

**Minutes of the 6th Meeting in 2020 of the District Facilities Management
and Culture, Recreation and Sports Committee
of the Tai Po District Council**

Date: 13 November 2020 (Friday)

Time: 9:37 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Venue: Conference Room, Tai Po District Council

<u>Present</u>	<u>Time of Arrival</u>	<u>Time of Withdrawal</u>
<u>Chairman</u>		
Mr. YAM Kai-bong	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
<u>Vice-chairman</u>		
Mr. LIN Kok-cheung, Dalu	10:00 a.m.	End of the meeting
<u>Members</u>		
Mr. AU Chun-ho	10:41 a.m.	End of the meeting
Mr. AU Chun-wah	10:50 a.m.	End of the meeting
Mr. CHAN Chun-chit, Richard	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Ms. CHAN Wai-ka, Olive	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai	10:06 a.m.	End of the meeting
Mr. HO Wai-lam	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. KWAN Wing-yip	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. LAM Ming-yat, Nick	10:17 a.m.	End of the meeting
Mr. LAM Yick-kuen	Beginning of the meeting	1:08 p.m.
Mr. LAU Yung-wai	Beginning of the meeting	12:38 p.m.
Mr. MAN Nim-chi	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
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	9:53 a.m.	1:26 p.m.
Mr. WU Yiu-cheong	Beginning of the meeting	End of the meeting
Mr. YIU Kwan-ho	9:47 a.m.	End of the meeting
Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang	9:41 a.m.	End of the meeting
<u>Secretary</u>		
Miss NG Suet-yau, Sharon	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
Miss LEUNG Wing-yin, Tiffany	Assistant District Officer (Tai Po), Home Affairs Department
Ms. KONG Po-yee, Alice	Chief Leisure Manager (New Territories East) (Atg.), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms. LIU Pui-wah, Stella	District Leisure Manager (Tai Po), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan	Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Tai Po, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr. CHAN Kam-shing, Eddie	Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 23, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Miss LO Wai-yin, Phoenix	Executive Officer (Planning) 23, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms. TAM Yuen-fun, Betty	Senior Manager (New Territories East) Promotion, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms. SAM Fung-mei, Esther	Manager (New Territories East) Marketing & District Activities, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr. NG Chi-keung, Barry	Senior Librarian (Tai Po), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr. SUEN Kwok-wai, Frankie	Administrative Assistant/Lands (Atg.), District Lands Office, Tai Po, Lands Department
Ms. CHAN Sin-yee	Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Tai Po/North) 1, Social Welfare Department
Ms. LEE Wing-sum, Summer	Engineer/Tai Po 1, Transport Department
Ms. CHAN Ho-shan, Susana	Architect (Works) 9, Home Affairs Department
Mr. LEE Yu-sau, Terence	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Tai Po District Office, Home Affairs Department
Miss CHAN Sui-king, Madeline	Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Tai Po District Office, Home Affairs Department
Ms. WONG Yu-hang, Anita	Senior Liaison Officer (2), Tai Po District Office, Home Affairs Department
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
Miss TANG Lok-man, Julie	Executive Officer (District Council) 4 (Designate), Tai Po District Office, Home Affairs Department

Mr. MAK Cheuk-kai, Ryan	Senior Architect, Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited
Mr. CHU Bo-hei, Boris	Architect, Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited

Absentee

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

Opening remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members to the 6th meeting of the District Facilities Management and Culture, Recreation and Sports Committee (“DFMC”) in 2020, and welcomed Miss TANG Lok-man, Julie, Executive Officer (District Council) 4 (Designate) of Tai Po District Office (“TPDO”) who would succeed the Secretary of DFMC to attend future DFMC meetings.

2. The Chairman advised that Mr. LI Yiu-ban was unable to attend the meeting owing to other commitments and had submitted application for absence to the Secretariat before the meeting. Pursuant to Order 51(1) of the Tai Po District Council (“TPDC”) Standing Orders, TPDC would only give consent to applications for absence from meetings filed on the grounds of sickness, jury service, attendance at another meeting or an activity on behalf of the DC, attendance at a Legislative Council (“LegCo”) or Executive Council meeting, confinement or paternity leave. Therefore, no consent could be given to the application filed by Mr. LI Yiu-ban.

I. Confirmation of the minutes of the 5th meeting in 2020 of the DFMC on 11 September 2020 (TPDC Paper No. DFM 28/2020)

3. The Chairman reported that neither had the Secretariat received prior to the meeting any proposed amendments to the minutes of the last meeting, nor did Members propose any amendments to the said minutes at this meeting. The said minutes were therefore confirmed without amendment.

II. Leisure and Cultural Services Department — proposed facilities under the project of Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po (TPDC Paper No. DFM 29/2020)

4. The Chairman welcomed Ms. CHAN Sin-ye, Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Tai

Po/North) 1 of Social Welfare Department (“SWD”) and Ms. LEE Wing-sum, Summer, Engineer of Transport Department (“TD”) to the meeting for discussion of this agenda item.

5. Mr. CHAN Kam-shing, Eddie introduced TPDC Paper No. DFM 29/2020. He supplemented that relevant departments would listen to Members’ opinions at this meeting and the Government would, where reasonable and practicable, consider accepting Members’ views to plan for works projects further. Should Members support the proposed facilities to be elaborated shortly, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”) would prepare a Project Definition Statement to seek approval from Home Affairs Bureau (“HAB”), and commission Architectural Services Department (“ArchSD”) to carry out technical feasibility study.

6. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan introduced the proposed facilities of LCSD and asked Members to refer to paragraph 4(A) of the paper for details of the items. The proposed facilities of LCSD were as follows:

- (i) 1 multi-purpose main arena which could accommodate 8 badminton courts, or 2 basketball courts, or 2 volleyball courts;
- (ii) 1 multi-purpose secondary hall which could be converted into 4 badminton courts, or 1 basketball court, or 1 volleyball court; and
- (iii) Fitness room, children’s playroom, table-tennis room, multi-purpose activity room, billiard room, outdoor sport climbing wall, office and other ancillary facilities, store rooms and so on.

7. Ms. CHAN Sin-yee introduced the proposed facilities of SWD covering services for the elderly, rehabilitation services and family and child welfare services. Given that the proposed facilities’ being in a preliminary stage, details such as service quotas and area of relevant facilities could not be furnished at this meeting and would be subsequently provided to Members in due course. Proposed facilities of SWD were as follows:

- (i) 1 home for the aged cum day care units for the elderly;
- (ii) 1 hostel for moderately mentally handicapped persons;
- (iii) 1 integrated vocational rehabilitation services centre;
- (iv) 1 supported hostel for mentally handicapped persons;
- (v) 1 hostel for severely mentally handicapped persons;
- (vi) 1 day activity centre;
- (vii) 1 on-site pre-school rehabilitation services office;
- (viii) 1 co-parenting support centre (New Territories East); and
- (ix) 1 child care centre.

8. Ms. LEE Wing-sum, Summer indicated that there was parking demand in the vicinity of the project site. Hence, TD followed the principle of “one site, multiple uses” put forward in the 2018 Policy Address and suggested to LCSD that it was suitable for the said project to provide a public car park, which would offer approximately 200 public parking spaces as preliminarily planned.

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

- (i) “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po” was a legacy from the former Regional Council and at the same time a development project which had been promised for over two decades. The 2017 Policy Address had included the development of the indoor recreation centre in the “Five-Year Plan for Sports and Recreation Facilities” and undertaken to take forward the project within five years. However, only two years remained for reaching this target and he considered it too late now to carry out a feasibility study according to the captioned paper.
- (ii) In the captioned paper, government departments wished to take forward the project in the “one site, multiple uses” model and would build various facilities. He opined that doing so would involve major changes in planning, turning the original facilities into a complex rather than an indoor recreation centre. He also indicated that residents had not been extensively consulted on the said alteration while he, as the DC Member of the constituency concerned (San Fu), had received the paper for the first time only a few days prior to the meeting, and had met with representatives of relevant departments to discuss for the first time only three days before the meeting. He considered such approach of the Government unthinkable. While TPDC had been given less than four days to consider options involving changes to planning, the relevant paper had no more than three pages without any detailed information. Even more unthinkable was that government departments could have the confidence that Members would make a decision based solely on such shanty information.
- (iii) He was of the view that DC Members in the past had the mentality of “not in my backyard”, yet, he himself did not have such thought. He understood that there was a serious shortage of elderly homes and homes for disabled persons while such persons had to wait for ages before they could be allocated a place. There had even been a tragedy in Kwai Chung Estate where a mother had strangled her disabled son as she could no longer stand the pressure of taking care of him. He understood the society had the need to increase hostel places which, however, could not serve as an excuse for not consulting and not providing any information. Should the Government’s consultation and explanation be inadequate, residents and hostel users would only be put in confrontation with each other, for which

government departments were accountable. He understood that government departments might not be able to provide very detailed planning for the time being in terms of procedures, but basic information would need to be furnished or consultation would have nothing to start with. Without providing information about which residents were concerned, it would not be possible to persuade them to accept the construction of relevant facilities. As regards this project item, he raised the following questions:

- There were not many sports centre projects developed in the model of “one site, multiple uses”, among which was the construction of sports centre, outdoor recreation facilities, social welfare facilities and underground public car park at Po Lun Street, Lai Chi Kok. The area available for development of the said project’s site was 3.9 hectares, which was three times larger than the site of “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po”. While the former would build under the “one site, multiple uses” model, no more than five social welfare facilities without including any hostels, construction of a series of social welfare facilities was intended for the latter, involving four different types of hostels and ancillary facilities. Hence, he enquired about the number of hostel places government departments estimated to provide under the project of “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po”, and how much land would need to be used for carrying out the project. He also asked based on what justification government departments were convinced that a 0.7 hectare site would have sufficient space to accommodate so many facilities while they were unable to provide relevant information.
- Tai Po and North District belonged to the same administrative district of SWD, of which hostel places for moderately mentally handicapped persons had increased from 80 in 2015 to 180 in 2020, whereas hostel places for severely mentally handicapped persons had increased from 104 in 2015 to 304 in 2020, which was the highest growth territory-wide. He asked if SWD had any clear growth indicators for hostels and how many additional hostel places for mentally handicapped persons would be provided in Tai Po and North District. He also wished to know about the progress of the conversion of CCC Kei Ching Primary School in Fu Shin Estate into a hostel to provide hostel places.
- As far as layout was concerned, he asked if LCSD as the lead department could answer questions about arrangement of a range of facilities. Should the facilities be arranged in the form of a complex, how many floors would need to be built to accommodate relevant facilities?
- It was mentioned in the consultation paper that the project would provide some 200 public parking spaces which should all be opened for public use. He enquired if there would be space reserved in the complex for provision of

parking spaces for government vehicles. If yes, how many such parking spaces? He also indicated that the project involved major planning changes and TPDC should therefore set aside time for consulting residents and defer the decision about this project to at least the next DFMC meeting. If the Government insisted on passing the proposal at this meeting, he was of the view that justification for supporting the proposal was hardly adequate given the lack of transparency of information and absence of consultation.

10. Mr. KWAN Wing-yip raised the following views and questions:

- (i) This project had been mentioned during the past 21 years of DC affairs, but it had always been referred to as “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po” and integrated facilities had never been heard of. Until about a month ago when DC Members conducted on-site inspections at several LCSD facilities, it had suddenly become known that the said site would be used for building not only an indoor recreation centre, but also other social welfare facilities.
- (ii) He supported “one site, multiple uses” and considered it a correct approach to make optimal use of land. Notwithstanding, the said proposal should not be forcibly passed without consulting the community and DC Members. Despite the policy of “one site, multiple uses” being put forward in the 2017 Policy Address, there had been no discussion of converting the aforementioned project into “one site, multiple uses” at DC meetings during the past three years. Hence, he wished to know when LCSD or relevant departments had become aware of the changes concerned and why TPDC had not been informed of it at all.
- (iii) Just as Mr. WU Yiu-cheong had said, the paper had been received only a few days prior to the meeting and the changes had been verbally notified no sooner than a month ago. Hence, he enquired why such major alteration was made known at such a short notice. It was difficult to seek views from residents when relevant information was obtained hastily and it was not reasonable for the DC either to demand that Members make decision.
- (iv) He opined that before DC made any decision, relevant departments would need to carry out thorough local consultation because the building was very close to residential areas. To build such a huge structure near residential areas, residents’ opinions would need to be respected and their interests considered even if relevant facilities would bring forth significant benefits to the public. He was of the view that instead of forcibly passing the project, consultation had to be carried out before implementation. He opined that forcing through this project like other white elephant projects and Lantau Tomorrow, public grievances would not disappear, he therefore hoped that this project would not be carried out in a hurry. While relevant project had been discussed for years, it would not make any big

difference to spend a year or so on consultation.

11. Mr. MO Ka-chun, Patrick raised the following views and questions:

- (i) He concurred with Mr. WU Yiu-cheong's views and opined that DC Members, in addition to being concerned about issues in the district, were also duty bound to balance the overall need of the society. As regards SWD facilities, he enquired about the number of places for services of the elderly and rehabilitation services, current shortfall in residential homes territory-wide, and the number of hostel places which would be provided this time such that current problems could be alleviated. He opined that Members would need substantial statistics for estimation so as to evaluate the effectiveness of the project.
- (ii) Besides, SWD facilities under the said project included co-parenting support centre and child care centre. He emphasised that there was a serious shortage of day child care places in Tai Po District and enquired if SWD would balance the need in this regard when increasing relevant facilities.
- (iii) As far as the underground car park offering 200 public parking spaces was concerned, he estimated that there would only be one level. However, since the site was relatively large, some locations might need to be reserved as parking spaces for government vehicles, there might not necessarily be sufficient public parking spaces. Hence, he enquired if an additional level would be provided. He also hoped that departments would provide statistics for reference, for instance, the ratio of parking spaces for medium and heavy goods vehicles and private cars among the public parking spaces. He opined that there was a serious shortage of parking spaces for heavy and medium-sized vehicles in Tai Po District while illegal parking was rampant in the vicinity of the project site. He therefore hoped that departments would provide concrete data for Members' reference.

