

(Translation)

Minutes of the 23rd Meeting of Coastal Affairs Committee (3/2019)

Date: 6 September 2019 (Friday)

Time: 2:30 p.m.

Venue: Main Conference Room, Tsuen Wan District Office

Present:

Members

Ms LAM, Lam Nixie (Chairlady)

Mr NG Hin-lung, Norris (Vice Chairman)

Mr KOO Yeung-pong, MH

Mr LI Hung-por

Ms LAM Yuen-pun, Phyllis

Mr CHAN Sung-ip, MH

Mr WONG Ka-wa

Mr WONG Wai-kit, MH

Mr CHOW Ping-tim

Mr CHENG Chit-pun

Mr LO Siu-kit, MH

Mr TAM Hoi-pong

Government Representatives:

Mr CHOW Chun-hun, Gary

Assistant District Officer (Tsuen Wan),
Tsuen Wan District Office

Mr MAK Shui-wing

Marine Manager/Licensing & Port
Formalities (2), Licensing and Port
Formalities Section, Marine Department
Health Inspector (Contract Management)
2, Food and Environmental Hygiene
Department

Miss NG Nei-yin

Ms SIU Yuen-ching, Sara

Deputy District Leisure Manager (Tsuen
Wan) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services
Department

Mr LEUNG Kam-man

Land Executive/Land Management 4
(District Lands Office, Tsuen Wan and
Kwai Tsing), Lands Department

Miss TAI Tsz-yan, Angie

Executive Officer (Development), Tsuen
Wan District Office

Tsuen Wan District Council Secretariat Representatives:

Miss LAM Siu-yung, Daisy

Senior Executive Officer (District
Council), Tsuen Wan District Office

Mr WAN Chun-hei, Leo (Secretary)

Executive Officer (District Council) 3,
Tsuen Wan District Office

Attendance by Invitation:

For discussion of item 2A

Mr WONG Chi-hung	Chief Engineer/W2, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr TSANG Lap-kei, Freddie	Senior Engineer/2 (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr SIU Man-kit, Terry	Engineer/14 (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr CHAN Ka-kin	Associate Director, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited
Mr TANG Kai-cheong	Engineer, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited
Mr HO Chuen-fung	Assistant Resident Engineer, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited
Mr TSUI Tze-yeung	Project Director, Contractor - Representative of Richwell Civil Joint Venture
Mr KONG Ka-man	Construction Manager, Contractor - Representative of Richwell Civil Joint Venture
Mr CHENG Kwok-kuen, Chris	District Leisure Manager (Tsuen Wan), Leisure and Cultural Services Department

For discussion of item 2B

Mr LEUNG Kwok-on	Senior Assistant Shipping Master/East, Marine Department
------------------	--

For discussion of item 2D

Mr CHOY Lap-shing, Eddie	Senior Building Surveyor/D5, Buildings Department
Ms TSANG Ka-man, Carmen	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional West) 2, Environmental Protection Department
Ms LO Sze-yan	Engineer/Tsuen Kwai 2, Drainage Services Department
Mr TANG Kin-on	Engineer/Consultants Management 13, Drainage Services Department

For discussion of item 3

Mr CHOI Wai-wing	Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing & Pest Control) Tsuen Wan 1, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
------------------	---

For discussion of item 4

Mr CHOI Wai-wing

Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing & Pest Control) Tsuen Wan 1, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Absent:

Member

Mr MAN Yu-ming, MH

The Meeting

I Opening Remarks and Introduction

The Chairlady welcomed the Members and representatives from the government departments to the 23rd meeting of the Coastal Affairs Committee (CAC).

2. The Chairlady reminded Members that according to section 28 of the Tsuen Wan District Council Standing Orders (the “Standing Orders”), unless otherwise agreed by the Chairlady, a Member might speak and make supplementary remarks once for each agenda item at the meeting. Each Member could speak up to three minutes each time.

II Item 1: Confirmation of Minutes of the Meeting held on 5.7.2019

3. The minutes of the previous meeting were unanimously confirmed by Members without amendment.

III Item 2: Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

(A) Paragraphs 4 to 25 of the Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 July 2019: 268RS - Cycle Track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun

4. The Chairlady welcomed the government representatives to the meeting, including:
- (1) Mr WONG Chi-hung, Chief Engineer/W2 (CE/W2) of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD);
 - (2) Mr TSANG Lap-kei, Freddie, Senior Engineer/2 (West) (SE/2(W)) of the CEDD;
 - (3) Mr SIU Man-kit, Terry, Engineer/14 (West) (E/14(W)) of the CEDD;
 - (4) Mr CHAN Ka-kin, Associate Director of the Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (OAP);
 - (5) Mr TANG Kai-cheong, Engineer of the OAP;
 - (6) Mr HO Chuen-fung, Assistant Resident Engineer of the OAP;
 - (7) Mr TSUI Tze-yeung, Project Director of the Richwell Civil Joint Venture (Richwell);
 - (8) Mr KONG Ka-man, Construction Manager of the Richwell; and
 - (9) Mr CHENG Kwok-kuen, Chris, District Leisure Manager (Tsuen Wan) (DLM(TW)) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD).

(Note: Mr WONG Wai-kit joined the meeting at 2:35 p.m.)

