kuen indicated that in connection with the project of Ha Hang Village Playground in Area 31, Tai Po, several works areas were shown on the drawings. LCSD would usually carry out project acceptance of all areas at the same time. However, since several projects, of which the works areas were smaller, were close to residential areas, he recommended that LCSD consider first completing works at certain areas and then open the facilities for public use to avoid enclosing the works sites over extended periods of time which would be disturbing for the residents.

72. Mr. Eddie CHAN noted Members' views on and residents' requests regarding Ha Hang Village Playground in Area 31, Tai Po. LCSD would discuss the contract arrangement of the project with ArchSD to commence works at smaller sites first as far as practicable, and coordinate with colleagues at the district level to open the facilities for use as soon as possible upon completion.

73. DFMC endorsed the above report.

VI. Follow up on safety issues of swimmers at Tai Po Lung Mei Beach

(TPDC Paper Nos. DFM 25/2021 and DFM 25a/2021)

74. The Chairman advised that Members had submitted Paper No. DFM 25/2021 on 28 June 2021, and two of the co-signatories, namely, Mr. KWAN Wing-yip and Mr. YAM Kai-bong, had resigned on 8 July. He asked Mr. LAU Yung-wai to introduce Paper No. DFM 25/2021.

75. Mr. LAU Yung-wai introduced Paper No. DFM 25/2021. He said that Members had discussed relevant topic at the meeting of Environmental Protection, Fisheries, Agriculture, Industries, Commerce, Food and Health Committee (“EFAC”) earlier too and expressed concerns over the safety of swimmers after the opening of Lung Mei Beach. Marine organisms such as sea urchins and jellyfish were found after the Beach was opened, which caused injuries to swimmers. There had been media reports that on-site lifeguards had already reflected the issue to the management as they first came to the Beach, but many swimmers were still injured in the end. He hoped that LCSD would send representatives to explain the current situation, ways to follow up, and how marine organisms washed ashore would be handled. He recommended that LCSD consider relocating the marine organisms to mudflats nearby or Ting Kok East for conservation of marine organisms.

76. The Chairman indicated that LCSD had submitted a written reply prior to the meeting and Members could refer to Paper No. DFM 25a/2021.

77. Mr. TAM Yi-pui raised the following views and questions:

- (i) He had conducted ecological field trips in the vicinity of Ting Kok during his university days. He had at that time found that Lung Mei Beach was very rich in biodiversity, including *Archaster typicus*, *Salmacis sphaeroides*, *Batillaria zonalis*, *Parasesarma pictum*, mangroves and so on, which, however, were no longer there.
- (ii) He opined that the Government had insisted on having its own way, and it had been a wrong decision to build Lung Mei Beach, which not only brought a large number of visitors and heavy vehicular flow to Shuen Wan District, whereby giving rise to traffic problems, but also damaged the ecology badly.
- (iii) The Beach had completed, and he hoped that LCSD would handle the marine organisms on the Beach properly and identify a suitable location to relocate them.
- (iv) He opined that the Beach had originally been the habitat of the marine organisms while swimmers were outsiders. Had the Beach not been built, incidents of swimmers being injured would not have happened. He hoped that LCSD would give an introduction to the ecology in the vicinity to remind members of the public to cherish the marine organisms.

- (v) He enquired how LCSD handled marine organisms such as sea urchins, and whether or not notice boards would be erected to remind members of the public to cherish and treat marine organisms well.

78. Mr. YIU Kwan-ho raised the following views and questions:

- (i) He was concerned about the situation of marine organisms on Lung Mei Beach. There had been reports that LCSD requested the lifeguards to remove marine organisms such as diadema and sea urchins, etc., daily. He enquired if it was really the case.
- (ii) When first constructing Lung Mei Beach, the Government had indicated that both the water quality and ecology were suitable for swimmers to swim there. However, the Beach at present was obviously not suitable for swimming, and both marine organisms and human were affected. Hence, he enquired if LCSD would close the Beach in the event marine organisms were still found on the Beach.
- (iii) It had been mentioned in LCSD's written reply that LCSD would arrange for staff to remove marine organisms from the swimming zone and set them free in the waters beyond the Beach in a timely manner. He enquired if any marine organisms had died as a result during LCSD's removal of marine organisms from the swimming zone, and whether or not such practice would affect those organisms which were in the waters beyond the Beach originally.

79. Mr. Richard CHAN raised the following views and questions:

- (i) According to LCSD's written reply, the seabed in the deep water zone would become shallower during ebb tides, and swimmers would easily step on organisms which inhabited the seabed. He opined that it was not the case that ebbs and flows had not occurred before June 2021 while the marine organisms had never appeared on the Beach until today. So he asked when LCSD and other government departments had discovered that there were marine organisms in the shoal of Lung Mei Beach which might lead to injuries of swimmers.
- (ii) Lung Mei Beach had officially been opened on 23 June 2021. He asked if LCSD had noticed the aforementioned problem at venue acceptance earlier. If yes, he asked why LCSD had still opened the Beach as scheduled. If no, he asked why LCSD had not noticed the problem during the works period and at the inspection and acceptance of the Beach.
- (iii) He wished to know in detail which marine organisms on Lung Mei Beach would pose danger to swimmers, and enquired if relevant considerations and findings had been raised when preparing the study report of Lung Mei Beach. He was of the view that there might have been something misleading with a view to getting the

project started as soon as possible.

- (iv) He enquired what long-term measures or solutions LCSD had, and whether or not the lifeguards were still required to remove marine organisms and handle matters beyond their scope of duties. He also asked if other beaches had similar experience or ways to cope which could serve as a reference.

80. Mr. SO Tat-leung raised the following views and questions:

- (i) As far as he knew, as the project of Lung Mei Beach was being carried out, there had been several relocations of marine organisms. He enquired if the marine organisms had originally inhabited in the Beach area, or had floated from other places to the Beach.
- (ii) According to LCSD personnel, it happened to be the days with larger tidal ranges when the Beach was first opened. He enquired if that was the reason why a lot of sea urchins had appeared.

81. Mr. LAU Yung-wai indicated that it had been mentioned in Paper No. DFM 25/2021 that the lifeguards had reflected the problem concerned to the management already as they had entered the Beach. He was concerned if there had been any staff being aware of the situation concerned without handling it, and asked if any human negligence had been involved.