12. Mr. Eddie CHAN responded as follows:

- (i) Development of relevant project was still at the stage of preliminary planning and the technical feasibility study had not commenced yet. According to Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan, the building height restriction ("BHR") of the development project at the site concerned was eight floors. Hence, the project "Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po" would observe the said BHR. Upon confirmation of the construction of proposed facilities, departments would follow up on matters concerning study of layout of facilities and so on.
- (ii) To separate the sports centre from SWD facilities and to provide different exits/entrances, the preliminary concept was to divide the project into two buildings. The project was a legacy from the Regional Council. LCSD would

adopt the “one site, multiple uses” principle in planning, including the construction of public car park and other facilities and had already reported to Members at the regular reports earlier. Sports Centre in Area 107, Tung Chung and Indoor Recreation Centre in Area 4, Sai Kung currently proposed also adopted the “one site, multiple uses” principle to add other facilities, and Tai Po District was not the only district to adopt the said principle. Despite the fact that the site area of the project was no more than 0.7 hectare, it would be developed in the “one site, multiple uses” model.

- (iii) As regards public consultation, departments would listen to views of members of the public during the design stage of a project. Before confirming the construction of project, departments would heed views from Members preliminarily. When officially taking forward a project, ArchSD would organise “value management workshops” to which stakeholders would be invited to give comments on the project.

13. Ms. CHAN Sin-yee responded as follows:

- (i) She thanked Members for recognising the need to provide additional social welfare facilities. It was well known that land resources were key to construction of facilities. Hence, the Government had all along adopted a multi-pronged approach to provide social welfare facilities, which included making optimal use of vacant government premises, identifying suitable sites for long-term social welfare purposes through redevelopment or new development projects, introduction of the “Special Scheme on Privately Owned Sites for Welfare Uses”, inclusion of the requirement to construct social welfare facilities in the conditions of sale of land as appropriate, encouraging private developers to provide different kinds of social welfare facilities in their development projects and so on.
- (ii) When being first planned, sport facilities had been proposed for this project. However, the Government had realised that public demand for social welfare facilities kept increasing and therefore considered it necessary to provide relevant facilities by “one site, multiple uses”. Having reviewed the project “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po”, the Government was of the view that there was room for the addition of social welfare facilities. While the community had always lacked services for the elderly and rehabilitation service facilities, it was hoped that such facilities could be included in the project to meet the service needs of the district.
- (iii) It was very rare to find suitable sites for building social welfare facilities. At the meeting of Healthcare, Education and Social Services Committee held earlier, Members had expressed their hope that more social welfare facilities would be provided in Tai Po District while the department had all along listened to opinions

of stakeholders. Since the conditions of the project “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po” were suitable, it was recommended that relevant social welfare facilities be constructed under the said project.

- (iv) The significant increase in the number of hostel places for moderately and severely mentally handicapped persons in Tai Po District within a short period was primarily due to the completion of Hong Chi Jockey Club Pinehill Hostel. Hong Chi Jockey Club Pinehill Village had sufficient space and area to increase hostel places serving mentally handicapped persons.
- (v) Variables remained before the project reached its detailed planning stage. Hence, details such as number of hostel places were not available for the time being while views of Members and other stakeholders would be heeded further. The department understood that Hong Kong society had a strong demand for social welfare facilities while the number of persons on the waiting list for places in residential care homes had always been made public on SWD website. She also indicated that not all premises were suitable for use as hostels as strict technical and layout requirements would need to be met, including daylight, air ventilation, building height of hostel and so on. As the project “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po” was suitable for constructing social welfare facilities, she would like to listen more to Members’ views in the hope that requests of various parties could be satisfied when detailed planning was being done in the future.

14. Ms. Summer LEE responded as follows:

- (i) When examining planning development of projects, TD would first request that each project provide the number of parking spaces required as generated by the project, and remaining space of the project would then be used for providing additional public parking spaces.
- (ii) As regards the distribution of parking spaces for various types of vehicles, consideration would be given first to the parking needs of commercial vehicles. All of the aforementioned 200 or so parking spaces were public parking spaces, while those which departments required for operational needs had not been included in the calculation.
- (iii) Departments had estimated that the project would provide some 200 public parking spaces based on the design of a 3-storey car park. As far as distribution of parking spaces was concerned, among those 200 or so parking spaces, about 70 were for commercial vehicles, from which some 50 would be earmarked for use by medium and heavy goods vehicles.

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

- (i) He was not satisfied with replies of the departments. He understood that while technical feasibility study had not been carried out at the current stage and professional advice of ArchSD had not become available yet, he opined that comparison could be drawn for this project. For instance, the project on Po Lun Street, Lai Chi Kok had been built in the model of “one site, multiple uses” too without including any hostel facilities on the 3.9-hectare site. Hence, he enquired about the factors which had made government departments think that the project “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po” could accommodate four residential care homes.
- (ii) Taking residential care homes in Fu Heng and Fu Shin as examples, it would at least take one level to accommodate some 40 hostel places. By inference, building four hostels would require four levels and together with other ancillary facilities, a minimum of six levels would need to be built. He opined that departments would at least need to take into consideration the above factors when drafting the proposal, instead of including in the proposal everything they came up with, which would make the proposal infeasible while residents would oppose too, and the whole project would have to be started anew. He did not want to see that the Government would hastily provide additional hostel places in order to meet the target either. He hoped that government departments would elaborate on the aforementioned planning and furnish information about provision of relevant hostel places in the next five years.
- (iii) The maximum plot ratio of this site was eight storeys, in other words, a total of 16 storeys if two buildings were constructed. He asked how many storeys of those 16 would be used for facilities of indoor recreation centre, and whether or not both buildings would have sports facilities. If not, the project would become the construction of one indoor recreation centre and one government building, which would be contrary to the original intention of this project of indoor recreation centre.
- (iv) Owing to the absence of departmental representatives of Planning Department (“PlanD”), he considered it inappropriate to make any decision at this meeting and decision making should be deferred to the next meeting. Doing so would give departments and Members ample time for consultation whereas representatives of PlanD should be invited to the meeting such that planning-related questions could be answered.

16. Mr. Patrick MO raised the following views:

- (i) Construction of property projects near Ma Wo Road had recently commenced. He therefore hoped that departments would pay attention when carrying out the project “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po”. As far as he was aware, the

number of parking spaces in many newly completed residential projects at present failed to keep up with the number of residential units, with a ratio of 1:5 or 1:6, leading to illegal parking problems in the vicinity of newly completed housing estates. He was of the view that housing estates in the district such as Mont Vert or The Regent and so on would have the problem of illegal parking too. Hence, he hoped that when carrying out studies to estimate, TD would take the situation mentioned above into account.

- (ii) He cited the experience in constructing the complex building next to Tai Po Centre to point out that upon completion of the project design, relevant departments had indicated that they had already provided parking spaces as far as technically feasible. Hence, he hoped that relevant departments would learn from experience to consider more carefully and try providing more parking spaces prior to the design to avoid the situation where changes were no longer possible due to various restrictions after the official planning was done.

17. The Chairman raised the following views and questions:

- (i) What the total gross floor area of the project was;
- (ii) What the gross floor areas of sports facilities and social welfare facilities under this project were;
- (iii) He considered it undesirable that SWD representative had said just now that one could check statistics of residential care homes on websites himself. He also indicated that the facility breakdown available on SWD website was divided into four items, namely, services for the elderly, rehabilitation services, family and child welfare, and youth and corrections, with the area required for each of the facilities clearly listed. Hence, he opined that departments would need to include in the paper relevant information to allow Members to see clearly the area each of the facilities would require. Besides, he enquired if departments would include in this project all the social welfare facilities listed in Paper No. DFM 29/2020. He opined that the approach for including all facilities under the project would be different from the one for incorporating only some of the facilities, whilst the former might not necessarily be suitable. Hence, he hoped that departments would respond in this connection.
- (iv) Whether or not there was room for increasing parking facilities.
- (v) As far as sports facilities were concerned, he had checked LCSD website and found out some venues had indoor jogging track so that members of the public could jog indoors in inclement weather. He enquired if an indoor jogging track could be included in this project.

18. Mr. Eddie CHAN responded as follows:

- (i) Technical feasibility study had not been carried out for the project yet and departments would carry out planning with reference to Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan, in other words, the BHR for this project was eight floors. At the present stage, height of the building and area of other facilities had not been confirmed yet.
- (ii) Users of LCSD sports facilities and SWD facilities varied. LCSD had recommended that another entrance/exit be provided for facilities of the indoor recreation centre to separate it from the entrance/exit of SWD facilities. Information about facilities and layout on each floor would become available only upon completion of technical feasibility study.
- (iii) The project was currently at the stage of preliminary planning and PlanD would be invited to confirm the plot ratio only at a later stage of development.
- (iv) As regards facilities of the project, departments had taken into account residents' demand for facilities in Tai Po District.

19. Ms. LIU Pui-wah, Stella indicated that no indoor jogging track would be provided for the time being under the project "Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po". To make more effective use of indoor space, in addition to including in the project sports facilities commonly seen, LCSD had also suggested that secondary hall and billiard room be included to satisfy the need of facility users to conduct indoor activities, while providing more diversified indoor recreational facilities for use by the public. Since jogging tracks were currently available at Mui Shue Hang Playground, Yuen Chau Tsai Park and Tai Po Waterfront Park in the district, the department believed that existing facilities could cater for the jogging need of residents in Tai Po District.

20. Ms. CHAN Sin-yee responded as follows:

- (i) As regards SWD's planning for increasing residential services for handicapped persons in the next few years, SWD expected to provide some 2 200 additional places for residential services between 2020-21 and 2024-25, including 337 hostel places for moderately mentally handicapped persons, 702 for severely mentally handicapped persons, 330 places for care and attention home for severely disabled persons, 280 places of supported hostels, 125 hostel places for severely physically handicapped persons, and 400 places of long stay care homes.
- (ii) The facility breakdown listed the area each facility required. At present, it was only the stage of preliminary consultation and technical feasibility study would be carried out afterwards. Arrangements in connection with the study result would be made accordingly. She indicated that the public had very keen demand for

social welfare facilities and hoped that social welfare facilities mentioned in the paper could be incorporated in this project.

21. Ms. Summer LEE responded as follows:

- (i) She noted Mr. Patrick MO's opinion concerning the shortage of parking spaces. TD would provide an appropriate number of parking spaces for private cars after according priority to the demand of commercial vehicles for parking spaces and considering the public transport-oriented policy. As regards whether or not this project could provide more space for parking, only two to three levels would in general be constructed for underground car parks. Owing to cost-effectiveness, designs with more than three levels would generally not be adopted. The department had estimated that the project could provide around 200 public parking spaces based on the design of a three-level car park.
- (ii) Regarding the traffic conditions in the vicinity of this project, traffic flow and operation near Ma Wo Road and Ma Chung Road were sound according to existing information of traffic flow and survey statistics, with capacity available to accommodate new private residential development projects and the project "Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po".

22. The Chairman indicated that he hoped SWD would provide the Secretariat in writing relevant planning statistics for distribution to Members. He also hoped that information of service facilities, such as standard area of each residential care home, could be presented in table form for Members' information. While 0.7 hectare could be converted to 7 000 square metres, the area for constructing facilities should be less than 7 000 square metres. As regards whether or not it would be suitable to accommodate all facilities, he opined that consideration should be given from the perspective of the audience and users.

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

- (i) He agreed to the provision of indoor jogging track under this project, and hoped that departments would seriously consider providing members of the public the said facility. Members had at meetings some years ago requested that departments provide indoor jogging tracks and departments had indicated that since the project planning had already been done, there was no room for additional facilities, making various excuses for not building the said facility. He opined that proposals that had been made for years often disappeared without a trace during the process, whereas departments suddenly prepared proposals and now requested that TPDC endorse allocation of funding, such that the responsibility of delaying the project would be passed to TPDC. He expressed his dissatisfaction with such approach of the Government and considered it necessary to ask

members of the public and the DC what they really needed.

- (ii) Examples which departments had cited just now were outdoor jogging tracks, while the reason why indoor jogging tracks were necessary was that members of the public could use them if they wished to have exercise during inclement weather. He opined that there were sufficient jogging track facilities which, however, were suitable for use only when it was not raining, while no facility was available for the public to use when it rained. There was an indoor jogging track in Po Wing Road Sports Centre, but relevant facilities were not available at Sports Centre in Area 1, Tai Po which had been built later. It was currently hoped that indoor jogging tracks could be provided in the new project, departments, however, made numerous excuses for not doing so.
- (iii) He opined that the new sports centre had sufficient floor-to-ceiling height and it should not be difficult to provide a circular track for members of the public to jog. Why Members would need to be consulted should the facility not be included in the project during the initial stage and the proposal be rejected once the draft was completed? Indoor jogging track was a must-have facility which could provide members of the public a comfortable space for exercise during inclement weather. Hence, he hoped that departments would seriously listen to views, and hoped that sports centres built in the future would all provide indoor jogging tracks.

24. Mr. WONG Siu-kin raised the following views:

- (i) He hoped that this project could be renamed and opined that consultation documents should be renamed as “recreational, cultural and social welfare facilities” or “Area 6 Development Project” next time to facilitate public understanding and accurately describe the relevant project.
- (ii) As regards SWD facilities, SWD representatives had once said that the society had a strong demand for such facilities. In fact, whether or not such facilities could be built hinged upon the preliminary study report. Given the absence of construction details at this meeting, outlines of relevant facilities should therefore be discussed at the meeting. He asked if SWD, when putting forward proposals of the facilities, had considered relevant supporting facilities, for instance, whether or not noises would be generated at night by roads and highways near the site and if persons living in residential homes would be affected. Whether or not TD or other departments had considered if means of transportation to access the site were available once day care facilities were provided. Since the project site was not located in the town centre but at the mid-levels near Classical Gardens which was far away from major public transport interchanges, he enquired if departments had considered the aforementioned questions.
- (iii) He understood that technical issues could not be explored at the present stage, but

opined that the criteria for constructing facilities were not the supply of land resources, but the needs behind. Should departments wish to persuade Members to endorse the proposal and carry out local consultation more smoothly, they should at this stage explain to Members the overall planning of the project and give an account of issues concerning the supporting facilities.