5. E/14(W) of the CEDD and Assistant Resident Engineer of the OAP briefed the

CAC on the latest status of the Advance Works of Project No. 268RS - Cycle Track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun, including the works progress of Areas 1 and 2 as well as the arrangements for tree no. AW-T019.

(Note: Mr WONG Ka-wa joined the meeting at 2:38 p.m.)

6. The views, enquiries and suggestions of Members were summarised as follows:
- (1) it failed to illustrate in the design plan for the waterfront along the road section at Riviera Gardens that the retaining wall would be actually taller than the existing concrete dwarf wall and railings at the waterfront promenade. Also, the design of continuous retaining wall was undesirable because it would block the view which the residents were used to enjoy for long. Therefore, the residents expressed strong dissatisfaction at the works of retaining wall when it commenced. He eventually succeeded in reflecting the residents' views after overcoming many difficulties (Mr CHOW Ping-tim);
 - (2) he opined that an ideal design should leave the existing view unobstructed. He thanked the contractor and consultant for listening to his comments, reducing the height of retaining wall and increasing the height of railings, in order to enhance the view of the location concerned upon completion of the works. However, the CEDD had not stated its position so far (Mr CHOW Ping-tim);
 - (3) he did not object to the cycle track project. However, he opined that the comments of nearby residents should be taken into account. He also hoped that as for future projects, more detailed works drawings (e.g. phtomontages which illustrated the height of relevant structures) would be provided instead of simple section plans or design concepts of the projects (Mr CHOW Ping-tim);
 - (4) he opined that the Legislative Councillors who had participated in the deliberation of the funding application for the project should be held accountable for the issues relating to the retaining wall. Besides, he was pleased that the Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC) had duly performed its gate-keeping role, so that the project design was finalised in accordance with the people's wishes (Mr CHOW Ping-tim);
 - (5) the contractor and consultant suggested during the on-site inspection that in the design, the road section should tilt gently upwards to facilitate connection at its end. However, after further consideration, he held that the installation of stainless steel railings was preferable to constructing an upward road section at the location concerned (Mr CHOW Ping-tim);
 - (6) the project experienced various problems posed by all road sections and the solutions to these problems should be identified. He was pleased to note that regarding the retaining wall, the consultant had eventually worked out a solution acceptable to all parties after several rounds of communication. He therefore thanked the CEDD and its teams for their efforts and open-minded work attitude. He also hoped that they would further improve the

- workflow and maintain communication with the stakeholders, in order to optimise the remaining works of the cycle track project (Mr LO Siu-kit);
- (7) the CAC had been closely monitoring the works progress of the cycle track project. He thanked the CEDD for preparing the information for Members. He hoped that it would be the start of connecting Members, the community and the CEDD in respect of the cycle track project (the Vice Chairman);
 - (8) after improvement, the 1.5-metre-tall railings would be installed on the road section at the waterfront, which were taller than the 1.1-metre-tall railings stipulated in the Buildings Ordinance. He enquired whether the Transport Department (TD) requested for the installation of 1.5-metre-tall railings along the cycle track (the Vice Chairman); and
 - (9) he enquired whether the enclosure proposal for Area 2 was revised to keep up with the original schedule and the commissioning date of the entire cycle track hinged on the commencement date of Phase 2 of the project (the Vice Chairman).

7. The Chairlady stated that the constituency areas of many Members of the CAC were waterfront areas. Therefore, she opined that the aspirations and views of the district councillors of the constituency areas should be respected when dealing with the controversies over the relevant proposals. She welcomed the design proposal refined by the CEDD at the request of Members and believed that it would be acceptable to the residents. She also hoped that the district councillors of the constituency areas would assist in the follow-up accordingly. As there was gradual residential intake recently and the lot covered the site managed by the LCS D and the front area of a private housing estate, she hoped that the CEDD would keep the access tidy and clean as shown on page 9 of the PowerPoint presentation. She was pleased to note that an access was reserved for pedestrians and wheelchair users after the discussion between the CEDD and LCS D. Besides, she noted that the works would be conducted in close proximity to the residential area and underneath a drainage channel. As the works might last until the end of 2019 or 2020, she was concerned about the noise nuisance thus caused. She opined that if the CEDD received complaints from the residents during the construction period, it should directly and closely liaise with the management offices of the relevant housing estates. She could provide the CEDD with the contact points of the management offices after the meeting. She pointed out that Members should not directly intervene in handling the complaints during the said period. Regarding the trees, she thanked the CEDD, engineering company, Convenor of the Working Group on Advance Works for Cycle Track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun and the independent arborist for their contributions, so that tree no. AW-T019 could be preserved for subsequent transplantation. The independent arborist had previously expressed willingness to give advice on other trees which were affected by the project. Hence, she hoped that if other trees should be removed due to the project, the CEDD would contact Members so as to seek advice on the trees from the independent arborist. The TWDC had discussed the cycle track project for about 20 years. She welcomed the commencement of the project which was facilitated by the CAC through its follow-ups. She thanked the CEDD for its prompt response to Members' views and active cooperation all along and hoped that the CEDD would keep up its commendable work

attitude. She also hoped that when implementing similar projects in the future, other District Councils (DCs) would adopt the practice of the cycle track project in which Members could participate in the discussion of project details, with a view to resolving difficulties at an early stage.