82. Ms. TAM Wai-chu responded as follows:

- (i) Lung Mei Beach, Tai Po had been opened for public use since 23 June 2021. Some swimmers had been subsequently stung by sea urchins. Since the shoreline of the beach would change because of tides, the seabed of the deep water zone would become shallower during ebb tides and swimmers would easily step on organisms inhabiting the seabed and get injured. Since it had happened to be the days with larger tidal ranges when the incidents had occurred, the risk of injuries was higher.
- (ii) After the incidents, LCSD would pay attention to the time of ebb tides on the Beach, broadcast announcements where appropriate, and send staff to remind swimmers to beware of sea urchins and cherish the nature. LCSD had also put up notices at major passages to remind swimmers, and erected crowd control barriers and large banners along passages on the Beach and at seaside to alert swimmers to beware of sea urchins so as to prevent them from getting injured.
- (iii) While preparing to open the Beach, LCSD personnel had spotted sea urchins at ebb tides and moved them to the waters beyond the swimming zone. The sea urchins had been carefully moved away from the swimming zone where necessary and set free in the waters beyond the Beach to prevent swimmers from getting injured after the opening of the Beach.

- (iv) Marine organisms which LCSD had spotted on Lung Mei Beach were primarily sea urchins and jellyfish. LCSD would arrange for staff to monitor the situation closely and pay extra attention at ebb tides to see if sea urchins were found, while manpower would be deployed to move sea urchins away from the swimming zone. After the incidents in June 2021, the number of swimmers being injured had dropped significantly. During future swimming seasons, especially on the days with larger tidal ranges, LCSD would take similar measures to cope with the situation so that swimmers could use the Beach safely.
- (v) To provide a more concrete reply and information, LCSD would need to check with relevant departments reports about relocation of organisms prior to the opening of the Beach. LCSD could follow up on the matter concerned with Members shortly.

83. Mr. LI Yiu-ban raised the following views and questions:

- (i) He had grown up in a village where he had lived with wildlife over a long time, hence, he considered it not unusual. It was very common to have wildlife in the living sphere of human, and vice versa. Apart from human and animals, a balance would need to be struck in the ecology among wildlife too.
- (ii) At the meeting of the Country and Marine Parks Board over a decade ago, some research reports had indicated that many reef frameworks at Hoi Ha Wan had been eroded by wildlife and collapsed as a result. During further investigation, an ecological imbalance had been found at the said site where a large number of conches had eroded the reef frameworks. So the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department had at that time deployed a lot of staff to the site to remove the conches in order to recover the ecological balance. Hence, he considered it not unusual at all for wildlife to appear in the living sphere of human. The question was how to deal with it.
- (iii) In the past, sharks had appeared at many beaches, particularly those which were far away from urban areas, so he asked if beaches should therefore be cancelled to completely prohibit members of the public from undertaking any activities on the beaches. He opined that human beings had the wisdom to make use of shark prevention nets to stop sharks from attacking swimmers. In the face of the problem of sea urchins or diadema appearing on the Beach, he was of the view that LCSD might consider erecting nets of suitable height to stop sea urchins or diadema from entering the swimming zone. He opined that LCSD could explore in this regard to co-ordinate the ecology of human and that of animals.

84. Mr. Richard CHAN raised the following views and questions:

- (i) He opined that wildlife did not appear all of a sudden today. In this connection, he

asked if LCSD had not noticed relevant issues until it designed the Beach, during the project period or inspection and acceptance of the Beach, and which remedial measures it had adopted after having noticed the problem. If LCSD indicated that it had not noticed the problem until June 2021, he would find the situation ridiculous as it would mean that the observation, inspection and acceptance done earlier were completely useless. Had LCSD been aware of the problem concerned before June 2021 already but adopted neither preventive nor remedial measures and opted for opening the Beach as scheduled, he would consider such approach an utter disregard for human life and safety of members of the public.

- (ii) According to the information of Hong Kong Observatory (“HKO”), there were in general two high tides and two low tides every day. Near New Moon or Full Moon each month, the Earth, Moon and Sun were aligned along a straight line, and the sea-level rise and fall would have a larger range. This phenomenon was known as Spring Tide. Higher Spring Tides in Hong Kong usually fell in the months of June and July or December and January each year.
- (iii) He opined that LCSD was very experienced in the management of beaches and water sports, and possessed certain knowledge about high and low tides. When undertaking water sports in the past, he had paid attention to the high and low tides to determine when to launch and retrieve the boat. The department must have paid attention to tidal information too when managing the beaches. Hence, he enquired if the aforementioned problem occurred only at higher Spring Tides rather than during average high and low tides. If the problem occurred only at higher Spring Tides and LCSD took no preventive measures, he asked if LCSD would consider closing the Beach temporarily at higher Spring Tides to minimise the chance of members of the public getting injured.

85. Mr. YIU Kwan-ho raised the following views and questions:

- (i) Some green groups had indicated that at low tides, there were various organisms on the Beach, and therefore recommended that swimmers be urged to stay out of the water during low tides and only undertake on-shore activities. He enquired if LCSD had ever accepted relevant recommendations and what comment it had. Would LCSD execute the recommendations concerned?
- (ii) He opined that organisms at the said site were not limited to sea urchins and jellyfish. There were also starfish and so on. He enquired how LCSD conserved such organisms.
- (iii) It had been mentioned in LCSD’s written reply that LCSD staff would handle the organisms concerned. He enquired if the staff concerned referred to the lifeguards. If yes, he asked if LCSD had mentioned this task when employing lifeguards or if the said task belonged to extra work.

- (iv) He asked if LCSD would cause any harm to marine organisms when handling them, and if the organisms were relocated to other waters, whether or not the organisms in other waters would be affected. If LCSD had assessed the relocation work mentioned above, he requested that LCSD furnish statistics about marine organisms being injured as a result of relocation.

86. Mr. AU Chun-wah raised the following views and questions:

- (i) He opined that LCSD had no feasible solution to ameliorate the problem for the time being. In its written reply, LCSD had only mentioned that swimmers would be reminded in a timely manner by announcements, posters, notices and so on. However, he considered such measures inadequate. The Beach, on which a lot of money had been spent, had already been constructed and it had been intended for public use. However, the Beach at present might not be suitable for members of the public to swim, and LCSD might need to consider closing the Beach temporarily until the situation improved.
- (ii) There had been some time since the Beach was opened and LCSD should have the numbers of swimmers being injured by marine organisms on weekends and weekdays available. Given that many swimmers got injured, he enquired if LCSD had set any indicators to measure if the Beach was suitable for opening for public use. He also asked if LCSD would contact experts for professional advice and implement corresponding measures to keep the risks to a minimum so as to prevent swimmers from being injured by marine organisms.