25. Mr. MAN Nim-chi raised the following views:

- (i) TD had replied just now that there was still spare capacity on Ma Wo Road and Tat Wan Road. He wished to know how departments calculated the capacity.
- (ii) Every evening, many large vehicles entered the said roads from Tolo Highway and parked either at lay-bys or on roadside. Of those 70 parking spaces for commercial vehicles mentioned just now, 50 were for medium to heavy vehicles. However, medium to heavy vehicles in general could not enter underground car parks. He enquired apart from costs, what the differences were between new and old car parks in terms of design. Besides, departments had mentioned that owing to cost-effectiveness, only a three-storey underground car park could be built. He asked if it would be feasible to develop the car park upwards and provide parking spaces on top of the sports centre, and if the overall layout could cope with traffic needs or demand for parking spaces.
- (iii) As far as he was aware, construction had completed for open space in Area 6, Tai Po and the said site had originally been two temporary car parks. He enquired about the numbers of parking spaces for different types of vehicles, for instance, medium vehicles, large vehicles, private cars and so on, which the aforementioned car parks had provided together. Meanwhile, both of the said sites had been resumed with one side already developed into a park and the other side being planned for construction of a sports centre. He agreed to the construction of different social welfare facilities, but opined that residents, be it those visiting the sports centre for exercise or those receiving treatment at social welfare facilities, might need to drive to access the site. Hence, he enquired that when comparing the number of parking spaces offered by the temporary car parks previously with the number of parking spaces which the park and the proposed sports centre facilities in Area 6, Tai Po as a whole would offer, whether or not the latter could completely make up for the number of the former. If not, did TD have any solution to address the impact on nearby traffic?

26. Ms. Olive CHAN said that sports which members of the public nowadays preferred had already changed. Hence, she enquired if it was necessary to build several pitches, volleyball courts, badminton courts, multi-purpose rooms and so on, and if consideration would be given to expanding the area of fitness rooms. The existing fitness rooms of LCSD were too small in

area, which were even smaller than the conference room where she was. Members of the public would get injured easily when doing exercises in a cramped fitness room where various fitness equipment was placed. Taking reference to commercial fitness rooms at present, there was large space for members of the public to do exercises. Therefore, she hoped that when building fitness rooms, departments would not place a lot of fitness equipment in small fitness rooms. Few ladies would use cramped fitness rooms because they worried that they might have close body contact with men they did not know when using the fitness equipment. Exercising too close together might cause inconvenience, hence, she hoped that the design could be improved.

27. Mr. Eddie CHAN responded as follows:

- (i) LCSD would consider building indoor jogging tracks subject to technical feasibility and venue limitations. Since the facility would take up usable floor area of the sports centre, departments would need to review relevant information such as whether or not other facilities would be affected, etc.
- (ii) He noted Mr. WONG Siu-kin's views concerning the project title.
- (iii) He noted Members' opinions about increasing the area of fitness rooms while departments would also review so as to improve the distance between equipment and to increase the usable space of fitness rooms.

28. The Chairman said that he hoped TD would respond in connection with parking of medium and large vehicles in underground car parks. As far as he knew, a car park for medium and large vehicles would be provided near the football pitch at Tai Po Industrial Estate in Area 33, Tai Po. He enquired if it would be technically viable to adjust the height of ramp and gate to allow vehicles to access underground car parks.

29. Ms. Summer LEE responded as follows:

- (i) Should medium to large vehicles be parked not on the road surface but underground, more room would need to be reserved in the design stage to allow entrance and exit of vehicles, such as widening the ramp and bend. As regards whether departments would, apart from underground car parks, consider developing car parks on road surface or even upwards, TD would discuss with ArchSD. However, given the height restrictions of the site, locations of other facilities might need to be adjusted should the car park be developed upwards. Departments would examine it carefully.
- (ii) Traffic data in the vicinity of the project site were derived from the traffic impact assessment report of the contract consultant, while data had been collected by calculating the number of vehicles during the morning and afternoon rush hours on-site. She indicated that current data of the temporary car park at the original

site of the park in Area 6 were not available for the time being, but statistics about the number of parking spaces of the public car park which should be provided when reviewing the development of “Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po” could be furnished. According to the on-site inspection in mid-2019, 150 vehicles had at that time been parked at the current project site. Together with the illegally parked vehicles nearby and those parked at the adjacent temporary car park, there had been approximately 300 private cars in total. When recommending ArchSD to build public car parks, TD would in its consideration accord priority to the need of commercial vehicles. She also indicated that due to the limitations of the project site, of those 200 or so public parking spaces under this project, some 70 were for commercial vehicles while those for private cars took up only about 130. Therefore, the number of parking spaces previously available could not be completely made up for.

- (iii) As far as transport facilities were concerned, should it be considered viable to construct relevant facilities upon completion of the technical feasibility study, TD would examine the number of people going to work at the building, pedestrian flows during rush hours in the morning and the afternoon, and the number of members of the public visiting the site to use facilities of this project, and would during the stage of design take into consideration the needs to adjust the frequency of means of public transportation and to provide ancillary facilities such as passing bays for minibuses and so on.

30. Ms. CHAN Sin-ye reiterated that the department would have more detailed service planning shortly. As regards the preliminary design of the development project, SWD had all along discussed with relevant departments such as TD ancillary facilities including pick-up and drop-off spaces, parking spaces and so on which the facilities required so as to meet future service needs. Departments would continue reviewing ancillary facilities of service planning.

31. The Chairman said that there was a vacant site near Ma Wo Road Garden and south of American School Hong Kong. He enquired about the planned use or type of land use of the said site, and if all sports and social welfare facilities would be incorporated in the original site of the project, or if the said vacant site could also be used for social welfare or other planned uses.

32. Mr. SUEN Kwok-wai, Frankie advised that relevant information was currently not available and would be supplemented after the meeting.

33. Mr. Eddie CHAN indicated that departments would collect and compile Members’ views in connection with this project with a view to reporting to Members again as soon as possible.

34. The Chairman said that having listened to Members’ views and replies of departments just now, DC Member of the constituency concerned was of the view that residents and groups in the

community should be consulted since alterations to the project were rather significant, and residents or stakeholders would have different opinions. As regards the discussion just now, he also highlighted the following points:

- (i) Despite the BHR's being eight levels, would the project be required to reach the maximum height?
- (ii) Were ancillary facilities of the project, for instance, traffic and transport facilities, sufficient?
- (iii) Should two buildings need to be constructed, careful planning of the density of buildings would be required because the said site was adjacent to the outermost blocks of Classical Gardens. Hence, opinions of residents nearby would need to be considered. It would also take time for DC Members of the constituency concerned and neighbouring constituencies to conduct local consultation.
- (iv) He could not support the project "Indoor Recreation Centre Area 6, Tai Po" at this meeting. As far as social welfare facilities were concerned, Members recognised the need to put in more resources to construct facilities such as hostels, but hoped that opinions of Members and residents could be heeded prior to construction. Only then their support for the project could be obtained. He hoped that LCSD and other departments would give Members more time to discuss the above matters and that representatives of PlanD would be invited to attend the next meeting for discussion.

35. DFMC concurred with the above views of the Chairman.

36. Mr. MAN Nim-chi said it had been mentioned in paragraph 6 of the paper that LCSD would prepare a Project Definition Statement for HAB's approval. He wished to know if the role TPDO played in this project was to co-ordinate and communicate among relevant departments. Since PlanD had formulated the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines ("Guidelines"), would other departments give advice related to the project based on the Guidelines? Which department was the lead department of this project?

37. Ms. Eunice CHAN advised that there were various departments under HAB while Home Affairs Department ("HAD") and LCSD were both under HAB. The Project Definition Statement prepared by LCSD would be vetted by HAB.

38. Mr. Eddie CHAN said that as the lead department of this project, LCSD would be responsible for the preparation of the Project Definition Statement, which was intended for the invitation of ArchSD to carry out a technical feasibility study in connection with proposed facilities of various departments, and belonged to established procedures in taking forward public works projects. LCSD would collect suggestions of SWD and TD regarding the proposed

facilities, and request HAB to sign the Project Definition Statement after discussing and confirming the suggestions. ArchSD would then be invited to carry out a technical feasibility study.

39. The Chairman indicated that Members would maintain close liaison with departments concerned in connection with this project, and would continue to follow up on the matter in subsequent meetings.

III. Leisure and Cultural Services Department — Inclusive Park for Pets in Tai Po District
(TPDC Paper No. DFM 30/2020)

40. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan introduced Paper No. DFM 30/2020. In recent years, many members of the public had proposed that individual parks be completely opened up for different users to take their pets to use park facilities in an inclusive environment to facilitate exchange and integration of the community. LCSD had in January 2019 launched a trial scheme to select six suitable parks in different regions territory-wide to become “Inclusive Parks for Pets”, and conducted in the end of the same year at the said parks questionnaire surveys which reflected general support of members of the public. In view of this, LCSD selected in various districts additional suitable venues which were expected to be opened up as “Inclusive Parks for Pets” in end of 2020 or early 2021. In selecting suitable venues, the department would consider various conditions such as public demand for relevant facilities, area and geographical location of parks and usage of venues and so on. Having considered various conditions, LCSD proposed to select Pak Shek Kok Promenade (Tai Po Section), Ha Hang Village Sitting-out Area and Ting Tai Road Children’s Playground in Tai Po District as “Inclusive Parks for Pets”. To achieve the goal of “pet-inclusiveness”, existing facilities and environment of the parks would remain unchanged. For the convenience of park users, LCSD would provide in the parks basic ancillary facilities such as dog excreta collection bins while stepping up cleansing of venues. Besides, LCSD would put up in the parks Users’ Code for “Inclusive Park for Pets” to remind pet owners to keep their pets under proper control to avoid causing nuisance to other persons, and to keep the venues clean and hygienic and so on.

41. Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang thanked LCSD for accepting Members’ suggestions to provide inclusive parks for pets in Tai Po District. Since relatively more residents hoped that the “Inclusive Park for Pets” programme would be launched at Tai Po Waterfront Park, he hoped that LCSD would expedite implementation of the programme at the three aforementioned venues, and provide an inclusive park for pets at Tai Po Waterfront Park as soon as possible upon confirmation.

42. Mr. MAN Nim-chi indicated that he had inspected Ting Tai Road Children’s Playground with Mr. HO Wai-lam and LCSD a couple of days prior to this meeting, while he had also asked

the department about specific approach of the pet inclusive policy. Should “pet gardens” be renamed as “Inclusive Parks for Pets”, members of the public might not necessarily be able to understand the differences between the two. He hoped that the department would publicise to members of the public that pets and people could share a common space while no stakeholder would be affected. He thanked LCSD for converting parks of some constituencies into “Inclusive Parks for Pets”, but hoped that the department would endeavour to publicise to the public and carry out policy support work to explain to members of the public why human and animals could co-exist without any impact.

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

- (i) Since Tai Po Section of Pak Shek Kok Promenade was connected to Shatin Section, he enquired if Shatin Section of the said Promenade would also be opened up as an inclusive park for pets.
- (ii) FEHD was currently building public toilets at the intersection of Tai Po and Shatin. He enquired if dog’s latrines and relevant facilities would also be provided in the vicinity for the convenience of pet owners.
- (iii) He recommended that patrolling be stepped up on the Waterfront Promenade. Should any dog excreta which had not been disposed of into a collection bin be spotted, pet owners could be alerted.

44. Mr. LAU Yung-wai thanked LCSD for its willingness to take forward the “Inclusive Parks for Pets” programme and for having all along supported the programme, while Ting Tai Road Children’s Playground, which was located in his constituency, was also among the “Inclusive Parks for Pets”. Many residents in his constituency kept pets and he hoped that their need would be satisfied. He recommended that the department erect notice boards at prominent spots within the playground to let members of the public know that the venue had become an inclusive park for pets. He also hoped that the department would accept opinions which Members had raised earlier regarding dog excreta collection bins, and step up cleansing work of parks to avoid giving rise to the perception of members of the public that the venues became unclean after being opened up as inclusive parks for pets.

45. Mr. LIN Kok-cheung, Dalu enquired if the department had received any complaints from members of the public about disputes between people and animals or among animals during the trial scheme. He considered it a good idea to provide inclusive parks for pets, but issues concerning the getting along between people and animals might arise. For instance, Ting Tai Road Children’s Playground had initially been a venue for children to play, but parents might not necessarily allow their children to have any contact with dogs as they considered dogs dirty and aggressive, so the department would need to deal with relevant issues by, for example, providing notice boards and display panels to publicise to members of the public how human could get

along with animals. He was of the view that restraints would have to be imposed on people's behaviour to prevent them from overly spoiling their pets to the extent that there were situations where the pets were frightened. He also enquired about insurance issues.

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

- (i) She thanked Members for supporting the "Inclusive Parks for Pets" programme. The department would first open the three aforementioned parks and playground as inclusive parks for pets, and would review the effectiveness after opening of such parks and heed residents' views. After balancing different opinions, consideration would be progressively given to open up additional suitable parks as inclusive parks for pets.
- (ii) She noted Members' views about enhancing education and would reflect such views to the headquarters to promote the concept of "pet-inclusiveness" further.
- (iii) As far as she was aware, Shatin District had also opened up Shatin Section of Pak Shek Kok Promenade as an inclusive park for pets already.
- (iv) After opening the three aforementioned inclusive parks for pets, the department would review the operation of parks, demand for relevant ancillary facilities and so on such as provision of dog's latrines and stepping up of patrolling.
- (v) The department would put up notices to allow members of the public to identify inclusive parks for pets, and would step up cleansing of parks as appropriate.
- (vi) For parks under the trial scheme which were larger in area such as Kai Tak Runway Park, quite a lot of opinions had been received from members of the public, including those about pet owners letting their dogs run freely after taking the dogs into the park, whereby causing nuisance to other members of the public and people who were afraid of dogs. Hence, she hoped that Members of the constituencies concerned and other Members could help publicise the Users' Code for "Inclusive Park for Pets" and remind members of the public that pet gardens were not the same as inclusive parks for pets. When entering inclusive parks for pets, pet owners were required to keep their dogs on leash.

47. Mr. LAM Ming-yat, Nick enquired about the definition of pets. Since some people liked keeping reptiles, how would the department deal with complaints about people allowing insects or animals to run freely in parks? He would also like to know what restrictions there were for inclusive parks for pets.

48. Mr. CHAN Chun-chit, Richard said there were numerous types of pets and he had seen residents in the district go for a stroll with parrots on the shoulder. He would like to know how pets were defined.

49. Mr. Dalu LIN enquired once again about insurance issues. He had received complaints about conflicts between dogs. According to the existing system, such cases might not necessarily be dealt with effectively even if members of the public reported to the police. Hence, he hoped that the department would enhance education and carefully consider how to deal with clashes.