(Note: Mr CHENG Chit-pun joined the meeting at 2:47 p.m. Mr WONG Ka-wa left the meeting at 2:48 p.m.)

8. The views, enquiries and suggestions of Members were summarised as follows:
 - (1) the aforesaid grey retaining wall gave an impression of coldness. Hence, he proposed that the retaining wall should be painted in a brighter colour (e.g. white) or decorated with sports patterns to enhance its vitality (Mr CHOW Ping-tim);
 - (2) she was worried that the retaining wall would be more likely to get soiled if it was painted white. Therefore, she did not recommend this proposal. Also, she opined that dark colours should be avoided and recommended using a light shade of grey (the Chairlady);
 - (3) she had conveyed the aspiration for beautifying the waterfront to the Development Bureau (DevB) in the past. As she learnt that the Harbourfront Commission was currently arranging for allocation of additional funding, she opined that the next-term TWDC might consider organising an activity in which children in the district were invited to create drawings on the retaining wall. She believed that such drawings would not be soiled easily (the Chairlady);
 - (4) she enquired of the CEDD about the expected completion date of the entire project under the current circumstances (the Chairlady); and
 - (5) he opined that a light shade of grey also looked dull. He wished to have further discussion if the CEDD would paint the retaining wall in another colour (Mr CHOW Ping-tim).

9. CE/W2 of the CEDD responded as follows:
 - (1) the CEDD should cater for the needs of cyclists and comply with the standard height for railings laid down by the TD. Therefore, the CEDD set the maximum height of railings at 1.5 metres along the cycle track at the waterfront. These railings would be taller than the ordinary railings which were 1 metre to 1.1 metres in height;
 - (2) even though the project had experienced some delays so far, such delays would have no impact on the overall progress provided that the critical construction activities were unaffected by the delays. Besides, the project management mainly consisted of three aspects, namely, time, quality and expenditure. Therefore, the CEDD put forth the proposals of enclosure of Area 2 in phases after considering the situation in a comprehensive manner instead of meeting the original schedule;
 - (3) the CEDD could make arrangements based on Members' proposals and further discuss the colour of retaining wall. Many footbridges were

painted greyish blue at present and this practice could serve as a reference;
and

- (4) he thanked the relevant teams of the CEDD, especially the contractor, for maintaining close liaison with Members around the clock, following up on the project and ensuring smooth implementation.

10. Assistant Resident Engineer of the OAP responded that the resident liaison officer of the consultant would proactively approach the management offices of housing estates in various areas to learn more about the complaints received. The resident liaison officer would also instruct the inspecting staff to ensure that the contractor kept the construction site tidy and clean. According to the contract, the consultant took over Area 2 and commenced the works in July 2019. Hence, the proposals of enclosure in phases were not raised to keep up with the original schedule.

(Note: Mr TAM Hoi-pong joined the meeting at 2:57 p.m.)

11. Construction Manager of the Richwell responded as follows:

- (1) the Richwell had previously undertaken to complete the works in the third quarter of 2020 and would continue to strive to meet the target;
- (2) the Richwell had raised two enclosure proposals for Area 2 as given on pages 10 and 11 of the PowerPoint presentation; and
- (3) in Proposal 1, the area indicated in red lines was the entire section of cycle track to be enclosed at Tsuen Wan Park. It was expected that the works would be completed in the third quarter of 2020. If the CAC preferred to enclose the said area in two phases, the works for the area enclosed in yellow lines could only commence in February 2020 and the completion date would be delayed to the fourth quarter of 2020. Hence, he would like to solicit Members' views.

12. The Chairlady said that regarding the road section of several hundred metres in length in Area 2, Members should determine whether Proposal 1 in which the entire road section was enclosed in one go or Proposal 2 in which the road section was enclosed in two phases should be adopted. If Proposal 2 was adopted, the completion date might be delayed by three months. As the district councillor of the constituency area, she had an open attitude towards both proposals and wished to heed Members' comments. Besides, Tsuen Wan Park was under the management of the LCSD. If a resident complained about the failure to implement works at the said area upon enclosure, the LCSD might be affected. Therefore, she hoped that the CAC would determine which enclosure proposal should be adopted.

13. The views, enquiries and suggestions of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) although the area would become an eyesore upon enclosure, an access would be made available during the construction period. He therefore suggested that the works should be conducted in one go to shorten the construction period, so that the residents could use the completed section of cycle track as soon as possible to avoid complaints (Mr LO Siu-kit);