87. Ms. TAM Wai-chu responded as follows:

- (i) While getting the Beach ready for opening, LCSD had spotted sea urchins and removed them from the swimming zone for relocation in the waters beyond the Beach. At low tides, spots where water was deep originally became shallower and this phenomenon was particularly prominent at Spring Tides when swimmers could even walk to water boundary area which was further away and would easily trample on sea urchins and injure themselves.
- (ii) LCSD would not urge swimmers to stay out of the water, but remind them to be careful while going into the water because they might trample on organisms on the seabed. Swimmers might also take this opportunity to see the marine organisms.
- (iii) LCSD had arranged for additional manpower to handle marine organisms. When removing sea urchins, LCSD staff would use caution and be particularly careful when picking up the organisms, set them free in nearby waters as quickly as possible so that they could further inhabit in a suitable environment. The number of subsequent injuries had dropped significantly. LCSD continued to observe the

situation to strike a balance between safety of swimmers and enjoying the Beach.

88. Mr. CHAU Chun-wing responded as follows:

- (i) The sea urchins and jellyfish concerned were species commonly seen in Hong Kong waters, which lived in the sea including the Beach area. The Beach was a natural environment where various marine organisms inhabited. When preparing the Beach for opening, LCSD had spotted sea urchins, which beach staff had carefully removed from the swimming zone to live further elsewhere without posing the risk of injuring swimmers after the opening of the Beach.
- (ii) Since the Beach had been opened, removal of sea urchins was mainly done by staff of LCSD's contractor. Should beach staff spot any marine organisms during the daily opening hours of the Beach, they would carefully remove the marine organisms from the swimming zone where necessary and set them free in the waters beyond the Beach at once where they could live further.
- (iii) There had been relatively more cases of swimmers being injured by sea urchins at the beach on 26 June 2021 when the tidal range had been larger. All cases of injuries had been minor, and swimmers had all left on their own after simple care provided by beach staff. LCSD had taken a number of measures immediately afterwards, including putting up reminder notices and banners within the Beach area and making timely announcements to remind swimmers to be careful and avoid trampling on or touching marine organisms such as sea urchins and jellyfish. Besides, reminders had been made verbally to swimmers by patrolling lifeguards and beach ambassadors. Since the said measures had been taken, the number of swimmers being injured because of sea urchins or jellyfish had dropped significantly on the following day when the tidal range had been larger too, while only one or zero case of swimmers being injured had been recorded on the days which followed.
- (iv) LCSD would closely monitor the tidal situation and continue to adopt suitable measures on days with larger tidal ranges so that swimmers could use the Beach safely.

89. Mr. WONG Siu-kin raised the following views and questions:

- (i) He opined that while safety of swimmers was important, he attached more importance to marine ecology at the Beach. He had submitted relevant agenda items for discussion at the EFAC meeting earlier, with marine ecology as the discussion focus. At that time, he had hoped that representatives of Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CEDD") and the Environment Bureau ("ENB") would be invited to attend the meeting, but relevant representatives had in the end failed to do so. LCSD was responsible for the management of the Beach

only upon its completion. As such, CEDD should send representatives to respond as to how marine organisms had been discovered and dealt with during the project period.

- (ii) Human beings had to co-exist with wildlife and could not refrain from development or human activities because of the existence of wildlife. He doubted why the Government had in the very beginning chosen to develop a site with a large number of marine organisms and biodiversity. Had it been unnecessary to consider any environmental factors when developing and building an artificial beach, then nature conservation zones in Hong Kong such as Mai Po and mangroves, in his opinion, could have been used to build public housing estates. However, the argument did not stand in reality.
- (iii) LCSD had indicated just now that frontline lifeguards would remove marine organisms such as sea urchins and diadema if they spotted any. He considered this practice not necessarily the best solution.
- (iv) LCSD had mentioned just now that the organisms primarily included sea urchins and jellyfish. He enquired if LCSD was aware of any other marine organisms at Lung Mei Beach, and whether or not LCSD had watched the video filmed by CEDD entitled “Lung Mei Aqua World 2021”. He reckoned that the said video had been filmed in 2021 by a drone in the vicinity of Lung Mei Beach, showcasing over a dozen species including *Hippocampus kuda*, *Abudefduf vaigiensis*, *Takifugu alboplumbeus*, *Lutjanus russellii*, *Scatophagus argus*, *Monacanthus chinensis*, *Penaeidae*, *Archaster typicus* and so on. Despite LCSD relocated relevant marine organisms upon completion of the Beach, there were still many organisms at the Beach. Hence, he enquired how LCSD would handle them.
- (v) He enquired if LCSD had consulted, prior to relocating the sea urchins, ENB or other green groups in order to assess if the practice concerned was appropriate.
- (vi) LCSD had indicated that there had been 41 cases of swimmers being injured. He asked during which timeslots the cases concerned had occurred.
- (vii) Even though the Beach would not be closed for the time being, he enquired if LCSD had any mechanism for closing the Beach, and whether or not it would close existing beaches under specific conditions.
- (viii) He opined that a balance must be struck between human activities and conservation while development should not take place at species-rich sites. Hence, he had reservation about the approach of relocating organisms after development.

90. Mr. Lam Yick-kuen indicated that he had held a meeting with the fishermen earlier to gain some understanding about the situation of the waters in the vicinity of Lung Mei. The fishermen had advised that sea urchins were seasonal organisms which in general appeared between May and July. He opined that LCSD should make preparation in the coming year prior to the season when

sea urchins would appear, such as placing smaller nets to prevent sea urchins from entering the Beach.

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

- (i) He opined that LCSD at present would need to take remedial measures, which were better late than never, whereas he did not agree with the department's saying that the Beach would not be closed because of tidal changes. It would be unreasonable to keep a beach open when there were sharks or red tides.
- (ii) LCSD had opened the Beach on 23 June while the ebb tides were at their lowest of the year during the period between 25 and 27 June. Many residents had been stabbed by sea urchins as a result. He opined that LCSD should use the right remedy to tackle the problem that closure of the Beach should be considered if the water level was lower than 0.3 metre.
- (iii) Given that there would still be situations when the water level was lower in the future (for instance, between 23 and 25 July), LCSD could take preventive measures in accordance with the tidal table. He did not hope that LCSD would still use tidal changes as an excuse when swimmers got injured again.
- (iv) Members of the public might find it a shame to close the Beach because of tidal changes during the swimming season. However, doing so would exactly reflect that LCSD should seriously think from the perspective of swimmers and members of the public, whereas it was irresponsible for LCSD to merely deploy staff to remove sea urchins and other marine organisms.
- (v) He was of the view that LCSD could refer to the tidal table to consider closing the Beach on certain days. Should there be no other feasible measures and LCSD not close the Beach, there might again be cases of swimmers being injured, for which LCSD would be duty-bound in his opinion.

92. Mr. Richard CHAN raised the following views and questions:

- (i) He concurred with Members' views while members of the public and LCSD could refer to the tidal table of HKO. LCSD had not noticed the problem with sea urchins until venue acceptance in late May 2021. He opined that LCSD seemed to have said that it had been pulled a fast one on by other departments and became a victim. He enumerated statistics of tidal levels in late May to illustrate that the chart datum had been at a low level when LCSD had accepted the venue, while the water level had still been rather low when LCSD had decided to open the Beach. He enquired why LCSD had under such circumstances decided nonetheless to open the Beach on 23 June, what considerations had involved, and whether or not LCSD had taken into consideration the safety of swimmers.