50. Mr. WONG Siu-kin said that while LCSD had in the paper stated that existing facilities in the parks would remain unchanged and given the inclusive nature of the parks, additional basic ancillary facilities would be provided. Since dogs would run freely, would fences or gates be provided at relevant venues should there be carriageways next to the parks?

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

- (i) The department did not have any specific definition for “pets”. In general, pets which used pet gardens were dogs. Pet owners should consider the habits of their pets, and the department would welcome it if pet owners opined that they could take their pets to enter inclusive parks for pets. However, pet owners were required to keep their pets under control in inclusive parks for pets and keep dogs or their pets on leash.
- (ii) At present, LCSD handled disputes in parks in accordance with the Pleasure Grounds Regulation or approaches used previously. Given the different definitions of “pet garden” and “inclusive park for pets”, fences would be provided within pet gardens, and dogs or other pets could move freely within the relevant area. As regards inclusive parks for pets, pet owners were required to observe the code to keep their dogs on leash, restrain and control behaviour of their dogs and clean up the faeces of their dogs to keep the parks clean. Original facilities of parks would remain unchanged after the parks were opened up as inclusive parks for pets. As long as pet owners kept their dogs on leash and under control in accordance with the code, accidents could be avoided. The department would therefore not install any gates or fences, and hoped that pet owners would follow relevant guidelines or codes when using inclusive parks for pets.

52. Mr. Richard CHAN welcomed LCSD’s reply. He also considered it not necessary to provide fences at this stage, and was pleased to see that more parks in Tai Po District would in the future join the “Inclusive Park for Pets” programme. He hoped that the department would give special consideration to providing such inclusive parks at places with a strong demand such as Tai Po Waterfront Park.

53. DFMC endorsed to support the development of Pak Shek Kok Promenade (Tai Po Section), Ha Hang Village Sitting-out Area and Ting Tai Road Children’s Playground in Tai Po District

into “Inclusive Parks for Pets”.

IV. Provision of a jogging track at Pak Shek Kok Promenade
(TPDC Paper Nos. DFM 31/2020 and DFM 31a/2020)

54. Mr. YIU Kwan-ho indicated that he had not been aware that Pak Shek Kok Promenade (Tai Po Section) would be developed into an inclusive park for pets when submitting the relevant paper. Should the promenade be developed into an inclusive park for pets, his proposal might not necessarily be suitable. The reason he hoped that a jogging track could be provided was that the promenade was at the waterfront and many members of the public jogged there during the week. Provision of a jogging track would help differentiate between pedestrians and joggers. Besides, he did not recommend paving the jogging track with tiles so as to minimise the physical strain caused to joggers. He opined that the proposal would become less practicable once the inclusive park for pets was provided, but nonetheless enquired if the provision of a jogging track would be feasible. Moreover, the residential areas of Pak Shek Kok and the promenade were separated from each other only by a cycling track, and it was very dangerous for members of the public to cross the cycling track to reach the promenade. He enquired if TD or other departments would provide any pedestrian crossings to facilitate passage of members of the public, or alter the position of the planters there.

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

- (i) Pak Shek Kok Promenade, which was approximately 2 000 metres long, was divided into Tai Po Section and Shatin Section. Tai Po Section was about 900 metres long and it was roughly estimated that ground width of some 90% of Tai Po Section was approximately 9 metres, with facilities including primarily benches, arbours, greening zones, light refreshment kiosks, elderly fitness equipment and so on. Members of the public in general would use the promenade for strolling, exercising and watching the scenery of Tolo Harbour, as well as for accessing Shatin.
- (ii) The promenade was also a popular site for long-distance running. According to records, a total of 60 distance running events and competitions had been held on Pak Shek Kok Promenade in 2019. The existing facilities were therefore suitable for running activities.
- (iii) LCSD would open up Pak Shek Kok Promenade as an inclusive park for pets between end of 2020 and early 2021. It was expected that members of the public would be attracted to take their pets to the promenade, whereby increasing the number of users of the promenade.
- (iv) Outdoor jogging tracks in Tai Po District such as Tai Po Waterfront Park jogging

track were painted with coloured material for joggers or visitors to identify the area of the jogging track. The materials of jogging tracks did not have any shock absorption function.

- (v) Since Pak Shek Kok Promenade (Tai Po Section) was rather narrow and there were facilities such as lamp posts, arbours, planters and so on, the department needed to reserve some room as buffer. Usable area for other users might be reduced should a jogging track be provided.
- (vi) Pak Shek Kok Promenade (Tai Po Section) was also an emergency vehicle access which would be used by emergency vehicles where necessary.
- (vii) Should provision of a jogging track paved with shock absorption material at Pak Shek Kok Promenade be proposed, the department would not accept Mr. YIU Kwan-ho's opinion for the time being given the actual usage and limitations of the venue.
- (viii) As regards the suggestion to provide a pedestrian crossing on the promenade at lamp post BE4110, LCSD could facilitate relevant departments' feasibility study concerning provision of pedestrian crossings or pedestrian network. LCSD wished to examine with relevant departments if it would be practicable to alter the location of the planters while maintaining the original design of the promenade and without affecting daily operation. However, LCSD currently had no intention to alter the original location and layout design of planters. There had already been 13 entrances/exits on Pak Shek Kok Promenade (Tai Po Section) for members of the public to access the cycling track and nearby housing estates, while there was already an entrance to the promenade less than 20 metres away from lamp post BE4110. Should Mr. YIU Kwan-ho wish to have an on-site inspection, LCSD would be happy to join the inspection together with relevant departments.

56. Mr. YIU Kwan-ho said that he would examine with Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan shortly if it would be feasible to provide jogging tracks at some locations. As far as pedestrian crossings were concerned, since no bicycle speed reduction sign was currently available at the said site, and TD had once indicated that it would study with LCSD the provision of pedestrian crossings, he wished to follow up on the progress.

57. The Chairman indicated that he hoped Mr. YIU Kwan-ho would maintain close contact with LCSD in connection with matters concerning facilities along Pak Shek Kok Promenade.

V. Development of a golf course at a closed landfill in Shuen Wan

58. The Chairman advised that regarding the development of a golf course at a closed landfill

in Shuen Wan, Environmental Protection Department (“EPD”) had replied that since its submission of Paper No. DFM 3/2020 in April 2020, EPD had not furnished any updates. It also did not send any representatives to attend this meeting.

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

- (i) The issue of night-roost usage had been mentioned in relevant Environmental Impact Assessment (“EIA”) report in 2019. The developer had at that time tended not to preserve all plantations with records of night-roost usage. He enquired about the current proposal.
- (ii) Someone had said that the golf course concerned could be opened to members and the public, but without mentioning the usage proportion between the two.
- (iii) The golf course would still be open between 7:00 and 11:00 in the evening while it was located near Fortune Garden. He therefore enquired if EPD had assessed the impact on residents nearby.
- (iv) Construction of the golf course was proposed to commence in 2021. He enquired if a more accurate works schedule could be provided.

60. The Chairman advised that since representatives of the relevant department were not present at this meeting to answer Members’ questions, whereas EPD had not introduced the captioned item at meetings during this DC term, DFMC would invite EPD to attend the next meeting to explain the situation and answer Members’ questions.

VI. Matters concerning organisation of dragon boat races in Tai Po District in 2021
(TPDC Paper No. DFM 32/2020)

61. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai introduced Paper No. DFM 32/2020. He supplemented that regarding matters about organisation of dragon boat races in Tai Po District, some members of the public had asked Members about subsequent arrangements of dragon boat races, and whether or not Members would discuss relevant issues at DFMC meetings. Besides, some members of the public had also enquired if groups would be allowed to apply for DC funding to organise dragon boat races, and if the role TPDC had previously played in the organisation of dragon boat races would be reviewed. There were six months to go before the dragon boat races, he hoped that he could first discuss the aforementioned matters with Members at the meeting, and would then notify the groups of arrangements concerning open application for DC funding to organise dragon boat races after the meeting. He also welcomed opinions from relevant departments about how better dragon boat races could be organised.

62. Ms. WONG Yu-hang, Anita introduced the background of organising dragon boat races in

the past. Dragon boat activities in Tai Po District had been jointly organised by Tai Po District Dragon Boat Race Committee (“Race Committee”) and Tai Po Sports Association (“TPSA”) previously. The Race Committee was chaired by the chairman of TPSA, while TPSA staff formed a secretariat and carried out all preparation work. As far as she knew, the Race Committee applied for \$1 million DC funding each year, and raised fund from external sources to organise dragon boat races. By tradition, the Race Committee would organise dragon boat races on the fifth day of the fifth month of the lunar calendar, and perform eye-dotting to pray for peace on the first day of the fifth month of the lunar calendar.

63. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai indicated that the Race Committee had been responsible for organising previous dragon boat races. He enquired if the funding for organising the activity was approximately \$1 million, and whether or not other districts used similar funding to organise races. In addition, he asked if there were other ways to organise this activity, such as working together with DFMC. Results of funding applications in the past had only been approval/rejection, or reduction of the funding amount. He said that some members of the public had asked if any land-based activities would be held in addition to water-based dragon boat races so as to enhance participation of members of the public and diversity of the event. He enquired if a new approach could be attempted to, apart from the Race Committee, openly recruit groups interested in organising the activities concerned to submit relevant proposals for DFMC’s assessment.

64. Mr. Patrick MO concurred with Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai’s views, and opined that previous dragon boat races in Tai Po District had been held for quite some time and it was now time to have the races organised in a new approach. He was of the view that many small local sports groups might in the past be interested in organising activities, but had not gone ahead because of their lack of experience in holding similar activities. As such, he enquired whether this opportunity would be taken to open up the activity for local sports groups to organise or participate. Besides, he indicated that only one dragon boat race had primarily been held each year in Tai Po District in the past, and asked if consideration would be given to split up the race into several ones to be held at different locations such as Lam Tsuen River or Sai Kung North so as to enhance the participation in dragon boat activities.

65. Ms. Anita WONG said that as far as she was aware, several districts including Shatin District had applied for DC funds to organise dragon boat races. Dragon boat races in Tai Po had a history of 80 years already, which involved participation of fishermen. Organisation of dragon boat races required substantial financial and material resources. TPSA at present possessed 40 dragon boats, and maintenance of each dragon boat required significant funding. Members of the Race Committee had accumulated considerable experience in organising dragon boat races and as far as she knew, the Race Committee hoped that relevant races could be held according to tradition each year. As regards working together with other groups or adopting a new approach to organise dragon boat races, she opined that DC could adopt an open attitude in

the discussion while groups might hold land-based activities and conduct competitions in other formats at other locations such as Tap Mun, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po Waterfront Park and so on.

66. Mr. Dalu LIN said that as far as he was aware, apart from dragon boat races, there was also a bazaar at the Hong Kong International Dragon Boat Races held at Central. Thus he would like to explore the feasibility of holding similar activities in Tai Po District. He was of the view that in addition to watching dragon boat races on television, it would help enhance the traditional atmosphere to incorporate the element of residents' participation in dragon boat activities, while offering people the opportunity to learn about the culture of the boat dwellers and ethos of Tai Po. He considered it a key issue how new modes of activities could be launched within the existing framework.

67. Mr. WU Yiu-cheong said that this agenda item was not meant to discuss whether or not organisation of the dragon boat races 2021 should be entrusted to TPSA. Rather, the discussion was about whether future dragon boat races could be made more diversified, more spectacular and outstanding through a better mode of invitation or cooperation. He opined that Members were also duty bound to deal with the controversies in the beginning of this year, including public enquiries about the budget for organising dragon boat activities and format of activities. He was of the view that TPDC could provide more support so that the groups could hold a more diversified dragon boat race should an open recruitment by TPDC be adopted to attract other groups to apply for organisation of dragon boat races. He also concurred with Mr. Dalu LIN's remarks that apart from dragon boat races, Dragon Boat Festival-related activities such as bazaar, production of rice-dumplings, introduction of the origin of rice-dumplings and so on could also be held on land to incorporate different elements. He believed that more support could be provided to the groups organising the activities if TPDC could conduct an open recruitment in the format of small groups.

68. Mr. Richard CHAN said that dragon boat races had a long history. Tai Po was located at an inland sea, and water was relatively calm in Tolo Harbour, the waterfront promenade, and the vicinity between Tolo Highway, Tai Po and Tai Po Industrial Estate, rendering it suitable for organising various water activities. He enquired if more facilities could be provided in Tai Po so that water activities such as dragon boat and so on would not be not subject to seasonal restrictions and could be held in Tai Po constantly. He pointed out that this agenda item was to discuss how to enhance participation of Tai Po residents in this event with a long history, and opined that the public should be allowed to take part in activities with a long history in a fair and open manner. Hong Kong had legislation which encouraged competition to allow activities to be held on the principle of fairness. He wished to focus at this meeting on the discussion of how dragon boat activities were to be organised and more interested parties could be invited to participate so that the activities could become more successful and participation of Tai Po residents could be enhanced.

69. The Chairman said that TPDO had in the past assisted in organising dragon boat activities. He wished to know if it was not required to designate a certain group to apply for organising dragon boat activities, and enquired in the event a group applied to organise dragon boat activities, whether it would be allowed to hold relevant activities as long as the funding guidelines were complied with.

70. Mr. LEE Yu-sau, Terence advised that relevant activities had not been required to be held by any particular groups. Should any local groups apply to organise activities, such applications would be reviewed to see if they complied with the “Guidelines on TPDC Funds” and processed accordingly.

71. Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang said the idea at present was that groups interested in organising dragon boat races and activities might submit proposals to apply for funding. He enquired if TPDC could lead the organisation of dragon boat races and activities and invite groups to prepare complete proposals for the activities. For instance, a certain group submitted a proposal for organising dragon boat races while another one submitted a proposal for organising bazaar/performances and dragon boat races and so on. Suitable groups would be selected from various proposals to organise dragon boat activities jointly with TPDC.

72. Mr. Terence LEE indicated that local groups had in the past been openly invited to jointly organise activities with TPDC. However, it would be rather complicated if proposals submitted by the groups covered different numbers and types of activities, while it was also difficult for the groups to master the format of proposals. He recommended that TPDC openly invite some groups to organise a single activity jointly, or specify which activities the groups could jointly organise. Such approach would be clearer.

73. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai said that dragon boat races were activities with a long history, for which competition committees had been formed by various groups after some evolution. He indicated that the purpose of putting forward this agenda item was that dragon boat races had been held for many years while other groups and organisations in the community were also interested in organising dragon boat races. Hence, it was hoped that this opportunity could be taken to let the public know that they also had the chance to apply to organise the activity themselves. He opined that competition would lead to progress, and submission of proposals by different groups should be encouraged. For instance, various groups had in the past submitted proposals in connection with the project at West Kowloon Cultural District to apply for funding of approximately \$500,000 to organise activities representing Tai Po. He was of the view that dragon boat was an activity to represent Tai Po too, and new ideas could be incorporated. Whether or not to hold activities such as bazaars and performances could be left for the groups to decide, and it was not necessary to set too many restrictions in connection with project ideas. He opined that Members would not oppose open recruitment, and hoped that conditions for open recruitment could be discussed, for instance, funding ceiling, content of activities, deadline for

submitting proposals and so on. In addition, he said that the groups might need to be invited to working group meetings. However, new working groups would increase the workload of the Secretariat, whereas it was not a suitable approach to have a new working group for each discussion item either. Hence, he would like to know what comments TPDO and other Members had on the said matter.

74. Mr. Nick LAM said that small organisations and groups might be put off by the need to handle too many activities if they were required to coordinate and conceive all activities. He opined that funding applications should be dealt with separately for each activity, such as funding applications for dragon boat races, funding applications for organising booth activities and so on, such that groups with more resources could hold large-scale projects, and smaller groups could organise projects in smaller scale. Such approach was relatively fair, and participation of groups would be higher too.

75. The Chairman indicated that as regards the question some Members had raised as to how groups should be invited, he enquired if relevant applications would be treated as activity applications submitted by societies or companies to DC for approval. Besides, he hoped that the Secretariat would furnish information about funding applications filed by the Race Committee in the past two years.

76. Mr. Terence LEE advised that the Race Committee had applied for funding of \$1 million each year during the past two years. However, just as what Ms. Anita WONG had said, the organisation had to organise the activity by self-subsidising or sponsorship. Taking 2019 as an example, the Race Committee had to subsidise some \$300,000 to \$400,000 to organise the activity, while there had also been hundred-odd thousand dollars from sponsorship. He opined that the activity was of a considerable scale involving significant human and material resources. The funding application was rather complicated with quite a lot of funding items.

77. Mr. Dalu LIN enquired about the formation and history of the Race Committee. He said that it would be necessary to know the background of the Race Committee if details about organising dragon boat activities had to be examined and discussed afresh.

78. Ms. Anita WONG responded that a race committee would be formed each year while the Chairman of TPSA would chair the said race committee, with members from seven major societies, namely, two rural committees, TPSA, Tai Po Tsat Yeuk Rural Committee, Tai Po Merchants Association, Federation of Fishermen's Co-operative Societies of Tai Po District, New Territories, Limited, and Tai Po Societies Fraternal Association, acting as partners of the activity.

79. Mr. Dalu LIN said that he had taken part in the meeting of the preparatory committee last year, at which representatives of several government departments had been present. Hence, he enquired about the role government departments played in the Race Committee.

80. Ms. Anita WONG responded that departmental representatives present at the meeting came from TPDO, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”), Marine Department, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (“FEHD”), Tai Po District Lands Office (“TPDLO”) and Marine Region, who were responsible for providing assistance and advice.

81. Mr. Dalu LIN asked if the departmental representatives were members of the Race Committee.

82. Ms. Eunice CHAN indicated that this activity was one which the relevant organising committee or organisation took the lead in arranging the event. Should the large-scale activity concerned involve matters such as pedestrian and traffic flows, relevant departments would offer assistance accordingly, including crowd control measures, ancillary transport arrangements and so on. If need be, TPDO would help coordinate among relevant departments to offer assistance in connection with the preparation and facilitation on or prior to the day of the activity.

83. Mr. Richard CHAN endorsed the practice of government departments to provide assistance no matter which groups organised the activity. He also indicated that given that the Government would support and assist any groups to organise dragon boat activities, Members could continue to discuss how to invite groups to organise activities. Besides, he asked how the Race Committee was formed because he had seen that some organisations in the said Committee had closed down already and were not on the registry any more when he was handling the applications of relevant activities and reviewing the Guidelines on TPDC Funds last year. He therefore found it weird about the structure of the Committee.

84. Ms. Anita WONG said that as far as she was aware, there was no information showing the seven societies mentioned above did not exist currently.

85. Mr. Richard CHAN said that he would contact TPDO in connection with the matter concerned after the meeting. He asked if TPDO had recently reviewed the registration status of the seven societies. If yes, when? Besides, he also asked if the Race Committee was a registered society.

86. The Chairman asked if it would be unnecessary to attend to matters concerning the Race Committee in the past should Members agree to allow groups to apply for funding to organise dragon boat activities, since the said committee might apply for funding on its own too, while it would need to be checked as to whether or not the committee was registered as a society. Should Members opine that there were issues with the Race Committee, they might allow all eligible societies or groups to submit applications in the name of societies or companies for organising dragon boat activities. He indicated that no Member had opposed applications of groups other than the Race Committee for funding to organise dragon boat activities just now,

while this meeting was being broadcasted live and meeting minutes would also be available, so that interested groups might apply for funding to organise the dragon boat activities next year.

87. Mr. Terence LEE advised that as regards open invitation, live broadcasting or minutes of meeting alone had not served as a proof of invitation in the past. Generally speaking, the Secretariat would invite groups in writing to submit applications while the letter concerned would also be open for public inspection by uploading it to TPDC website.

88. The Chairman enquired if there would be no issue concerning invitation should the groups be allowed to submit applications for organising dragon boat races on or around the day of Dragon Boat Festival as a general local activity.

89. Mr. Terence LEE said that some Members had just now suggested joint organisation of activities with TPDC. To jointly organise activities with TPDC, there would usually be an open invitation to indicate the intention of TPDC to organise an activity with some groups while letters would be issued and an invitation letter would be uploaded to TPDC website. For activities which were not jointly organised with TPDC, the groups concerned would simply need to submit applications on their own.

90. The Chairman enquired if Members wished to organise activities jointly with the groups in the name of TPDC, or to let all groups which were interested apply for organising the activities.

91. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai said that should applications be made in accordance with ordinary local activities, no discussion at the meeting would be necessary. He had put forward this agenda item because he hoped that there would be new changes so that the public would know that they could organise activities jointly with TPDC. Dragon boat activities had been held in Tai Po for many years while the Race Committee had also organised dragon boat races for many years. He did not mean to criticise the effectiveness of previous activities, while many people had participated in the event too. Even if the Race Committee was the only group to apply for organising activities next year, the platform of TPDC or DFMC could be made use of to put forward improvement suggestions in connection with joint organisation of dragon boat races. Hence, he hoped that recruitment or open invitation would be conducted in the format of joint organisation. He indicated that in addition to writing to the Race Committee, letter could also be sent to the Dragon Boat Association because of the important role it played in dragon boat activities in Hong Kong. He was of the view that other dragon boat clubs had maintained contact with Dragon Boat Association, so that they could receive and learn about TPDC's invitation through the Dragon Boat Association, while persons interested in dragon boat races/sport territory-wide could also be invited to apply for organising this activity.

92. The Chairman enquired if activities were jointly organised in the name of TPDC with the groups, would invitation letters be issued by TPDC to all interested groups/persons so that they

could apply to organise the activities jointly?

93. Mr. Terence LEE advised that the aforementioned procedures would be followed by and large. However, more details, including date of activities, funding budget, formats in which activities were held, etc., would have to be gathered before issuing invitation letters. As regards groups/persons interested in dragon boat activities as Members had mentioned, given the excessively broad definition, it would be difficult to decide which groups/persons would receive the invitation. Since the said problems had been encountered in the past when issuing an open invitation, it was therefore hoped that Members would state in greater detail information of the activities and groups which were to receive invitation letters. Only then could more specific invitation letters be drafted and sent to the groups. Otherwise it would be difficult for the groups to prepare proposals in connection with the activities.

94. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai indicated that taking reference from the open invitation for New Year activities before, time frame and funding ceiling would be set for organising the activities, whereas no special restrictions had been imposed for the format of activities. Hence, groups might be invited to organise dragon boat races and other land-based activities. The funding ceiling for dragon boat activities had in the past been \$1 million, which could be slightly adjusted in accordance with the guidelines of Home Affairs Department (“HAD”). As regards the time frame for holding activities, he said that the groups which would organise activities could be invited to attend the DFMC meeting in January next year where Members could enquire about the details of the activities. He asked if it would be feasible to issue invitation letters in end of November, with a deadline in mid-December for the groups to submit their applications and to discuss relevant matters at the DFMC meeting in January.

95. The Chairman enquired if inviting the groups to DFMC would mean that Members would meet with the groups which were interested in applying to organise activities, or certain groups would be designated or referred to attend the meeting.

96. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai indicated that he had meant the former. He said that the Dragon Boat Association had other affiliated associations or dragon boat clubs. Hence, in addition to issuing an invitation to the existing Race Committee, an invitation letter should also be sent to the Dragon Boat Association which could disseminate the message to other affiliated associations, while the letter could also be uploaded to TPDC website such that the public could become aware of relevant invitation.

97. Mr. Terence LEE said that only relatively preliminary information was available for the time being. When processing applications of jointly organised activities in the past, TPDC would invite certain groups in writing, and the activity as a whole would be organised by relevant groups. In the past, the Secretariat would only examine if relevant applications complied with the Guidelines on DC Funds, and assist in conducting open invitation, without participating in the

organisation of activities, which would be organised exclusively by the groups.

98. Mr. KWAN Wing-yip said given that this meeting was an open one, he enquired if other non-local or overseas groups which intended to apply for organising dragon boat activities, should there be any, with a view to introducing new ideas to make local dragon boat activities a spectacular event, would be allowed to submit applications while such groups did not receive any invitation letters.

99. Mr. Terence LEE advised that the Guidelines on DC Funds stipulated that groups eligible for applying DC funds were those which were either statutory bodies or those registered in accordance with the legislation of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region such as Companies Ordinance, while such bodies were set up wholly or mainly for the benefit of the district or to serve the public, and organised activities for the benefit of the local community and the people who live, work or study in the district, as well as autonomous bodies of persons (whether incorporated or not) or organisations established wholly or mainly for the benefit of the district or to serve the public, and organised activities for the benefit of the local community and the people who live, work or study in the district.

100. Mr. KWAN Wing-yip said that as regards the Secretariat's follow-up on issuance of invitation letters to local dragon boat groups after the meeting, he enquired if TPDC could accept applications of overseas/mainland groups which did not receive invitation letters but nonetheless submitted application.

101. Mr. Terence LEE advised that no application for DC funds had ever been received from groups outside Hong Kong in the past. Should a group be required to be established wholly or mainly for the benefit of the district, groups outside Hong Kong might not necessarily be able to meet this requirement. To play safe, HAD's advice might need to be sought on relevant provisions in the event such applications were received.

102. The Chairman enquired if those groups, which did not receive any invitation letters but were aware of relevant information, could submit applications.

103. Mr. Terence LEE responded that the invitation letter would be uploaded to TPDC website, and invitation was therefore not limited to those groups which received invitation letters by post.

104. Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai indicated that since the Guidelines on DC Funds also allowed organisations outside Tai Po District to apply for funding, he enquired if "in the district" referred to Tai Po District or the districts of the applicant organisations. Other dragon boat clubs or the Dragon Boat Association did not have their addresses in Tai Po, and he enquired if such condition would have any impact on funding applications. Besides, he opined that detailed discussion of the deadline to be specified in the invitation at this meeting was not necessarily required.

Should Members reach a consensus to invite groups which had submitted applications to elaborate on the project details at the meeting in January next year, the Secretariat could be entrusted to draft the invitation letter, which could be issued after being vetted by Members. Besides, he also asked the Secretariat about the budget ceiling.

105. Mr. Terence LEE indicated that as far as the nature of groups was concerned, the Guidelines on DC Funds did not specify that the groups had to be those in the district. Hence, the Secretariat had from time to time received funding applications submitted by groups outside the district. As regards the funding ceiling, the maximum funding amount which TPDO could approve was \$1.2 million, whereas applications for funding over \$1.2 million would need to be approved by HAD. He said that the budget of the activity could be prepared first while the Chairman and relevant Members of DFMC could be authorised to clarify other details such as invitation letters with the Secretariat later.

106. The Chairman advised that several Members could be invited after the meeting to discuss the content of the invitation letter which, once vetted by Members, could be sent out. Since authorisation was involved while such arrangement was new, it would take some time to process.

107. Mr. Richard CHAN said that there were many locations in the district which were suitable for organising water activities, he enquired if the departments would consider providing more facilities for water activities in the district, for instance, places for landing/storage of boats at Tai Po Waterfront Park.

108. Ms. Stella LIU advised that the pier area of Tai Po Waterfront Park was currently not under LCSD's management while construction of piers was not under LCSD's purview either. She indicated that LCSD had several water sports centres and the one in Tai Po District was Tai Mei Tuk Water Sports Centre. She welcomed Members' participation in relevant activities at the said centre.

109. The Chairman indicated that in addition to their concern over water sports centres managed by LCSD, Members were also concerned about water-based facilities. While provision of water sports centres could be discussed further at DFMC meetings, construction of facilities such as piers would need to be brought up for discussion at meetings of other relevant committees.

110. Mr. Richard CHAN said that he was aware of the existence of Tai Mei Tuk Water Sports Centre, however, traffic at the location was overloaded. The waters between Tolo Highway, Tai Po and Tai Po Industrial Estate/Tai Po Waterfront Promenade were very suitable for organising various water activities. Yet, the location was not made good use of at present. He therefore hoped that LCSD would note his opinion and consider providing at the said location a water sports centre and facilities.

111. The Chairman recommended that \$1 million be preliminarily earmarked as funding for dragon boat activities and DFMC agreed.

VII. 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 33/2020, DFM 33a/2020, DFM 33b/2020, DFM 33c/2020, DFM 33d/2020, DFM 33e/2020, DFM 33f/2020 and DFM 33g/2020)

112. The Chairman requested that Members note the position of the District Minor Works Funds and the Progress Report on the Approved District Minor Works Projects. He reported that the DFMC currently had an approved project estimates of \$122 million, of which around \$30.74 million was for 2020/21 and approximately \$91.54 million for 2021/22 and thereafter.

113. The Chairman welcomed Senior Architect Mr. MAK Cheuk-kai, Ryan and Architect Mr. CHU Bo-hei, Boris of Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited to the meeting for the discussion of this item, and asked representatives of the term consultant, TPDO and LCSD to report the progress of approved District Minor Works (“DMW”) projects.