- (2) if the entire area was enclosed in one go, the works might be completed earlier. It could also give the residents an impression that the CEDD worked efficiently. Contrarily, if the area was enclosed in phases, the residents might question why there were endless construction works. Hence, he agreed to the Member's views and recommended the adoption of Proposal 1 (Mr KOO Yeung-pong);
- (3) the key concern was whether the works would be carried out immediately upon enclosure of the area concerned. He thus opined that the enclosure measure should be deemed necessary according to the progress instead of facilitating the implementation of works (Mr WONG Wai-kit);
- (4) the second enclosure area was an access to MTR Tsuen Wan West Station which had a higher pedestrian flow. Hence, the CEDD should further consider whether the works should be implemented concurrently upon enclosure of the area concerned or the works should only commence after the project reached a certain stage (Mr WONG Wai-kit);
- (5) he shared the Member's concern as to whether the works would commence immediately upon enclosure of the aforesaid area. He enquired whether the CEDD should cordon off the second enclosure area simultaneously. He opined that as it covered a small area, the CEDD might be able to complete the works earlier at that time. If the CEDD failed to confirm whether the works should be implemented concurrently, he believed that it would be more desirable to keep the view unobstructed at certain spots (Mr CHOW Ping-tim);
- (6) if the CEDD confirmed that the works would commence immediately upon enclosure of the area, he would not object to the implementation of works for the entire area in one go (Mr CHOW Ping-tim);
- (7) he enquired about the reasons for enclosing the area above the red zone on page 12 of the PowerPoint presentation (Mr TAM Hoi-pong);
- (8) the concrete works would generate noise. She thus enquired whether the CEDD would reschedule the concrete works (the Chairlady); and
- (9) he enquired whether rainy season had been taken into account in the estimation of construction period. He was worried that the completion date would be delayed if it rained for several days (Mr CHAN Sung-ip).

14. Construction Manager of the Richwell responded as follows:

- (1) the Richwell originally planned to enclose the entire area in one go and simultaneously commence the works for the area indicated in red as shown in the PowerPoint presentation. Also, subject to the procurement, the Richwell planned to conduct the works for the area indicated in yellow as shown in the PowerPoint presentation in November 2019. Therefore, the area concerned would be under construction upon enclosure;
- (2) the water-filled barriers were indicated in red on page 12 of the PowerPoint presentation. The plastic guards would be installed above these barriers to prevent the pedestrians from being affected by construction noise and gravel;
- (3) according to the environmental protection legislation of Hong Kong, the concrete works should only be carried out between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.

The concrete works of the captioned project would be conducted between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. in general. After discussion with the district councillor of the constituency area, the concrete works for the road section concerned would only be conducted between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. in order to address the residents' concern; and

- (4) as it was impossible to estimate the daily rainfall, as a general rule, several rainy days would be incorporated in the estimation of construction period.

15. The Chairlady believed that Members understood the issue of rainy season because they had participated in the discussions of many construction projects in the past. Two construction projects were underway at the waterfront currently. The cycle track project was largely on schedule and the progress was satisfactory. However, there was a delay in the DevB's project. She believed that the cycle track project would be completed as scheduled if the CEDD maintained the current workflow. Moreover, in the light of Members' discussion, she advised the CEDD to adopt the construction proposals set out on page 10 of the PowerPoint presentation. She also reminded that the CEDD should implement the concrete works during the aforesaid period (i.e. between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.).

(Note: Mr CHOW Ping-tim left the meeting at 3:10 p.m.)

16. Members agreed that the CEDD's Proposal 1 on enclosure of Area 2 should be adopted.

(B) Paragraphs 26 to 31 of the Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 July 2019: Request for Relocation of Dangerous Vessel Berths at Rambler Channel to a Location Far Away from Residential Area to Eliminate Safety Hazard

17. The Chairlady welcomed the representatives of the Marine Department (MD) who were responsible for giving response and specially joined the meeting, including:

- (1) Mr MAK Shui-wing, Marine Manager/Licensing & Port Formalities (2) (MM/LPF(2)); and
- (2) Mr LEUNG Kwok-on, Senior Assistant Shipping Master/East (SASM/E).

Besides, the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and Planning Department (PlanD) had submitted the written replies on the captioned matter prior to the meeting for Members' perusal. In addition, as this agenda item was raised by the Chairlady and Mr WONG Wai-kit, the Vice Chairman would take over the chair temporarily.

18. MM/LPF(2) of the MD responded as follows:

- (1) the MD had studied Members' proposals on the relocation of the private moorings (PMs). However, as the proposed locations for relocation had various constraints, the study failed to yield satisfactory results;
- (2) the staff of the MD had conducted an on-site inspection at the west of the Tsuen Wan Dangerous Goods Anchorage (TWDGA) on 30 August 2019, in order to study whether there were appropriate locations for the relocation of the PMs;

- (3) on the said day, the MD's staff found during the on-site inspection along Tsuen Wan harbourfront by patrol launch that the base of Hong Kong & Kowloon Motor Boats & Tug Boats Association Limited (MBTA) lay to the west of the TWDGA. Also, there was a quay at the coast off Bayview Garden. If the PMs were relocated to this location, it would pose difficulties to other vessels accessing and leaving the quay. Besides, the MD learnt from the nautical chart that a submarine main had been laid at the location. The MD confirmed that neither the anchorage of vessel nor placement of equipment above the submarine main was allowed. Therefore, the relocation of the PMs to the said location was technically difficult;
 - (4) furthermore, there was insufficient sea room for safe navigation in the aforesaid waters and the waterfront area was densely populated. Under such circumstances, the MD considered that the relocation of the two PMs to this location was unattainable; and
 - (5) the MD would make on-going effort to identify suitable locations for the relocation of the PMs within Tsuen Wan district or in other waters.
19. The views, enquiries and suggestions of Members were summarised as follows:
- (1) there were about 5 000 new households in the vicinity of Tsuen Wan Pier. As vessels conveying dangerous goods were berthed in close proximity to the residential area and the residents were disturbed by pollution and noise nuisance arising from these vessels, he expected that the number of complaints received would rise along with the residential intake. Hence, he hoped that the MD would actively deal with the issue and gradually relocate the PMs, so that vessels conveying dangerous goods would be berthed at locations far away from the residential area (Mr LO Siu-kit);
 - (2) Members requested that the MD should utilise its resources to explore the feasibility of Members' proposals and other practicable solutions as far as possible. She hoped that the MD would continue to address the issue proactively (Ms LAM, Lam Nixie); and
 - (3) as the MBTA had another base off Gin Drinkers Bay at present, he hoped that the representatives of the MD would discuss with the MBTA the feasibility of moving the base to another location, so as to make room for the relocation of the PMs (Mr CHAN Sung-ip).
20. MM/LPF(2) of the MD responded that the MD had all along been handling Members' proposals proactively. He pointed out that the tugboat base at Gin Drinkers Bay belonged to the South China Towing Company Limited instead of the MBTA. Nevertheless, the MD would consider the Member's proposal and discuss it with the tugboat company concerned. The MD hoped that by doing so, it would be of assistance to the residents and Members.
21. The Chairlady resumed the chair.