- (ii) According to the statistics of the tidal levels between 23 and 25 July, it had happened to be a Spring Tide when it might be dangerous for members of the public to use the Beach. He cited an example that had shark prevention nets not been installed yet at a beach, LCSD would hoist a shark warning flag when sharks appeared to alert members of the public of the appearance of sharks, while LCSD had a mechanism to hoist red flags too. Hence, he did not think that it would be difficult for LCSD to close the Beach on designated days as doing so was for the safety of members of the public.
- (iii) He had repeatedly asked LCSD if the situation concerned had anything to do with the daily high and low tides or the higher Spring Tide. He was of the view that had an upcoming higher Spring Tide been predicted, the Beach should be closed to prevent swimmers from getting injured. In this connection, he enquired if LCSD could adopt the approach mentioned above, or consider making announcements to remind swimmers not to get into the water but to undertake activities on the Beach only to avoid danger. He considered it not necessary to close the Beach for a whole month, but only on days of higher Spring Tide while measures should be taken according to the benchmark to ensure the safety of swimmers.

93. Mr. LI Yiu-ban raised the following views:

- (i) Facing the nuisance arising from sea urchins and jellyfish, he opined that LCSD should work more on the facilities such as erecting warning flags where necessary to alert swimmers to beware of the presence of sea urchins.
- (ii) A Member had said that LCSD showed an utter disregard for human life. He found such an accusation too serious, and said that while he had always been stung by sea urchins since childhood, there had been no problem once the spines of the urchins had been plucked out. Some people might be allergic to sea urchins in which case redness and swelling on the skin would occur. However, such were superficial wounds which caused relatively little harm to the body. Hence, he considered it unnecessary to close the beach for this reason.
- (iii) *Aedes albopictus* were found in many parks managed by LCSD, and *Aedes albopictus* might transmit Zika virus and other transmissible diseases. As such, he enquired if parks would need to be closed for this reason. Members of the public going to the Beach would need to bear the risk and explore the environment, just like those going to parks would need to bring along mosquito-repellent sprays themselves, while they would look at the traffic light and check if there were vehicles running on the road before crossing. All such instances were crisis awareness which members of the public should possess. Beaches were natural ecological environment with an abundant diversity of wild animals and plants. When going to the beach, members of the public should have crisis awareness too.

It was rather unrealistic to solely rely on the facility provider to provide an absolutely safe environment, and members of the public should be responsible for their own safety. Hence, he did not support closing the Beach at the slightest pretext. Rather, members of the public should be given suitable reminder while facilities and staffing arrangement should be enhanced.

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

- (i) She enquired if LCSD would set up any mechanism in connection with the sea urchin problem of Lung Mei Beach, for instance, temporary closure of the Beach would be considered when there were more sea urchins. Should a large number of sea urchins appear because of tidal changes, LCSD staff would need time to remove them, in which case temporary closure of the Beach could facilitate an accelerated removal of sea urchins which was beneficial to both members of the public and LCSD staff. During the temporary closure of the Beach, swimmers were allowed to undertake activities only on-shore and not in the water.
- (ii) She opined that LCSD could engage marine biologists to study how to conserve marine life in the said environment while carrying out improvement works at the Beach concurrently. She hoped that LCSD would consider submitting at the next meeting mechanism to ameliorate and ways to handle the problem.

95. Mr. HO Wai-lam indicated that regardless of whether or not LCSD would consider closing the Beach on designated days, it should deploy staff to give out promotional leaflets at the Beach during the breeding season of sea urchins to remind members of the public of the risks and points to note for using the Beach. Announcements could also be broadcasted at the venue to inform members of the public of the information concerned. Even though members of the public were informed that the Beach had to be closed owing to the presence of sea urchins, some might not be afraid and would want to use the Beach further. It was therefore necessary to make them aware of the risks concerned and consider whether or not to use the facilities.

96. Mr. YIU Kwan-ho raised the following views and questions:

- (i) He enquired if LCSD had consulted professionals in the department on the current handling of the issue, or simply adopted the usual practice of the department to relocate organisms elsewhere to solve the problem of ecological conservation, which was an approach he had doubts about.
- (ii) LCSD had indicated just now that extra manpower was available for removing the sea urchins, while it had also said that before the opening of the Beach, sea urchins had been removed by lifeguards while cleaning workers were responsible for removing the sea urchins after the opening. He enquired if extra manpower

referred to cleaning workers, or there was no extra manpower responsible for the removal.

- (iii) He had already opposed the construction of Lung Mei Beach project before the commencement of the project. He considered it a wrong decision to convert a site with an abundant biodiversity into an artificial beach, which would bring forth a high visitor flow and pollute the water quality. The Government had no comprehensive solution thus far but insisted on having its own way to build the beach, about which he felt helpless. During an on-site inspection earlier, he had found micro particles of polyfoams on the shore. He asked if LCSD was aware of it. Did LCSD opine that the problems concerned could be solved and therefore continued building the Beach?

97. Mr. Richard CHAN said that since many Members had raised questions, he asked if LCSD representatives could be allowed to respond first before Members would follow up further. Discussion of some questions could proceed only after the department had responded.

98. The Chairman advised that two Members had not spoken yet in this round of questions, so he hoped that those two Members could put forward questions so that the departmental representatives could respond in one go. He believed that doing so would enhance the overall efficiency.

99. Mr. WONG Siu-kin raised the following views and questions:

- (i) Pursuant to prevailing regulations, which stakeholder would be held responsible in the event a swimmer was injured at the Beach and wanted to make a court claim for damage?
- (ii) Someone had an on-site inspection at the Beach and found that a swimmer had been stabbed by marine organisms within the beach area and needed to be admitted to hospital in a life-threatening condition. In this connection, he asked how LCSD would handle the organisms concerned and the incident of swimmer being injured.

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

- (i) He agreed that the Beach was a natural environment which members of the public could explore. Notwithstanding, Lung Mei Beach was a government facility and members of the public, during their visit, would have some expectations of the management of the facility. For instance, they would expect the environment of the Beach to be safe and equipped with shark prevention nets and so on, unlike natural beaches without lifeguards and other facilities.
- (ii) Should the water quality of a beach be poor with an excessive level of *Escherichia*

coli, or have problems such as sharks and red tides, the beach concerned would be unsuitable for swimming. For the safety of swimmers, LCSD should close the beach concerned, for which members of the public would have understanding. Since LCSD was aware that the rising and receding tides would make the seabed in deeper water shallower, swimmers might step on organisms on the seabed and get injured, it should handle the situation appropriately. Given that the situation where water level was low might occur again in the future, which LCSD must handle urgently, it might be necessary to discuss solutions immediately after this meeting.