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

(Items (1) to (22) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 33/2020, TPDC Paper Nos. DFM 33a/2020, DFM 33b/2020, DFM 33c/2020 and DFM 33d/2020)

114. Mr. CHU Bo-hei, Boris recapped the feasibility study report regarding Project Item (21) “TP-DMW242 Provision of sitting-out area at San Uk Tsai, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po” in TPDC Paper No. DFM 33a/2020. He supplemented that the area of the construction site was 1 388 square metres and the estimated construction cost was \$17.98 million. The project was expected to commence in Q4 in 2021 and would take 12 months to complete.

115. Ms. CHAN Ho-shan, Susana enquired when she could report matters concerned which had been discussed at another occasion, and opined that she was duty bound to report relevant situation.

116. Mr. Richard CHAN said he hoped that meeting procedures would be observed. The aforementioned feasibility study report had been endorsed at the Working Group on District Works (“WGDW”) earlier. It would suffice for Members to discuss at this meeting the papers which had been endorsed by the working groups while it was not necessary to discuss matters other than those which the working groups had discussed.

117. Ms. Susana CHAN indicated that she would refer the matter concerned to LCSD for reporting.

118. Mr. Richard CHAN said that it was not about the issue of passing to LCSD the responsibility to report. Discussion items at a meeting should be decided by the Members. In terms of procedures, WGDW had already endorsed the aforementioned works project while Members' views should now be sought at DFMC on projects endorsed by WGDW.

119. Mr. LAM Yick-kuen indicated that the matter concerned had already been discussed with Mr. Richard CHAN earlier, and different views of the village heads had also been heeded prior to the meeting, while Mr. Richard CHAN had also reflected opinions of other residents. He would respect residents' views and opined that this project should not be altered for the time being.

120. The Chairman reported that the construction cost of Project Item (21) "TP-DMW242 Provision of sitting-out area at San Uk Tsai, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po" was \$17.98 million.

121. Members raised no objections. The Chairman announced that the feasibility study report and construction cost above were endorsed.

122. Mr. Boris CHU recapped the feasibility study report regarding Project Item (16) "TP-DMW263 Provision of fitness equipment and elderly facilities near the morning trail at Wan Tau Tong, Tai Po" in TPDC Paper No. DFM 33b/2020. He supplemented that the area of the construction site was 168 square metres and the estimated construction cost was \$9.6 million. The project was expected to commence in Q4 in 2021 and would take 12 months to complete.

123. The Chairman reported that the construction cost of Project Item (16) "TP-DMW263 Provision of fitness equipment and elderly facilities near the morning trail at Wan Tau Tong, Tai Po" was \$9.6 million.

124. Members raised no objections. The Chairman announced that the feasibility study report and construction cost above were endorsed.

125. Mr. Boris CHU recapped the feasibility study report regarding Project Item (18) "TP-DMW266 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Tau Tong Estate at Fung Wan Road, Tai Po" in TPDC Paper No. DFM 33c/2020. He supplemented that the estimated construction cost was \$3.29 million. The project was expected to commence in Q4 in 2021 and would take 12 months to complete.

126. Mr. WONG Siu-kin indicated that according to the information provided by the term consultant, when the rainshelter project would commence hinged upon the completion date of the

bus stop shelter works nearby. At present, Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited (“KMB”) had already finished constructing one shelter, and he enquired if the term consultant had checked when KMB would finish constructing the second shelter. Besides, he also enquired if a 12-month construction period was standard for a rainshelter. According to his observation, it had taken about two weeks only for KMB to build a shelter to a bus stop, so he asked if the construction period of the rainshelter could be shortened.

127. Mr. Boris CHU responded that he had already checked with KMB the completion date of the bus stop shelter concerned. KMB had replied that the entire bus stop shelter works would complete in end of December 2020. Hence, this rainshelter project could be carried out as scheduled. As regards the estimated time required for the construction period, different stages were taken into account such as filing application for approval of temporary traffic management measures with relevant departments. Currently, a 12-month construction period was reserved for the rainshelter project while the actual completion date would become available once works progress could be updated after works at the construction site officially commenced.

128. The Chairman reported that the construction cost of Project Item (18) “TP-DMW266 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Tau Tong Estate at Fung Wan Road, Tai Po” was \$3.29 million.

129. Members raised no objections. The Chairman announced that the feasibility study report and construction cost above were endorsed.

130. Mr. Boris CHU recapped the feasibility study report regarding Project Item (19) “TP-DMW270 Provision of shelters at Po Nga Road connecting Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po” in TPDC Paper No. DFM 33d/2020. He supplemented that the estimated construction cost was \$1.8 million. The project was expected to commence in mid-October 2021 and would take eight months to complete.

131. Ms. Olive CHAN said that since there were members of the public coming from other districts who were not familiar with Tai Wo Bus Terminus and needed to ask for directions after getting off, she enquired if signage to Tai Wo Plaza or Mass Transit Railway (“MTR”) Station could be provided at the shelter. Moreover, as aluminium sunshades would be installed on the shelter while it was rather dark on both sides near the bus terminus at Tai Wo Plaza, she hoped that lighting facilities could be provided.

132. Mr. Boris CHU responded that since the scope of works involved only the construction of shelter, provision of signage at Tai Wo Bus Terminus would therefore not be covered. As regards the opinion about provision of lighting facilities, the scope of works at the current stage did not include the installation of any lighting facilities. The term consultant would conduct lighting brightness tests at the detailed design stage shortly to ascertain if the lighting standards of the Highways Department (“HyD”) were met. Provision of lighting facilities would not be

necessary should the said standards be met.

133. Miss Lisa YIP indicated that as regards the provision of signage at Tai Wo Bus Terminus to locations such as MTR Station, TPDO would contact relevant departments to follow up shortly. Regarding the lighting condition surrounding the site, as far as the overall improvement of Tai Wo Bus Terminus was concerned, Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai had put forward expansion and enhancement works of Tai Wo Bus Terminus in the DMW project proposal 2021 which he had submitted. In addition to improvement of traffic operation, the project outline had also mentioned lighting matters. TPDO had already arranged for TD, Housing Department (“HD”) and the bus companies to have an on-site inspection with the project proponent Mr. CHOW Yuen-wai. After detailed discussion, given the need to review the lighting and condition of Tai Wo Bus Terminus as a whole, the proponent had agreed to refer the work to review, study and improve Tai Wo Bus Terminus to the Traffic and Transport Committee (“TTC”) for follow up.

134. The Chairman reported that the construction cost of Project Item (19) “TP-DMW270 Provision of shelters at Po Nga Road connecting Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po” was \$1.8 million.

135. Members raised no objections. The Chairman announced that the feasibility study report and construction cost above were endorsed.

136. Mr. Boris CHU reported the progress of the remaining 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”: TPDLO had on 30 October 2020 approved the application for government land allocation, and tender invitation for the project had been carried out on 13 November 2020.
- (ii) Project Item (2) “TP-DMW211 Provision of sitting-out area outside Tai Po Sports Ground, Tai Po Tau Road, Tai Po”: Tile paving and painting were being carried out at this stage. The term consultant, HAD (Works Section) and the works contractor would conduct an inspection with LCSD in November 2020 prior to the handover.
- (iii) Project Item (3) “TP-DMW215 Construction of covered walkway at Tai Po Tai Wo Road connecting footbridge NF97”: Construction of foundations and installation of temporary electricity supply facilities were currently underway.
- (iv) Project Item (4) “TP-DMW227 Provision of sitting-out area and children’s playground at Nai Chung, Tai Po”: The term consultant was awaiting TPDLO’s approval of the site allocation. Tender invitation of the project was expected to take place in Q4 in 2020.
- (v) Project Item (5) “TP-DMW231 Provision of sitting-out area at CARE Village, Tai Po”: The term consultant was awaiting TPDLO’s approval of the site allocation.

Tender invitation of the project was expected to take place in Q4 in 2020.

- (vi) Project Item (6) “TP-DMW232 Provision of sitting-out area at Po Sam Pai, Tai Po”: The term consultant was working on the detailed design while awaiting TPDLO’s approval of the site allocation.
- (vii) Project Item (7) “TP-DMW238 Provision of rainshelters at Tai Po Kau Constituency (Mayfair By The Sea, Wong Yi Au, Ta Tit Yan and Cheung Shue Tan)”: The term consultant had submitted to TD, HyD and Hong Kong Police Force (“HKPF”) temporary traffic management schemes for road works and relevant documents were being vetted.
- (viii) Project Item (8) “TP-DMW240 Extension construction works of existing covered walkway at Nga Wan Road near Uptown Plaza, Tai Po”: The term consultant was preparing to submit temporary traffic management schemes for road works to TD, HyD and HKPF to consult the departments concerned.
- (ix) Project Item (9) “TP-DMW241 Provision of sitting-out area at San Wa On Lane, Tai Po Tau, Tai Po”: The term consultant was preparing to submit temporary traffic management schemes for road works to TD and HyD for approval, while working on the detailed design and consulting the departments concerned. Tender invitation of the project was expected to take place in Q1 in 2021.
- (x) Project Item (10) “TP-DMW242 Provision of sitting-out area at San Uk Tsai, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po”: The term consultant had already reported at the meeting, and the feasibility study report and construction cost had been endorsed.
- (xi) Project Item (11) “TP-DMW252 Provision of Rainshelters in Tao Po Kau Constituency (Chong San Road, Deerhill Bay and Chung Tsai Yuen Lookout)”: Tender invitation of the project had been conducted on 5 October 2020, and tenders were returned on 23 October 2020. The term consultant was currently analysing the tenders.
- (xii) Project Item (12) “TP-DMW253 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Hang House, Wan Tau Tong Estate at Tat Wan Road, Tai Po”: Tender invitation of the project had been conducted on 28 August 2020, and tenders were returned on 18 September 2020. The term consultant was currently analysing the tenders.
- (xiii) Project Item (13) “TP-DMW255 Provision of covered walkway at Tai Po Road Yuen Chau Tsai section near Kwong Fuk Estate, Tai Po”: The term consultant was preparing the feasibility study report and revising the design.
- (xiv) Project Item (14) “TP-DMW256 Provision of sitting-out area at Tseng Tau, Sai Sha Road, Sai Kung North, Tai Po”: The term consultant was awaiting TPDLO’s approval of the site allocation. LCSD had conducted an on-site inspection with the term consultant, ArchSD, HAD (Works Section) and TPDO (Works Section) in November 2020 and discussed future repair and maintenance as well as

management issues of the existing railings.

- (xv) Project Item (15) “TP-DMW260 Provision of shelter at Nam Wan Road near NF132 footbridge, Tai Po”: Tender invitation of the project had been conducted on 11 September 2020, and tenders were returned on 5 October 2020. The term consultant was currently analysing the tenders.
- (xvi) Project Item (16) “TP-DMW263 Provision of fitness equipment and elderly facilities near the morning trail at Wan Tau Tong, Tai Po”: The term consultant had already reported at the meeting, and the feasibility study report and construction cost had been endorsed.
- (xvii) Project Item (17) “TP-DMW264 Provision of elderly fitness equipment near Hing Wo House, Po Nga Court, Tai Po”: The term consultant was consulting relevant departments and working on the detailed design.
- (xviii) Project Item (18) “TP-DMW266 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Tau Tong Estate at Fung Wan Road, Tai Po”: The term consultant had already reported at the meeting and the feasibility study report and construction cost had been endorsed.
- (xix) Project Item (19) “TP-DMW270 Provision of shelters at Po Nga Road connecting Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po”: The term consultant had already reported at the meeting, and the feasibility study report and construction cost had been endorsed.
- (xx) Project Item (20) “TP-DMW295 Provision of a sitting-out area at Pak Shek Kok”: LCSD had arranged for an on-site inspection with the term consultant, HAD (Works Section), TD, TPDLO and the follow-up Member on 2 November 2020. At the present stage, the follow-up Member’s confirmation of concrete project outline content and scope was being awaited to facilitate the term consultant’s further follow up. The term consultant shelved the relevant feasibility study report for the time being while awaiting further instructions of LCSD and the follow-up Member. As regards the follow-up Member Mr. YIU Kwan-ho’s suggestion to provide a pedestrian access near the project site, TD had already given Mr. YIU Kwan-ho advice during the on-site inspection. A pedestrian access was not any DMW project and the said suggestion would be followed up on directly by TD with Mr. YIU Kwan-ho.
- (xxi) Project Item (21) “TP-DMW296 Provision of a sitting-out area at Cheung Muk Tau Village”: The term consultant, LCSD and HAD (Works Section) had conducted an on-site inspection with the follow-up Member on 23 September 2020 and briefed on the project overview and timetable. The feasibility study report was being amended currently.
- (xxii) Project Item (22) “TP-DMW309 Construction of Shelter at Chuen On Road near Tai Po Hospital, Tai Po”: HAD (Works Section) had on 22 September 2020 commissioned the term consultant to follow up on the advance work, and the latter

was carrying out the feasibility study.

137. Mr. YIU Kwan-ho enquired in connection with Project Item (20) “TP-DMW295 Provision of a sitting-out area at Pak Shek Kok” if the provision of a walkway would affect the project area and asked about the additional project costs incurred from expanding the area of the sitting-out area. Besides, he also asked how much the project cost would be if facilities of the sitting-out area were reduced. He wished to schedule an appointment with LCSD, TPDLO and the term consultant to discuss the aforementioned issues after the meeting. He was also of the view that it was not cost-effective to construct relevant facilities while nearby land would be wasted too. Hence, he hoped that a meeting could be held as soon as possible to discuss the matter and requested that the term consultant prepare information about the cost breakdown of the project.

138. Mr. Boris CHU responded that the proposal to provide a walkway would be discussed by TD and relevant departments. As regards the information about the breakdown of the sitting-out area project, the follow-up Member might first confirm the facilities and area specifically required, and then discuss with LCSD and the term consultant relevant project costs.