(C) Paragraphs 32 to 35 of the Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 July 2019: Request to Solve the Problem of Marine Refuse and Pollution of Rambler Channel Actively

22. The Chairlady said that the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) and MD had submitted the written replies on the captioned matter prior to the meeting for Members' perusal. Besides, as this agenda item was raised by the Chairlady, the Vice Chairman would take over the chair temporarily.

23. Ms LAM, Lam Nixie said that the residents who had recently moved to the waterfront area had made new requests for addressing the problem of marine refuse. She believed that it would take time for the departments concerned to cope with the requests and give explanations to the residents. She had been liaising with various departments including the Drainage Services Department (DSD), MD and EPD as regards the problem of marine refuse. However, the problem failed to be thoroughly solved. Therefore, she opined that attention should be paid to the problem in an on-going manner and hoped that the next-term CAC would retain this agenda item and continue the discussion at its meetings. She also hoped that the Government would adopt new approaches to tackle the problem effectively in the future.

24. The Chairlady resumed the chair.

(D) Paragraphs 36 to 45 of the Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 July 2019: The Water Quality and Effluent Discharges in the Waters off Tsuen Wan Pier

25. The Chairlady welcomed the government representatives who specially joined the meeting, including:

- (1) Mr CHOY Lap-shing, Eddie, Senior Building Surveyor/D5 (SBS/D5) of the Buildings Department (BD);
- (2) Ms TSANG Ka-man, Carmen, Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional West) 2 (SEPO(RW)2) of the EPD;
- (3) Ms LO Sze-yan, Engineer/Tsuen Kwai 2 (E/TK 2) of the DSD; and
- (4) Mr TANG Kin-on, Engineer/Consultants Management 13 of the DSD.

Besides, the Water Supplies Department, DSD and BD had submitted the written replies on the captioned matter prior to the meeting for Members' perusal.

26. E/TK 2 of the DSD responded as follows:

- (1) the DSD had all along been keeping in view the odour nuisance at Tsuen Wan waterfront and actively adopting multi-pronged measures, with a view to reducing the possible odour emission from the DSD's drainage system;
- (2) currently, there were three major stormwater box culverts in Tsuen Wan which collected stormwater from the water gathering grounds of buildings, streets and slopes in the district. The outfalls of these box culverts were set up at Tsuen Wan waterfront. The sewers might be misconnected to the stormwater drains in the district, resulting in the discharge of effluent to the waterfront via the box culverts and thereby giving rise to the odour nuisance;
- (3) the DSD had been addressing the situation in close collaboration with the EPD and BD and providing assistance in handling the relevant cases.

However, the surface run-off collected by some box culverts might have been polluted when flowing through the densely populated areas. As it was difficult to tackle this pollution problem at source, the DSD was currently constructing four dry weather flow interceptors in Tsuen Wan district, which prevented effluent from entering the stormwater drains during the dry season and conveyed the intercepted effluent to the sewage treatment works via the sewerage system;

- (4) the DSD's dry weather flow interceptors at Wo Tik Street and Tsuen Wan Market Street were in full operation currently. The dry weather flow interceptors at Chung On Street and Hoi Pa Street would be put into service one after another in late September 2019;
- (5) besides, the DSD installed plastic curtains at the outfalls of the three box culverts in 2015. The DSD was currently conducting the study on the effectiveness of odour-control hydrogel (hydrogel) for inhibiting hydrogen sulfide with the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. As the first stage of the study on hydrogel yielded satisfactory results, the DSD placed hydrogels at the outfalls of the three box culverts and more than 30 upstream locations in November 2018. The hydrogels would be replaced on a monthly basis. Also, the DSD commenced the second stage of the study on hydrogel in 2018 to test the effectiveness of hydrogel in suppressing other gases (e.g. volatile organic compounds) and the effective coverage area of hydrogel in different environments; and
- (6) as indicated earlier, the DSD planned to clear the sludge in major stormwater box culverts with the aid of machinery starting from the end of 2019. After a recent discussion on the cycle track project with the CEDD and LCSD, the DSD decided to adopt the said approach to clear the sludge in the box culvert at Tai Chung Road since late 2019. The tender exercise was in progress. Hopefully, this measure would further alleviate the odour problem.