- (iii) He would move an impromptu motion to recommend that LCSD need to consider closing the Beach or prohibiting swimmers from entering the water during the period when the water level was 0.4 metre or below to ensure the safety of swimmers. He hoped that LCSD would consider and implement the abovementioned measure on the upcoming days of Spring Tides.
- (iv) He had opposed the construction of Lung Mei Beach back then too. However, relevant proposal had already been endorsed earlier. He hoped that LCSD would handle the issue in the direction discussed above. Given the urgency of the action, he hoped that the Chairman would process the impromptu motion shortly.

101. Mr. CHAU Chun-wing responded as follows:

- (i) There had been several cases of swimmers being injured by sea urchins at the beach on 26 June 2021 when the tidal range had been larger. LCSD had taken a number of measures immediately afterwards, including putting up reminder notices and banners within the Beach area and making timely announcements to remind swimmers to be careful and avoid trampling on or touching marine organisms. Besides, verbal reminders to swimmers had been made by staff performing inspections. Since the said measures had been taken, the number of swimmers being injured because of sea urchins or jellyfish had dropped significantly on the following day when the tidal range had been larger too, while only one or zero case of swimmers being injured had been recorded per day for more than 10 consecutive days since then.
- (ii) LCSD had all along attached great importance to management of venue facilities to provide better service to the public. As such, LCSD would continue to pay attention to days with larger tidal ranges. Apart from erecting large banners and broadcasting announcements to remind members of the public to beware of sea urchins, beach ambassadors and lifeguards would also be deployed to patrol the Beach to remind swimmers to pay attention to low water level and safety. LCSD would go on to adopt a multi-pronged approach and expected the number of injury cases to fall to a lower level.
- (iii) Sea water level at the Beach would change in response to high and low tides

accordingly. The seabed in the deep water zone would become shallower during ebb tides, and swimmers would easily step on organisms which inhabited the seabed. In this connection, LCSD had already adopted multiple measures to remind swimmers to be more alert. Cases of swimmers being injured because of marine organisms had decreased significantly. LCSD would continue monitoring closely the situation of the Beach, and remind swimmers to use caution and avoid stepping on or touching marine organisms, while caring for and protecting organisms in the nature.

- (iv) LCSD had all along working guidelines on handling marine organisms on beaches. As far as relocation of sea urchins at Lung Mei Beach was concerned, LCSD would carefully remove them from the swimming zone where necessary to surrounding waters beyond the swimming zone, so that they could live further in comparable and suitable waters and seabed environment.

102. Mr. Richard CHAN raised the following views and questions:

- (i) The number of cases of swimmers getting injured fell from 41 to 16. He opined that the sampling size involved was not scientific because not all swimmers stabbed by sea urchins would notify LCSD. Hence, he was of the view that the number concerned fell short of reflecting the actual situation.
- (ii) He understood that LCSD took into account the needs of members of the public and opened the Beach for public use as far as possible. Hence, LCSD could refer to the tidal table while announcement should be made as early as possible should the Beach need to be closed.
- (iii) He understood that LCSD needed time to adjust, however, consideration should also be given to the safety of members of the public. Should there be danger, it would be more appropriate to close the Beach temporarily to minimise risk.
- (iv) A Member had indicated that members of the public should possess crisis awareness, which he did not agree. Should the statement concerned be true, then all notice boards at facilities managed by LCSD could be removed. He opined that preventive measures must be enhanced, such as providing additional signage to remind members of the public.
- (v) The tort law in Hong Kong covered a claim mechanism. Members of the public being stabbed by sea urchins at the Beach could sue the Government and file a claim for compensation. As such, he hoped that LCSD would establish relevant mechanism to close the Beach under certain conditions to prevent members of the public from getting injured.

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

- (i) Before proper and effective methods for handling marine organisms became available, he opined that LCSD had to consider taking remedial measures. Despite the fact that members of the public might be disappointed if the Beach was closed, LCSD should nonetheless accord priority to the consideration of safety issues. The tidal table showed the predicted water level throughout the year and LCSD would only need to set the water level standard for Beach closure. There would be no expectation gap provided that LCSD notified the public of the arrangement of Beach closure as early as possible. LCSD should not disregard public safety to meet the expectation of a minority of the public either.
- (ii) Cases of swimmers being injured had dropped from 41 to 16, which seemed to be a significant decrease. However, he considered even one single incident of injury too many. He did not know if LCSD had evaluated after the incidents the reasons for the significant drop of the above numbers and estimated whether or not there was any direct correlation between the low tides and number of injury cases. Members of the public might have already left the Beach before the ebb and the number of injury cases dropped as a result.
- (iii) He was concerned about the days with Spring Tides in late July when the water level would drop to 0.2 metre again while the ebb would occur earlier at 2 p.m. or so, which was the time when there might be more swimmers playing on the Beach. So it could be dangerous.
- (iv) He would move an impromptu motion including the recommendation that LCSD should close the Beach or advise swimmers not to go into the water during higher Spring Tides when water level was low so as to ensure the safety of swimmers. He hoped that LCSD would accept the views of TPDC and try adopting the solutions concerned to ameliorate the problem.

104. Mr. CHAU Chun-wing responded as follows:

- (i) On 26 June when more than 40 cases of swimmers' being stabbed by sea urchins had occurred, there had been some 2 600 swimmers. LCSD had taken a number of measures immediately afterwards, and the number of such cases had dropped to a dozen or so on the following day, i.e. 27 June when the water level had been low, while there had been some 6 100 swimmers in total. On more than 10 consecutive days which followed, only one or zero case of swimmers being injured had been recorded per day.
- (ii) LCSD had already adopted multiple measures to remind swimmers to be more alert. Cases of swimmers being injured because of marine organisms had decreased significantly. LCSD would continue monitoring closely the situation of the Beach,

pay attention to the tidal table and continue to carry out preventive measures concerned to remind swimmers to use caution and avoid stepping on or touching marine organisms.

105. The Chairman advised that under Order 17 of the Standing Orders, unless the Chairman agreed otherwise, Members were required to notify the Secretary 10 clear working days prior to the upcoming meeting should they wish to move a motion. Order 16 of the Standing Orders also stipulated that a motion was required to be moved in writing and signed by the Member concerned while the title and content of the motion should not be in conflict with the duties of the DC.

106. The Chairman indicated that he would use discretion to accept Mr. LAU Yung-wai's moving of an impromptu motion at the meeting, and asked Mr. LAU to read out the motion with the content as follows:

“District Facilities Management and Culture, Recreation and Sports Committee of the Tai Po District Council requests LCSD to close Lung Mei Bathing Beach when water level is low during higher Spring Tides or stop members of the public from going into the water if the beach is open so as to ensure the safety of swimmers.”