139. DFMC endorsed the above report.

(B) DMW projects reported by TPDO

(Items (23) to (55) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 33/2020)

140. Mr. LAU Chun-ming gave supplementary remarks on the following projects:

- (i) Project Item (23) “TP-DMW079 Provision of access road and drainage from Tai Hang Au Tsai to San Wai, Tai Po”: Drainage Services Department (“DSD”) indicated that the drainage works were expected to complete in January 2021. Upon completion of the said drainage works, TPDO (Works Section) would carry out improvement works of the driveway.
- (ii) Project Item (25) “TP-DMW226 Provision of footpath and lay-by at Tung Tsz Road, Tai Po”: Works had already commenced on 5 December 2019 and completed on 7 October 2020. Since provision of footpath and lay-by had already completed, this project item would be removed from the progress summary of projects.
- (iii) Project Item (26) “TP-DMW233 Improvement works of footbridge at Ma Kwu Lam, Sai Kung North, Tai Po”: Works had already commenced on 3 December 2019 and completed on 1 September 2020. Since works to rebuild the footbridge had already completed, this project item would be removed from the progress summary of projects.

- (iv) Project Item (27) “TP-DMW249 Improvement and widening to footpath at Yuen Leng, Kau Lung Hang and Tai Wo”: The Works Section had completed the detailed engineering design and was seeking views from the DC Member of the constituency concerned and relevant persons.
- (v) Project Item (28) “TP-DMW250 Provision of rainshelters with benches at Fung Yuen, Tai Wo and Yuen Leng Kam Fung Garden”: As regards the works to provide rainshelter at Yuen Leng Kam Fung Garden, the Works Section would follow up further with the DC Member of the constituency concerned since there was no suitable works site at the original location and its vicinity.
- (vi) Project Item (29) “TP-DMW265 Construction of rainshelters at paved area adjacent to Lam Tsuen wishing square, Ng Tung Chai and Tai Om Tsuen, Tai Po”: Regarding the construction of rainshelters at the paved area adjacent to Lam Tsuen Wishing Square and provision of rainshelters with benches at Tai Om Tsuen, the Works Section would consult the DC Member of the constituency concerned and relevant persons upon completion of preliminary engineering design.
- (vii) Project Item (30) “TP-DMW267 Improvement works of Wilson Trail Section 8 (near Hong Lok Yuen), Tai Po”: The Works Section was carrying out topographical survey and tree assessment.
- (viii) Project Item (31) “TP-DMW268 Provision of rainshelters at Shuen Wan Constituency near San Tau Kok Tsuen, Po Sam Pai Village, Fortune Garden and Sam Mun Tsai The Beverly Hills”: As regards provision of rainshelters at San Tau Kok Tsuen and Po Sham Pai Village, the Works Section had filed an application for temporary site allocation with TPDLO on 29 October 2020.
- (ix) Project Item (32) “TP-DMW283 Maintenance and improvement of facilities under Tai Po District Council Minor Works Programmes (2019-20)”: The Works Section had commenced the works on 23 October 2019 and completed on 21 October 2020. The cost of the whole project was approximately \$4.99 million. Since the maintenance and improvement works (2019/20) had already completed, this project item would be removed from the progress summary of projects.
- (x) Project Item (33) “TP-DMW284 Provision of systematic letter boxes in Tai Po District (2018-19)”: Regarding the works at San Uk Ka Village, the Works Section had found underground high voltage cables and other underground facilities upon completion of trial pit works. It was therefore not suitable to construct letter boxes at the said site. The Works Section would have an on-site inspection with the DC Member of the constituency concerned and discuss further.
- (xi) Project Item (35) “TP-DMW286 Provision of signage and improvement of footpath near the entrance of Tai Po Tau, Shui Wai, Tai Po”: The Works Section had completed the preliminary engineering design and was seeking advice from relevant departments.

- (xii) Project Item (36) “TP-DMW287 Repair of solar lights at Tung Ping Chau and other miscellaneous repair items at Tai Po District”: Works had already commenced on 3 December 2019. Since there were more maintenance and improvement works than expected, the updated costs of maintenance and improvement works currently underway were approximately \$2.07 million.
- (xiii) Project Item (39) “TP-DMW308 Maintenance and improvement of facilities under Tai Po District Council Minor Works Programmes (2020-21)”: Tender invitation of the maintenance and improvement works was expected to take place in December 2020.
- (xiv) Project Item (45) “Provision of passing place and improvement to access road at Wai Tau Tsuen”: The Works Section had already conducted an on-site inspection with the DC Member of the constituency concerned on 14 May 2020. The preliminary engineering design had completed, and comments of relevant departments were currently being sought.
- (xv) Project Item (49) “Improvement Works of Rainshelter at Tai Po Tai Wo Road near Yata Department Store, Tai Po”: The Works Section had already completed on 22 September 2020 the improvement works of rainshelter TP-DMW 148, and conducted an inspection and handover with the proponent and the Chairman on 25 September 2020. Since the improvement works of rainshelter had already completed, this project item would be removed from the progress summary of projects.
- (xvi) Project Item (50) “Replacement Works of Seating Benches at Tai Po Tai Wo Road near Yata Department Store, Tai Po”: WGDW had already endorsed the allocation of \$600,000 for this project at its meeting on 23 October 2020. The Works Section now applied for DFMC’s allocation of \$600,000 to carry out this project.

141. The Chairman reported that the construction cost of Project Item (50) “Replacement Works of Seating Benches at Tai Po Tai Wo Road near Yata Department Store, Tai Po” was \$600,000.

142. Members raised no objections. The Chairman announced that the report and construction cost above were endorsed.

143. Miss Lisa YIP gave supplementary remarks on the following projects:

- (i) Project Item (56) “TP-DMW272 Improvement of Sam Mui Tsai Pier” and Project Item (57) “TP-DMW274 Provision of pavement in Tai Po Tau Road”: Progress had already been enumerated in the progress summary of projects for Members’ reference.
- (ii) Project Item (58) “Provision of covered walkway near Wan Tau Tong Estate

entrance connecting lift of Uptown Plaza footbridge, Tai Po”: The cover was 13.6 metres long, 3 metres wide and 3.5 metres tall. The estimated construction cost of the overall project was \$3.2 million, of which \$ 412,000 was the advance works fees (including consultancy fees and trial pit fees). HAD (Works Section) had on 23 September 2020 met with the follow-up Member and explained the content of the pre-feasibility study report and estimated construction cost in detail. Views of the follow-up Member had been sought and consent secured. The pre-feasibility study report was now being submitted to DFMC and Members might refer to Paper No. DFM 33e/2020, while the advance works fees of \$412,000 was being applied for such that trial pit works could be carried out to ascertain the locations of relevant underground facilities.

- (iii) Project Item (59) “Provision of Rainshelter at Tai Po Tai Wo Road near the lay-by outside Yata Department Store, Tai Po”: HAD (Works Section) had completed the pre-feasibility study report on 10 November 2020, and was currently seeking advice from the proponent. The funding application for advance works was expected to be filed at the WGDW meeting in December 2020.
- (iv) Project Item (60) “Provision of rain shelter and benches next to Tai Po Community Centre”: As regards whether or not the minibus stop of route 25B next to the rainshelter would be relocated, TD had replied on 10 November that the department was looking into suitable locations for the minibus stop of 25B with a view to providing additional locations to meet the demand of the operator. Given that the location of minibus stop of route 25B had not been decided yet, further reply from TD was being awaited to confirm the progress before application for funding to pay for advance works of the cover could be filed. TPDO had already reported to the proponent and the follow-up Member the aforementioned reply and arrangement for funding application.
- (v) Project Item (61) “Provision of covered walkway near Wan Loi House, Wan Tau Tong Estate at Nam Wan Road, Tai Po”: Progress had already been enumerated in the progress summary of projects for Members’ reference.
- (vi) Project Item (62) “Extension of Construction Works of Existing Covered Walkway at Nam Wan Road near Sun Hing Garden, Tai Po”: HAD (Works Section) had completed the pre-feasibility study report on 20 July 2020 and obtained the proponent’s consent on 27 August 2020. The cover was 15 metres long, 2.5 metres wide and 2.7 metres tall. The tentative estimated construction cost of the overall project was \$3.7 million, of which \$440,500 was the advance works fees (including consultancy fees and trial pit fees). The funding application of \$440,500 for the advance works fees was being filed with DFMC, and Members were requested to refer to the pre-feasibility study report contained in Paper No. DFM 33f/2020. Once funding for the advance works was secured, the term consultant could start the trial pit works to ascertain the location of cables and

underground facilities.

- (vii) Project Item (63) “Provision of Covered Walkway at Nam Wan Road connecting the Lift of Footbridge NF 132, Tai Po”: HAD (Works Section) had completed the pre-feasibility study report on 5 August 2020 and obtained the proponent’s consent on 27 August 2020. The cover was L-shaped, 7.2 to 24 metres long, 3 metres wide and 2.7 metres tall. The tentative estimated construction cost of the overall project was \$5.5 million, of which \$702,000 was the advance works fees (including consultancy fees and trial pit fees). She asked Members to refer to Paper No. DFM 33g/2020. The funding application for the advance works fees was being filed with DFMC so that the term consultant could start the trial pit works to ascertain the location of cables and underground facilities.
- (viii) Project Item (64) “Extension and improvement works of Tai Wo Bus Terminus, Tai Po”: TPDO had already arranged for TD, KMB and HD to have an on-site inspection with the proponent on 28 October 2020. Since the project outline was the overall improvement of the traffic situation at Tai Wo Plaza Bus Terminus, the proponent had agreed after discussion that it would be more appropriate to refer the proposed works above to relevant working group under the TTC for follow up.

144. The Chairman reported that the advance works fee for Project Item (58) “Provision of covered walkway near Wan Tau Tong Estate entrance connecting lift of Uptown Plaza footbridge, Tai Po” was \$412,000, advance works fee for Project Item (62) “Extension of Construction Works of Existing Covered Walkway at Nam Wan Road near Sun Hing Garden, Tai Po” was \$440,500, and advance works fee for Project Item (63) “Provision of Covered Walkway at Nam Wan Road connecting the Lift of Footbridge NF 132, Tai Po” was \$702,000.

145. Members raised no objections. The Chairman announced that the reports and advance works fees above were endorsed.

(C) DMW projects followed up by the Tai Po District Leisure Services Office of the LCSD
(Items (65) to (78) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 33/2020)

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

- (i) Project Item (65) “TP-DMW244 Provision and upgrading of drinking fountain facilities at the recreational and sports venues in Tai Po District”: Installation of drinking fountain facilities at Tai Po Tau Playground had already completed. The venue was closed temporarily owing to the epidemic. As regards drinking fountain facilities at the remaining five sports venues, Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (“EMSD”) had already completed the procurement

procedures, and installation was expected to complete in Q1 in 2021.

- (ii) Project Item (66) “TP-DMW298 Improvement works for landscape facilities and footpaths at Tai Po Waterfront Park”, Project Item (67) “TP-DMW299 Improvement works of facilities at parks and playgrounds in Tai Po District”, Project Item (68) “TP-DMW300 Beautification works at recreational and leisure venues and district focal interchange points, Tai Po”, Project Item (69) “TP-DMW301 Contingency fund for urgent and minor improvement works for leisure venues in Tai Po District”, Project Item (70) “TP-DMW302 Provision of mosquito trapping devices at parks and playgrounds in Tai Po District” and Project Item (71) “TP-DMW303 Provision and improvement of the drinking fountains at Tai Po Waterfront Park” had all commenced in November 2020. Progress had already been enumerated in the progress summary of projects for Members’ reference.
- (iii) Project Item (72) “TP-DMW304 Provision of elderly fitness equipment at Chuen On Road Garden”: Funding allocation had already completed, and LCSD, ArchSD and the technical team would set the commencement date for the project shortly.
- (iv) Project Item (73) “TP-DMW305 Improvement works at Mui Shue Hang Playground”: As regards the installation of lockers, LCSD had already conducted an on-site inspection at the installation location on 4 November with the proponent and the DC Member of the constituency concerned. The works could commence upon confirmation of the location and were expected to take approximately two months to complete.
- (v) Project Item (74) “Improvement works at Tai Po Tau Playground”: LCSD had already provided the proponent the first draft of engineering details for reference, while the department would follow up on the project’s application arrangement with ArchSD and the technical team shortly.
- (vi) Project Item (75) “Provision of arbours for existing sitting benches at Kwong Fuk Sitting-out Area”: LCSD had just received the preliminary draft of the plan from ArchSD, and would provide Members information such as the dimensions and drawings of the cover for reference shortly.
- (vii) Project Item (76) “Improvement works at Kwong Fuk Bridge Garden”: Since this project item would be included among ArchSD’s refurbishment projects 2021-22, further information from ArchSD was being awaited at the moment and relevant information would be furnished to the follow-up Member in due course.
- (viii) Project Item (77) “Improvement works at Chung Nga Road Children’s Playground”: LCSD had conducted an on-site inspection with the proponent on 10 November to confirm preliminarily the works site, and was now awaiting ArchSD’s follow up on whether or not the works area would be affected by underground facilities.

- (ix) Project Item (78) “Provision of fitness equipment at Kwong Fuk Sitting-out Area”: LCSD had just received the preliminary draft of the plan from ArchSD and would provide the follow-up Member the design for reference and give advice shortly.

147. Mr. Nick LAM enquired in connection with Project Item (65) “Provision and upgrading of drinking fountain facilities at the recreational and sports venues in Tai Po District” if the two water dispensers after replacement at Tai Po Hui Sports Centre were for use by adults only or for children, and asked about the model of the water dispensers.

148. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan responded that the model of the water dispensers could be provided for Mr. Nick LAM’s reference shortly, and the works to upgrade water dispensers this time had been carried out in accordance with “Barrier-free” requirements, details of which could also be provided shortly for Mr. Nick LAM’s reference.

149. The Chairman enquired if the water dispensers after replacement were bottle-filling type or fountain type.

150. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan responded that the water dispensers in Tai Po Hui Sports Centre were fountain type like those previous ones, rather than bottle-filling water dispensers.

(Post-meeting note: There were both fountain type and bottle-filling water dispensers in Tai Po Hui Sports Centre.)

151. Mr. AU Chun-ho said that he had noticed that LCSD had several improvement works at Tai Po Waterfront Park and enquired if LCSD had any plans for works to repair or improve cycling tracks. While cycling in the vicinity of the pier of the Waterfront Park, he had seen that it was uneven along the tracks which might have been caused by roots of trees. He had the impression that there had never been any large-scale repair or improvement works along the Waterfront Promenade. Hence, he enquired if LCSD had thought about improving the cycling tracks.

152. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan responded that the cycling track inside Tai Po Waterfront Park was not under LCSD’s purview. If need be, LCSD could reflect the above opinion to relevant departments.

(Post-meeting note: LCSD had referred Mr. AU Chun-ho’s opinion to TD for follow up on 17 November 2020.)