27. SEPO(RW)2 of the EPD said that in June and July 2019, the EPD had continued to carry out the investigation of the misconnection of sewers and followed up nine cases. The EPD had found in the cases that two ground floor shops and a public pipeline were associated with the misconnection of pipelines and was following up on the relevant cases currently.

28. SBS/D5 of the BD responded as follows:

- (1) regarding the seven cases of misconnected pipelines in buildings referred by the EPD to the BD, the BD had issued the statutory order for two of these cases and required the owners to make rectifications. Also, the BD had issued the advisory letter for one case and would further issue the statutory order to the owner of this case in September 2019; and
- (2) besides, the repair works had been completed for one case. After investigation and follow-up, no misconnection of pipelines was identified in two cases. In addition, the BD was preparing to issue the statutory order for the remaining case.

29. The views, enquiries and suggestions of Members were summarised as follows:
- (1) he often travelled past the aforesaid locations and a strong odour could still be detected. In his opinion, it was probable that some of the DSD's work was pending completion or commencement (Mr TAM Hoi-pong);
 - (2) the level of cleanliness of plastic curtains at the outfalls was unsatisfactory and the curtains would be pushed upwards by water flowing through the outfalls. He thus enquired whether the DSD would cleanse the plastic curtains and the installation of plastic curtains was an effective measure (Mr TAM Hoi-pong);
 - (3) many shops in Tsuen Wan town centre poured food remnants into stormwater drains when washing articles. He hoped that the EPD or DSD would follow up on this potential source of odour together with the FEHD (Mr TAM Hoi-pong);
 - (4) she had liaised with the DSD after the last CAC meeting, so that the DSD could learn more about the requests from the residents who had recently moved into the housing estates along the waterfront (the Chairlady);
 - (5) she pointed out that it was normal to find the discharge of black water and yellow water. When it rained, if there were stains on the streets, stormwater would wash away the stains and turn black. Hence, black water was not effluent discharge. Yellow water was muddy water flowing through the stormwater drains (the Chairlady); and
 - (6) the immediate collection of water samples for testing was necessary under special circumstances. However, she opined that as it took time to collect water samples, the EPD might fail to obtain the actual water sample of the incident and the investigation might be hampered. She hoped that the EPD would explore improvement measures from various aspects (e.g. the workflow) during the suspension of operation of the TWDC (the Chairlady).
30. E/TK 2 of the DSD responded that the plastic curtains soaked in seawater for a long time and would therefore wear off with time. The DSD would replace the plastic curtains on an annual basis. Also, the DSD would study whether the plastic curtains could be replaced more frequently and discuss with the FEHD the improvement measures for the situation of the shops mentioned by the Member.
31. SEPO(RW)2 of the EPD responded that the EPD had set up a manned hotline (telephone no. 2417 6116). Upon receipt of calls from the public, the responsible staff of the EPD would be immediately notified by email and the EPD would handle the reported cases as soon as possible.
32. Mr LO Siu-kit said that many departments had set up 24-hour hotlines at present. He enquired whether the EPD's hotline was a 24-hour hotline or it was only manned during office hours. He also enquired whether the staff of the EPD would follow up the problem of effluent discharges during non-office hours. If the public failed to notify the EPD on the same day when the problem was identified, he believed that it would be impossible to trace the source of effluent afterwards. Hence, he hoped that

the EPD would further study the improvement measures.

33. SEPO(RW)2 of the EPD responded that according to past experience, the discovery of effluent discharges under special circumstances or coloured effluent was usually reported in the daytime. Hence, she believed that the hotline which operated during office hours could cope with the needs. The public could also call the hotline and leave voice messages during non-office hours. The EPD would immediately take follow-up actions in the morning on the next day.

34. The Chairlady wished to know the time required by the EPD for deploying staff to collect water samples upon receipt of calls from the public. She also hoped that the EPD would review the internal workflow, in order to address the public reports on discovery of effluent discharges during non-office hours and shorten the time required for collection of water samples.

(Note: Mr CHENG Chit-pun left the meeting at 3:35 p.m.)

IV Item 3: The Responsibility for Handling the Waste Washed Ashore
(CAC Paper No. 11/2019)

35. The Chairlady said that the Vice Chairman submitted the paper. She welcomed the government representatives who were responsible for giving response and specially joined the meeting, including:

- (1) Mr LEUNG Kam-man, Land Executive/Land Management 4 (District Lands Office, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing) (LE/LM4) of the Lands Department (LandsD);
- (2) Mr CHOI Wai-wing, Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing & Pest Control) Tsuen Wan 1 (SHI(C&PC)1) of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD);
- (3) Miss NG Nei-yin, Health Inspector (Contract Management) 2 (HI(CM)2) of the FEHD; and
- (4) Ms SIU Yuen-ching, Sara, Deputy District Leisure Manager (Tsuen Wan) 1 (DDL(M)1) of the LCSD.

Besides, the EPD, MD, Lands D and Highways Department (HyD) had submitted the written replies on the captioned matter prior to the meeting for Members' perusal.

36. The Vice Chairman introduced the paper.

(Note: Mr LI Hung-por left the meeting at 3:40 p.m.)