This impromptu motion was moved by Mr. LAU Yung-wai and seconded by Ms. Olive CHAN.

107. Mr. LI Yiu-ban enquired if LCSD had the statutory power to prohibit members of the public from entering the water. During the period when a No. 8 Gale or Storm Signal was being hoisted in the past, many members of the public had still gone surfing at Shek O Beach or Tai Long Wan. He asked if such acts were illegal. If yes, which legislation would LCSD enforce? The department must clarify the issue in order to implement relevant measures.

108. Mr. CHAU Chun-wing indicated that LCSD provided life-saving service during daytime designated hours in the swimming season. Beach closure referred to the period when relevant life-saving service was not available while members of the public could still enter the area of the beaches.

109. Mr. LAU Yung-wai enquired if LCSD would allow members of the public to enter the water after a shark warning flag was hoisted, and whether or not there would be relevant personnel on-site to advise members of the public not to, or stop them from entering the water.

110. Mr. CHAU Chun-wing indicated that life-saving service would be suspended at Lung Mei Beach, Tai Po after the swimming season ended each year (i.e. from 1 November to 31 March next year), and members of the public could still enter the beach during the said period. Should members of the public enter the water, staff at the beach would advise them not to.

111. Mr. Richard CHAN said that members of the public would need to bear the responsibility themselves when undertaking any activities in a public space without management by a government department. However, if a venue was managed by a government department, the department concerned would be legally liable to take care of the safety of the users of the venue. As such, even if the department had no authority to stop members of the public from entering the beach, it should have corresponding measures to take initiative to warn and advise members of the public not to undertake dangerous activities to ensure their safety. Otherwise, the department would have an unshrinkable responsibility and face legal risks should there be an accident. As regards Mr. LAU Yung-wai's impromptu motion, its content did not mean to force the department to adopt the measures concerned, but to solemnly reflect to LCSD that it was duty-bound to ensure the safety of members of the public instead. There was little which the department could do if it had already adopted sufficient preventive measures and members of the public entered the water nonetheless.

112. Mr. LAU Yung-wai indicated that despite the preventive measures, for instance, hoisting of shark warning flags, LCSD had already taken, members of the public would have to bear the responsibility themselves should they undertake dangerous activities under extreme weather conditions while LCSD had no authority to stop them. Notwithstanding, given that the Beach was managed by LCSD, it should give advice and warning as much as possible to prevent swimmers from getting injured again. Once the impromptu motion was carried, it would be LCSD's decision and responsibility as to whether or not it would pay attention to the impromptu motion. He would pursue the matter with the department should there be any injuries again in the future.

113. Members agreed to vote by open ballot. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the aforementioned impromptu motion, and the results were as follows:

| | | |
|-------------------------|---------|--|
| For: | 6 votes | Mr. AU Chun-ho, the Vice-chairman, Mr. AU Chun-wah, Mr. Richard CHAN, Ms. Olive CHAN, Mr. LAU Yung-wai and Mr. TAM Yi-pui |
| Against: | 1 vote | Mr. SO Tat-leung |
| Abstain: | 3 votes | Mr. LAM Yick-kuen, Mr. LI Yiu-ban and Mr. YIU Kwan-ho |
| Present without voting: | 2 votes | Mr. Patrick MO, the Chairman and Mr. WONG Siu-kin |
| Absent without voting: | 1 vote | Mr. HO Wai-lam |
| Total: | | 13 votes |

114. The Chairman announced that the motion was carried.

(Post-meeting note: Cases of swimmers having trampled on sea urchins or touched jellyfish had primarily occurred during the first few days after the opening of the Beach. LCSD had already adopted multiple measures including putting up reminder notices and banners within the Beach area, water buoys and making timely announcements to remind swimmers to use caution and avoid trampling on or touching marine organisms such as sea urchins and jellyfish. Besides, verbal reminders had also been given to swimmers via patrolling lifeguards and beach ambassadors. Since the above measures had been adopted, the number of cases of swimmers being injured because of sea urchins or jellyfish had dropped significantly. During the period between mid-July and mid-August, LCSD had only recorded four cases of trampling on sea urchins on four days and two cases of touching jellyfish on two days. No cases of swimmers being stabbed or stung by sea urchins or jellyfish had been recorded on the remaining days. The aforementioned cases had all been minor and the swimmers concerned had left on their own after receiving simple treatment provided by LCSD staff.

The sea level at the Beach would change in response to tidal phases in the nature. The seabed in the deep water zone would become shallower during ebb tides, and swimmers would easily step on organisms which inhabited the seabed, resulting in injuries. LCSD would continue monitoring closely the situation of the Beach and remind swimmers to use caution and avoid stepping on or touching marine organisms, while caring for and protecting organisms in the nature.)

115. The Chairman announced that the meeting would be adjourned for 1 hour and 20 minutes.

116. The meeting resumed afterwards.

VII. Request to construct an inclusive playground in Tai Po District

(TPDC Paper Nos. DFM 26/2021 and DFM 26a/2021)

117. The Chairman advised that Members had already submitted on 28 June 2021 Paper No. DFM 26/2021, of which two of the co-signatories, namely Mr. KWAN Wing-yip and Mr. YAM Kai-bong, had left their offices as DC Members on 8 July 2021. He asked Mr. LAU Yung-wai to introduce Paper No. DFM 26/2021.

118. Mr. LAU Yung-wai introduced Paper No. DFM 26/2021. He indicated that the inclusive playground in Tuen Mun Park had completed in recent months and was extensively well received by the public. Many residents had asked when a similar park would be built in Tai Po District such that Tai Po residents could enjoy an equally favourable treatment and members of the public would be provided a comfortable sitting-out environment. In this connection, he and other Members hoped that LCSD would identify a suitable site in Tai Po town centre for constructing an inclusive playground.

119. The Chairman indicated that LCSD had submitted a written reply prior to the meeting in connection with the aforementioned paper. Members could refer to Paper No. DFM 26a/2021.

120. Mr. LAU Yung-wai enquired if LCSD representatives could introduce the department's written reply.

121. Mr. Eddie CHAN indicated that LCSD would refer to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines ("HKPSG") when planning recreational and sports facilities in Tai Po District to review the number of open spaces in the district while factors such as population change, demand for facilities, supply and usage of existing facilities in the district and so on would also be taken into consideration. According to the projected population of Tai Po District in 2028, open spaces in the district were in line with the recommendations of HKPSG. LCSD was also aware that the playground of Tuen Mun Park was very well received by members of the public after the transformation.

122. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan advised that since the opening of the inclusive playground in Tuen Mun Park in 2018, LCSD had received various opinions and the popularity of the playground was evident. As such, LCSD would launch the plan to transform the public play spaces ("PPS") in the five years starting from the fiscal year of 2020. The said plan would use Tuen Mun Park as a blueprint as far as possible with a view to transforming existing playgrounds and children's play equipment, including Yuen Shin Park and Chung Nga Road Children's Playground in Tai Po District, so as to provide challenging and interesting PPSs while elements of the nature would be incorporated where feasible. On 29 June 2021, LCSD had written to Members to invite them to give views on the order of priority of venues to be transformed under the PPS transformation plan for the year of 2022/2023. Members' replies had been received. Upon completion of a brief statistical survey, LCSD would submit papers at future meetings to inform Members of the order of priority for transforming venues and the venues selected for the coming year. LCSD would report the progress to Members in due course.

123. Mr. LAU Yung-wai enquired about LCSD's estimated number of open space users in Tai Po District according to the projected population in 2028 and the area of open spaces as mentioned in the HKPSG.

124. Mr. Eddie CHAN indicated that according to the HKPSG and the projected population in 2028, population of Tai Po District was expected to be about 350 000 and the area of open spaces required was 70 hectares. At present, there were over 90 hectares of open spaces in Tai Po District, which exceeded the figures said above and was in line with the planning recommendations of HKPSG.

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

- (i) He hoped that LCSD could identify a new site for building the park concerned. He understood that it was no easy task, but was of the view that the standards of HKPSG lagged behind whereas some districts did not develop and build facilities in accordance with HKPSG. Hence, he considered HKPSG useless and existed in name only. It had also been pointed out in HKPSG that there was no set standard of size for regional open space where planning would only need to be carried out according to the ratio between district and population.
- (ii) Population of Tai Po District concentrated around the town centre, he therefore hoped that a new site could be identified there or existing venues could be transformed to build an inclusive playground. He was glad that the department would transform Yuen Shin Park and Chung Nga Road Children's Playground, and transform other existing venues next year.
- (iii) He hoped that the department would consider building inclusive playgrounds similar to that of Tuen Mun Park in LCSD's leisure facilities, and carrying out the transformation concerned at Tai Po Waterfront Park. He had also been aware of the opinions of other Members earlier, such as transforming the space at Tai Po Old Market Playground to build the facility concerned, or considering the sitting-out area near Tai Po Centre for planning because many children walked by the said location while several child care centres were nearby. Hence, he hoped that the department could consider building inclusive playgrounds concerned in the district.

126. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan indicated that some Members had suggested that existing venues such as Tai Po Old Market Playground and Nam Wan Road Sitting-out Area be transformed into inclusive playgrounds similar to the one in Tuen Mun Park. LCSD noted relevant views, and would select venues under the five-year plan to transform PPS and seek views from Members, so that Members could consider the order of priority for venue transformation. Should Members wish to have other existing facilities and venues transformed in the future, LCSD would consider including such facilities and venues in the list too for further study by relevant divisions. The five-year plan to transform PPS aimed to identify pilot sites for transformation. LCSD would review the effectiveness of the plan and consider Members' views in a timely manner.

127. Mr. HO Wai-lam said he hoped that Tai Po Waterfront Park would be included in the list of PPS to be transformed, and enquired when LCSD would implement the transformation works of Chung Nga Road Children's Playground. He also requested the provision of information for reference.

128. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan advised that the transformation works of Chung Nga Road Children's Playground would be carried out in the second year. LCSD currently prepared for the

district consultation and expected to conduct the district consultation later this year when a professional consultant would be engaged to seek stakeholders' views through workshops and so on. LCSD would notify Members as soon as possible should more information become available.

129. The Chairman advised that Members had submitted the motion with the following content 10 clear working days prior to the meeting:

“The District Facilities Management and Culture, Recreation and Sports Committee of the Tai Po District Council requests that inclusive playgrounds be built in Tai Po District.”

This motion was moved by Mr. LAU Yung-wai and seconded by Ms. Olive CHAN.

130. Members agreed to vote by open ballot. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the aforementioned motion, and the results were as follows:

| | | |
|-------------------------|---------|--|
| For: | 8 votes | Mr. AU Chun-ho, the Vice-chairman, Mr. AU Chun-wah, Ms. Olive CHAN, Mr. HO Wai-lam, Mr. LAU Yung-wai, Mr. SO Tat-leung, Mr. TAM Yi-pui and Mr. YIU Kwan-ho |
| Against: | 0 vote | |
| Abstain: | 0 vote | |
| Present without voting: | 2 votes | Mr. Patrick MO, the Chairman and Mr. WONG Siu-kin |
| Absent without voting: | 3 votes | Mr. Richard CHAN, Mr. LAM Yick-kuen and Mr. LI Yiu-ban |
| Total: | | 13 votes |

131. The Chairman announced that the above motion was carried.

VIII. Leisure and Cultural Services Department — Report on the participation in community activities held in May and June 2021 in Tai Po and proposed community activities to be held in July and August 2021 in Tai Po
(TPDC Paper No. DFM 27/2021)

132. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan introduced Annex I to TPDC Paper No. DFM 27/2021. She reported that in light of the latest development of COVID-19, LCSD had progressively resumed organisation of some recreational and sports activities since May 2021 and would continue paying close attention to latest news from the Centre for Health Protection to organise more recreational

and sports activities for members of the public in due course. LCSD had held approximately 76 recreational and sports activities between May and June 2021 and the number of participants was about 771 persons. About 164 recreational and sports activities were proposed to be held in July and August 2021 and the expected number of participants was 3 718, details of which were contained respectively in Appendices I and II to Annex I to Paper No. DFM 27/2021 for Members' reference.

133. Ms. SAM Fung-mei, Esther introduced Annex II to TPDC Paper No. DFM 27/2021. She indicated that that the five appendices to the Annex II were regular reports of cultural activities and usage of facilities. Appendix A contained cultural programmes scheduled to be held and sponsored in Tai Po District between May and June 2021, some of which had been cancelled or held in other formats owing to the epidemic. Appendix B contained programmes scheduled to be held in July and August 2021. Appendix C contained the usage situation of Tai Po Civic Centre between May and June 2021. TPDC and LCSD had joined local groups to launch in Tai Po District "18dART - Tai Po" in 2021/22, a community arts scheme under which experienced professional arts groups strategically organised arts enhancement activities and 12 programmes covering various art categories. Appendix D contained cultural and arts programmes scheduled to be held between April and June 2021. Appendix E contained details of activities proposed to be held in July and August 2021.