153. DFMC endorsed the above report.

(D) DMW projects followed up by the Cultural Services Branch of the LCSD

(Items (79) to (81) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 33/2020)

154. Mr. NG Chi-keung, Barry reported that Project Item (79) “To set up a 24-hour self-service library station at Yuen Shin Park”, Project Item (80) “To set up a 24-hour self-service library station at Tai Po Old Market” and Project Item (81) “To set up a 24-hour self-service library station at Tai Wo MTR station lobby” had no update for the time being. He thanked Members for having attended the briefing session one day prior to this meeting. Should there be any updates on the above items, he would report to Members at the meeting as soon as possible.

155. The Chairman indicated that some 10 Members had taken part in the briefing session to gain some understanding about matters concerning self-service library stations while DFMC and relevant Members would continue to follow up.

156. DFMC endorsed the above report.

(E) DMW projects followed up by the Planning Section of the LCSD

(Items (82) to (83) in Annex 2 to TPDC Paper No. DFM 33/2020)

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

- (i) Project Item (82) “Provision of a Pet Garden at the Open Space near Block 10 and 19 of Tai Po Centre, On Pong Road, Tai Po”: LCSD had already forwarded comments of relevant departments to HAD (Works Section) and the term consultant for evaluation in Q3 in 2020.
- (ii) Project Item (83) “Provision of Fitness Equipment near Hang Wo House, Tai Wo Estate, Tai Po”: LCSD, HAD (Works Section) and the term consultant would have another on-site inspection with the proponent to see if it was feasible to construct the facilities in the works area.

158. DFMC endorsed the above report.

VIII. Tai Po District Office — Proposed District Minor Works Projects

(TPDC Paper No. DFM 34/2020)

159. The Chairman indicated that WGDW had already endorsed four DMW project proposals for 2020/2021 and their proposed order of priority at its meeting on 23 October 2020, and endorsed the estimated construction costs of the three proposed projects submitted by government departments. The four proposed projects and their order of priority were listed in TPDC Paper No. DFM 34/2020 for Members’ consideration.

160. DFMC endorsed the four DMW projects and their proposed order of priority and the estimated construction costs of the three proposed projects submitted by government departments.

IX. Leisure and Cultural Services Department — Report on the participation in community activities held in September and October 2020 in Tai Po and proposed community activities to be held in November and December 2020 in Tai Po
(TPDC Paper No. DFM 35/2020)

161. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan introduced Annex I to TPDC Paper No. DFM 35/2020. She reported that owing to COVID-19, LCSD had cancelled recreational and sports activities which had been initially scheduled for September 2020 and some of those initially scheduled for October 2020. As the epidemic became under control, LCSD had resumed organising some of the activities starting from 19 October 2020 at recreational facilities which had opened again, and team sports training courses and fun days from December 2020 onwards, whereas activities such as excursions, competitions, carnivals, large-scale fun days and so on continued to be suspended to avoid crowd gatherings and to minimise social contact. LCSD had in October 2020 held 16 recreational and sports activities, including aerobic dance classes, badminton classes, table-tennis classes, tennis classes, yoga classes, activities for elderly and disabled persons and so on, in which a total of 171 persons had participated. There were about 97 proposed classes to be held in November and December 2020 and the expected number of participants was 1 121.

162. Ms. TAM Yuen-fun, Betty introduced Annex II to TPDC Paper No. DFM 35/2020. She reported that owing to suspension of classes territory-wide and the epidemic, LCSD had cancelled some cultural activities or held them in another format. LCSD would follow up on the arrangement of activities in a timely manner in light of the latest development of COVID-19.

163. Mr. Barry NG introduced Annex III to TPDC Paper No. DFM 35/2020. He reported that since the epidemic currently slowed down, LCSD planned to resume normal organisation of library promotional activities progressively from December 2020, while arranging to resume holding some of the activities, which had been cancelled earlier, in December 2020 or later. LCSD would follow the guidelines on infection control and prevention of the Department of Health to require that participants wear face masks and properly maintain social distancing to protect their health.

164. DFMC noted the above reports.

X. Setting up of non-standing Working Groups

(TPDC Paper No. DFM 36/2020)

165. The Chairman reported that under Order 41 of Tai Po District Council Standing Orders, committees could set up non-standing working groups to assist in delivering short-term projects within their terms of reference while the term of office should not exceed eight months. Mr. WU Yiu-cheong had already put forward four proposals in connection with the terms of reference of the “Working Group on Reviewing the Appointment of Tai Po District Football Team” for Members’ consideration.

166. Mr. WU Yiu-cheong indicated that he hoped Members would consider the proposals contained in the paper. The Working Group could lay down a clear system for the district football team next year such that TPDC could officially examine the qualifications of district football teams. He said that the term of office of non-standing working groups would not exceed eight months. If the decision to set up the working group was made at this meeting, he enquired if the term of office would be calculated from the day when the term of office was endorsed, or from the day when the first meeting of the working group was held.

167. The Secretary said that as Mr. WU Yiu-cheong had proposed at the last DFMC meeting that the aforementioned working group be set up, the date of setting up the working group had not been discussed at that time. Should Members confirm at this meeting the setting up of the working group and elect a chairman, the establishment date of the working group could be set and the term of office should not exceed eight months. Should the term of office of the working group commence on 1 December 2020, the first meeting could be held on 1 December 2020 or thereafter.

168. The Chairman indicated that it would be easier to calculate the term of office if the establishment date was set at the beginning of a month. Hence, the term of office could begin on 1 December 2020 the soonest.

169. DFMC endorsed the terms of reference of the “Working Group on Reviewing the Appointment of Tai Po District Football Team”.

170. The Chairman asked Members to elect a chairman for the Working Group.

171. Mr. Dalu LIN nominated Mr. WU Yiu-cheong to become the Chairman of the “Working Group on Reviewing the Appointment of Tai Po District Football Team”. The nomination was seconded by Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang and accepted by Mr. WU Yiu-cheong.

172. Members made no other nominations. The Chairman announced that Mr. WU Yiu-cheong was elected the Chairman of the “Working Group on Reviewing the Appointment of Tai Po District Football Team”.

173. The Chairman said that since the term of office of non-standing working groups should not exceed eight months, he asked if Members agreed to set the term of office as from 1 December 2020 to 31 July 2021.

174. Mr. Richard CHAN enquired about the procedures to set up a working group. He said that once a working group was set up, Members would enrol to join the working group, and the membership list of the working group would need to be endorsed too. Should the term of office of the working group commence on 1 December 2020 without passing the membership list on the same day, what arrangements would there be in terms of procedures?

175. Mr. Terence LEE advised that should the chairman, terms of reference and term of office of the working group be endorsed at this meeting, the Secretariat would then distribute papers to invite Members to join the working group. After collecting information which Members provided, the Secretariat could confirm the membership list of the working group by circulation of paper. Hence, all of the aforementioned procedures should be able to be completed before 1 December 2020.

176. The Chairman recommended that the term of office of the working group mentioned above be set as from 1 December 2020 to 31 July 2021.

177. DFMC endorsed the term of office of the said working group.

178. The Chairman indicated that the Secretariat would hand out forms to Members shortly. He asked Members to fill out on the forms if they would join the working group and return the completed forms to the Secretariat. He invited Members to actively take part in the working group.

XI. Reports of working groups

(I) Working Group on District Works

179. The Chairman reported as follows:

- (i) WGDW had held its second meeting in 2020 on 23 October 2020. WGDW had at the meeting discussed the feasibility study reports of four DMW projects and endorsed the feasibility study reports and construction costs of the following four DMW projects:

- Project Item (10) “TP-DMW242 Provision of sitting-out area at San Uk Tsai, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po” (construction cost was \$17.98 million);

- Project Item (16) “TP-DMW263 Provision of fitness equipment and elderly facilities near the morning trail at Wan Tau Tong, Tai Po” (construction cost was \$9.6 million);
 - Project Item (18) “TP-DMW266 Provision of rainshelter near Wan Tau Tong Estate at Fung Wan Road, Tai Po” (construction cost was \$3.29 million); and
 - Project Item (19) “TP-DMW270 Provision of shelters at Po Nga Road connecting Tai Wo Plaza, Tai Po” (construction cost was \$1.8 million).
- (ii) At the meeting, WGDW had also followed up on the progress of approved DMW projects and endorsed the estimated construction costs of the following four projects:
- Project Item (50) “Replacement Works of Seating Benches at Tai Po Tai Wo Road near Yata Department Store, Tai Po” (construction cost was \$600,000);
 - Project (58) Item “Provision of covered walkway near Wan Tau Tong Estate entrance connecting lift of Uptown Plaza footbridge, Tai Po” (cost of advance works was \$412,000);
 - Project Item (62) “Extension of Construction Works of Existing Covered Walkway at Nam Wan Road near Sun Hing Garden, Tai Po” (cost of advance works was \$440,500); and
 - Project Item (63) “Provision of Covered Walkway at Nam Wan Road connecting the Lift of Footbridge NF 132, Tai Po” (cost of advance works was \$702,000).
- (iii) WGDW had at the meeting vetted proposals of DMW projects for the year 2020/2021 and endorsed four proposed projects and their proposed order of priority. It had also endorsed the estimated construction costs of three proposed projects submitted by government departments for DFMC to consider further.

180. DFMC endorsed the report of WGDW.

(II) Working Group on Facilities Management

181. Mr. Dalu LIN, Chairman of the Working Group on Facilities Management (“WGFM”), reported as follows:

- (i) WGFM had held its second meeting in 2020 on 23 October 2020. At the meeting, Members noted the report by the TPDO on the management of community centre/community halls from June to September 2020 and the airing of programmes on LED display panels at community centres in Tai Po District.

Members requested that the management and usage of LED display panels at community centres in Tai Po District be discussed at the next meeting, and the spot-checking system of fee-based activities hiring community halls as venues be reviewed.

- (ii) LCSD had also reported on the management of facilities in Tai Po District between May and August 2020 at the meeting.

182. DFMC endorsed the report of WGFM.

XII. Any other business

(TPDC Paper Nos. DFM 37/2020(Revised) and DFM 38/2020)

(I) Hong Kong Flower Show 2021 “Recommended greening attractions in 18 Districts” Exhibition

183. The Chairman requested that Members note TPDC Paper No. DFM 37/2020 (Revised). He indicated that it had been mentioned in the said paper that the Hong Kong Flower Show Committee would sponsor the photo or video shooting costs capped at \$2,000. He enquired about the role TPDC played in the activity, and whether or not groups would need to be invited to take part in this exhibition.

184. Ms. CHEUNG Kwai-yan said that “Discovery Gallery” was one of the new items in the Hong Kong Flower Show 2021. The Secretariat of Hong Kong Flower Show 2021 Committee had already written to invite various District Councils to participate in the exhibition “Recommended greening attractions in 18 Districts” earlier. There were two ways to take part in the exhibition, namely, by about five to 10 photos with resolution of 1 980 x 1 200 or above; or by videos of approximately 30 to 90 seconds with resolution of 1 980 x 1 200 or above. Should TPDC decide to participate, it would need to consider if it would like to provide information by photos or videos, and the organiser would sponsor \$2,000 while TPDC could invite relevant groups to provide photos or videos in this connection. Should TPDC not take part for individual reasons, the “Recommended greening attractions in 18 Districts” in “Discovery Gallery” would then not have any information about Tai Po District.

185. Mr. YIU Yeuk-sang said that he would try contacting Fung Yuen Butterfly Reserve to participate in this activity.

186. The Chairman indicated that as regards the discussion of matters about the Flower Show just now, he recommended that LCSD’s invitation be uploaded to TPDC website for the principle of fairness and openness such that interested members of the public could note and submit applications.

187. DFMC agreed to the Chairman's recommendation above.

(II) The 55th Hong Kong Brands & Products Expo's Invitation of groups from 18 Districts to perform at the venue

188. The Chairman asked Members to note TPDC Paper No. DFM 38/2020. The captioned topic had been discussed at the meeting of Environmental Protection, Fisheries, Agriculture, Industries, Commerce, Food and Health Committee ("EFAC"). Miss NG Wing-yan, Sophie of the Secretariat was asked to give a report.

189. Miss NG Wing-yan, Sophie indicated that at the EFAC meeting earlier, Mr. Richard CHAN and Mr. Patrick MO had enquired about performance matters. She had checked with The Chinese Manufacturers' Association of Hong Kong ("CMA") after the said meeting the relevant issues, and would take this opportunity to report to Members at this meeting. As far as epidemic prevention measures, social distancing in particular, were concerned, CMA would provide performing groups guidelines on epidemic prevention while the preliminary arrangements currently in place were as follows:

- (i) Given the area of the performing stage being 16 metres x 5 metres, the maximum number of each group during performance was 30, and the 1.5-metre distance between performers on the stage would be required as far as possible.
- (ii) Staff of the performing groups would be reminded not to gather at the back stage.
- (iii) The number of audience would be kept to 50% to 70% of the maximum seating capacity of the venue while there would be a certain distance between the audience and the stage. The organiser would also not allow exchanges between performers on the stage and the audience.
- (iv) Groups would be requested to wear face masks during performance as far as possible while performances with wind instruments were not recommended.
- (v) CMA would grant approval according to the nature and content of performances. Performances were required to last at least 30 minutes but no more than 60 minutes. There were no restrictions as far as the types of performance were concerned: singing, dancing or instrumental performances were all acceptable.

190. Mr. KWAN Wing-yip said that it had been discussed at EFAC meeting as to whether or not Members would contact any groups interested in participating in this activity. Participation of groups would be difficult if relevant groups could not be contacted.

191. The Chairman advised that Members would need to decide at this meeting whether or not

to accept the invitation to take part in the group performance at the Hong Kong Brands & Products Expo.

192. Mr. HO Wai-lam said that owing to the epidemic and shortage of funding, he opined that TPDC should not take part in this activity.

193. The Chairman said that CMA had sent the invitation to TPDC on 2 November and requested that TPDC reply on or before 10 November. Since this activity would take place on 12 December, there would not be much time for preparation. He therefore recommended that TPDC not take part in it, and asked the Secretariat to reply to CMA.

194. DFMC agreed to the above recommendation of the Chairman.

XIII. Date of next meeting

195. The next meeting would be held at 9:30 a.m. on 15 January 2021 (Friday).

(Post-meeting note: The next meeting would be postponed owing to the epidemic.)

196. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.