37. LE/LM4 of the LandsD responded as follows:

- (1) the LandsD mainly assisted other departments in clearing the construction waste on unleased land upon receipt of public complaints and the FEHD's notification;
- (2) the LandsD had approached the MD and learnt that the MD would assist in removing smaller construction waste and bamboo poles washed up on beaches;

- (3) the LandsD believed that the problem was caused mainly because of the piling up of bamboo poles beside a beach by the FEHD's staff prior to the clearance work of the MD's staff. Once the assistants of district councillors and the residents spotted the stack of bamboo poles, they often conveyed the situation to the Lands D before the FEHD served notification to the Lands D; and
 - (4) bamboo poles washed ashore would often be piled up for one or two weeks, giving rise to environmental hygiene problems. It was therefore undesirable to solely rely on the LandsD to clear these bamboo poles upon accumulation. Hence, the LandsD proposed to solve the problem at source through the concerted effort of various departments. For example, the FEHD could clear shorter bamboo poles according to the practice in the past.
38. SHI(C&PC)1 of the FEHD responded as follows:
- (1) the FEHD provided cleanup service for non-gazetted beaches on a weekly basis and had all along been clearing shorter bamboo poles washed onshore. However, the clearance of long bamboo poles and construction waste which were shown in the captioned paper fell beyond the purview of the FEHD;
 - (2) the FEHD would properly place the longer bamboo poles which were washed ashore on the side of a beach as far as possible, in order to prevent the situation from deteriorating. The FEHD would also notify the Lands D to continue the follow-up;
 - (3) currently, the FEHD continued to adopt the aforesaid procedures for handling bamboo poles. The FEHD would, having regard to the accumulation of bamboo poles, consider notifying the LandsD of the situation more frequently or after a certain amount of bamboo poles were piled up; and
 - (4) the said matter involved a number of departments. It was very important for the departments to provide assistance in, for example, tackling the problem of marine refuse drifting into the waters concerned and considering the regularisation of clearance of bamboo poles.
39. DDLM (TW)1 of the LCSD responded as follows:
- (1) the LCSD was responsible for the cleanup of 41 gazetted public beaches in Hong Kong and had all along been closely monitoring the situation of the beaches;
 - (2) there were a total of eight gazetted public beaches in the Tsuen Wan district, namely, Anglers' Beach, Gemini Beaches, Hoi Mei Wan Beach, Casam Beach, Lido Beach, Ting Kau Beach, Approach Beach and Ma Wan Tung Wan Beach. No lifeguard service was available at Gemini Beaches; and
 - (3) the LCSD would arrange cleansing workers to conduct cleanup within the gazetted public beaches (including the sandy and coastal areas) two or three times a day. The effectiveness of the cleanup work was satisfactory at present. The LCSD would make on-going effort to take follow-up

actions.

40. The views, enquiries and suggestions of Members were summarised as follows:
- (1) he learnt from the written replies of the departments that the FEHD provided cleanup service for beaches on a regular basis. The problem was caused by the practice of clearing bamboo poles upon complaint (the Vice Chairman);
 - (2) he believed that the LCSD would clear bamboo poles together with other refuse on the beaches under its management. Hence, he enquired why the FEHD was not equipped to handle longer bamboo poles while the LCSD was able to do so (the Vice Chairman);
 - (3) citing the non-gazetted beach next to Angler's Beach as an example, the bamboo poles washed ashore were piled up under a tree beside the staircase for the time being. He enquired whether the FEHD could transport bulky waste to the large refuse collection points (RCPs) nearby (e.g. the RCP in Sham Tseng) for further follow-up instead of piling up the waste onshore (the Vice Chairman);
 - (4) he enquired of the MD whether there were many bamboo poles floating in the sea; whether the floating bamboo poles would hamper the safe navigation of vessels; and whether the staff of the MD would collect many bamboo poles during sea patrol and handle the bamboo poles directly, in order to prevent them from being washed ashore (the Vice Chairman); and
 - (5) there was also a lot of refuse on the beaches in Ma Wan and Tsing Lung Tau. He enquired why the departments failed to remove bamboo poles upon accumulation and clear the bamboo poles mentioned in the paper after being piled up for a few days (Mr TAM Hoi-pong).
41. SHI (C&PC)1 of the FEHD responded as follows:
- (1) various departments had their respective arrangements for handling refuse. The HyD and LandsD were responsible for removing ordinary construction waste, bamboo poles and renovation waste on roads and along the coast respectively. The FEHD was mainly responsible for clearing refuse on beaches;
 - (2) the most ideal approach was to control the amount of refuse at source. The FEHD would endeavor to move bulky refuse (e.g. debris) to the area adjacent to a beach and clear ordinary refuse (e.g. plastic bottles) washed ashore;
 - (3) the clearance of construction waste fell beyond the FEHD's purview. If the FEHD took the initiative to clear the construction waste, it might affect the HyD's arrangement. Therefore, the FEHD was unable to move bulky refuse to a farther location; and
 - (4) bamboo poles which were construction waste should be handed over to the HyD for special arrangement and treatment, instead of being transported to the EPD's landfills.