134. Mr. Barry NG introduced Annex III to TPDC Paper No. DFM 27/2021. He reported that Appendix 1 to Annex III contained the situation of library extension activities between May and June 2021. During the past two months, the library had held a total of 59 activities, in which approximately 27 341 persons had taken part. Appendix 2 contained the usage situation of mobile library service points between May and June 2021. Appendix 3 contained promotion activities proposed to be held in July and August 2021 for Members' reference.

135. Mr. AU Chun-wah raised the following views:

- (i) The Government had earlier demanded that the number of users in public swimming pools be limited. However, since many classes and swimming clubs had already hired lanes in the swimming pools, few members of the public could enter. A large number of members of the public had to queue up outside the venue, and such situation was particularly prominent in the evening and on weekends. Members of the public had no idea how long they would need to wait until they could enter, which might take more than an hour. Even though the said restriction had been relaxed currently, he was of the view that LCSD should nonetheless review the arrangement of limiting the number of swimmers entering the swimming pools and make timely adjustments to increase the number of swimming pool users.
- (ii) He enquired if LCSD could give the public priority in using swimming pools instead of catering for the needs of swimming clubs only. LCSD offered swimming

classes too which would take up certain space in swimming pools. He enquired if LCSD would consider opening all facilities in the swimming pools, including leisure pools, for public use.

136. Ms. Olive CHAN said that she had inspected the situation at Tai Po Swimming Pool earlier. At present, the main pool and two teaching pools were open, the diving pool was open occasionally whereas the leisure pool and slide facilities were temporarily closed. The teaching pools were currently occupied by swimming classes over extended periods of time. Given the closure of the leisure pool, members of the public who did not know how to swim could only use the other end of the teaching pools, which as a result became very crowded and the situation was just like being at a hot spring. As far as the main pool was concerned, members of the public needed to queue up for swimming one by one, resulting in gathering of crowds which was not satisfactory. She recommended that LCSD consider opening the leisure pool again such that more swimmers could use the swimming pools without affecting participants of swimming classes.

137. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan advised that as required by Prevention and Control of Disease (Requirements and Directions) (Business and Premises) Regulation (Cap. 599F) (“the Regulation”), leisure pools had to be closed temporarily. Hence, LCSD would pay attention to the latest disease prevention measures and re-open the venue facilities concerned in accordance with the guidelines should there be any amendments. LCSD would strike a balance as far as possible between the swimming lanes hired by swimming classes and swimming clubs and various demands of the public, while looking into the opinions of Members to review and make arrangements in light of the situation.

138. Mr. Richard CHAN opined that the usage rate and arrangement of swimming pools could be followed up at the Working Group on Facilities Management (“WGFM”). He hoped that LCSD would furnish the usage situation of swimming pools during the past two months and follow up on and discuss the management criteria at the meeting concerned.

139. Mr. HO Wai-lam indicated that closing the leisure pool was of little help to disease prevention because members of the public would gather at other pools. Hence, he hoped that LCSD would consider opening the leisure pool and limit the number of users. It would be more desirable if swimmers would keep an appropriate distance among themselves while undertaking water sports activities.

140. Mr. LAU Yung-wai enquired if the leisure pool referred to the swimming pool with a long slide. He also hoped that LCSD would write to Food and Health Bureau to reflect the situation of Tai Po Swimming Pool and enquire if the disease prevention policy would be affected.

141. Mr. AU Chun-wah said he was of the view that the slide could remain closed while re-opening the leisure pool would offer users more options. Besides, children using swim rings were not

allowed to swim in the main pool and could only go to the teaching pools, which were also used by swimming classes and might cause obstruction. Re-opening the leisure pool would help divert users. He enquired why beaches currently could be opened, whereas leisure pools, which served similar functions, had to be closed. He opined that a limit could be set for the overall number of users of the swimming pool, but the leisure pool should be opened to facilitate diversion of users to tackle the problem of the venue being overcrowded. He hoped that LCSD would review and adjust measures concerned before the end of the swimming season during summer vacation, such that more members of the public could use the swimming pool facilities.

142. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan indicated that those pools with slides were leisure pools. Besides, LCSD closed the leisure pools in accordance with the Regulation and observed requirements of legislation. She said she could reflect Members' opinions to the divisions concerned.

143. DFMC noted the above report.

IX. Tai Po District Office — Proposed District Minor Works Projects
(TPDC Paper No. DFM 28/2021)

144. The Chairman indicated that WGDW had already endorsed 13 DMW project proposals for 2020/2021 and their proposed order of priority at its meeting on 21 June 2021. The 13 proposed projects and their order of priority were listed in TPDC Paper No. DFM 28/2021 for Members' consideration.

145. DFMC endorsed the 13 proposed projects and their order of priority.

X. Reports of working groups

(I) Working Group on District Works

146. The Chairman reported as follows:

- (i) WGDW had held its third meeting in 2021 on 21 June 2021. WGDW had at the meeting followed up on the progress of approved DMW projects and endorsed the estimates and adjustments of the construction costs of the following two DMW projects:

- Item (7) in the Paper “TP-DMW241 Provision of sitting-out area at San Wa On Lane, Tai Po Tau, Tai Po” (project cost was revised from \$8.45 million to \$7.31 million);

— Item (45) in the Paper “Provision of passing place and improvement to access road at Wai Tau Tsuen” (project cost was \$1.5 million).

- (ii) WGDW had at the meeting vetted proposals of DMW projects for the year 2021/2022 and endorsed 13 proposed projects and their proposed order of priority for DFMC to consider further.
- (iii) In addition, WGDW had also discussed at the meeting DMW project proposals put forward by Members who had vacated office, and endorsed the following arrangement: had a Member submitted a DMW project proposal to the Secretariat during his/her tenure, the proposal concerned could still be submitted to WGDW for discussion even if the Member concerned vacated office subsequently.

147. DFMC endorsed the report of WGDW.

(II) Working Group on Facilities Management

148. Mr. Richard CHAN reported as follows:

- (i) WGFM had held its second meeting in 2021 on 21 June 2021. At the meeting, Members noted the report by the TPDO on the management of community centre/community halls from April to May 2021, and spot-checked income and expenditure statements of seven fee-charging activities in community halls/community centres in accordance with the principle of spot-checking 5% of the total number of fee-charging activities. Members had also noted the airing of programmes on LED display panels at community centres in Tai Po District.
- (ii) LCSD had reported on the management of facilities in Tai Po District between March and April 2021 at the meeting. WGDW had endorsed the naming of two newly-built sitting-out areas, namely, “Ting Kok Road Sitting-out Area” (汀角路休憩處) and “Nai Chung Sitting-out Area” (泥涌休憩處).

149. DFMC endorsed the report of WGFM.

XI. Date of next meeting

150. The next meeting would be held at 9:30 a.m. on 17 September 2021 (Friday).

151. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:53 p.m.

Tai Po District Council Secretariat
August 2021