42. DDLM(TW)1 of the LCSD said that the LCSD was responsible for the cleanup of gazetted public beaches and therefore had nothing to add.
43. LE/LM4 of the LandsD responded as follows:
- (1) he believed that construction waste (e.g. debris) would not drift into the sea and be washed up on beaches. Therefore, the major problem was caused by bamboo poles at present and the Lands D would provide assistance in the clearance of bamboo poles;
 - (2) the Lands D had enquired of the MD and learnt that the MD would assist in removing bamboo poles which were washed ashore near beaches; and
 - (3) to prevent random disposal of refuse due to the accumulation of bamboo poles, he proposed that the FEHD should consider notifying the MD to conduct clearance after moving the bamboo poles to the side of a beach, so that the bamboo poles would be removed as soon as possible.
44. MM/LPF(2) of the MD responded as follows:
- (1) the MD had liaised with the EPD in respect of the captioned matter. As the coordinating department, the EPD had already set out the MD's responsibility (i.e. to clear floating marine refuse) in the written reply to the CAC. The MD would endeavour to clear refuse which drifted to inshore waters within its capacity;
 - (2) the staff of the MD would immediately instruct the contractors to clear floating refuse once spotted during patrol;
 - (3) it was impossible for debris to accumulate at sea. The staff of the MD had never found a large quantity of bamboo poles floating in the sea during patrol; and
 - (4) the MD was responsible for the clearance of floating refuse in all waters of Hong Kong, including the waters in various districts and Victoria Harbour. The MD would make on-going effort to clear floating refuse in the sea.
45. The views, enquiries and suggestions of Members were summarised as follows:
- (1) the MD would clear refuse and bamboo poles found at sea. However, if bamboo poles were washed up on non-gazetted beaches, the LCSD was unable to handle them. Also, as the bamboo poles were very long, the FEHD could only pile them up at the corner of a beach. He thus enquired why bamboo poles were classified as construction waste (Mr CHAN Sung-ip);
 - (2) he, together with Members and volunteers, conducted a cleanup at the embankment near Tsuen Wan Pier in October 2018. Different types of refuse, including slippers, foam plastics and wood, were found. It took about 20 handcarts to carry all the refuse collected (Mr KOO Yeung-pong);
 - (3) as the bamboo poles mentioned in the paper were piled up at a non-gazetted beach, the LCSD was unable to arrange its staff for clearance. Besides, the FEHD was mainly responsible for clearing refuse instead of waste such as wood. Hence, he opined that the paper should focus on identifying solutions to the problem and requesting for assistance from various

- departments, instead of ascertaining their respective responsibilities (Mr KOO Yeung-pong);
- (4) he opined that it could consider conducting an on-site inspection at all gazetted and non-gazetted beaches in Tsuen Wan district. The Tsuen Wan District Office could take up the coordinating role and Members could arrange district organisations to clear refuse at the beaches. However, it should pay attention to safety during the cleanup and various government departments should work together to handle bamboo poles which had been cut thin (Mr KOO Yeung-pong);
 - (5) the clearance of bamboo poles could be arranged through liaison with the departments concerned at present but it was time-consuming and labour intensive. He therefore proposed to establish a mechanism for clearance of bamboo poles washed ashore. If the terms of reference of the departments were clearly defined, he believed that proposals could be drawn up to tackle this problem in the future (the Vice Chairman);
 - (6) he found in 2016 that the staff of the FEHD carried bamboo poles to the road via the staircase and transport the bamboo poles by a goods vehicle of the FEHD. If the FEHD would no longer adopt this approach to handle bamboo poles washed ashore, he enquired whether the LandsD could arrange its staff to remove bamboo poles on a regular basis (the Vice Chairman); and
 - (7) he noted that the MD would take up the clearance of bamboo poles washed ashore. He hoped that the departments would establish a relevant mechanism, instead of only notifying the MD to conduct clearance when the problem got worse (the Vice Chairman).

46. The Chairlady believed that the problem was caused by the accumulation of bamboo poles washed ashore. It remained unresolved because no department was designated to handle these bamboo poles. Besides, there were long staircases at the aforesaid beaches. It was difficult to transport bamboo poles by vehicles because they were bulky and came in a large quantity. Hence, vessels might be required for transportation. Also, southeast wind often carried refuse to Tsuen Wan. As the source of refuse could not be identified, it was more difficult to handle the refuse problem at source. In addition, the CAC noted that the departments had discussed with the Guangdong Provincial Government on the refuse problem before and after the strike of typhoons. However, she hoped that the departments would firstly accord priority to the handling of bamboo poles in order to keep the beaches tidy and clean. She also hoped that the departments would discuss how to address the problem in the future.

47. LE/LM4 of the LandsD responded as follows:

- (1) the LandsD had all along been clearing bamboo poles and unattended refuse. He believed that the staff of the Lands D had already removed the bamboo poles mentioned in the captioned paper;
- (2) the LandsD had been clearing bamboo poles by utilising the resources originally dedicated to the demolition of unauthorised structures.

Therefore, there was no resource available for cleanup on a regular basis. Nevertheless, upon receipt of complaint about the accumulation of bamboo poles, the LandsD would make every effort to assist in the clearance work; and

- (3) if bamboo poles were piled up continuously, it would attract random disposal of refuse or sundries. Hence, the infrequent clearance of bamboo poles might yield unsatisfactory results.

48. SHI(C&PC)1 of the FEHD responded that the FEHD had all along been assisting in the clearance of shorter bamboo poles. The FEHD could notify the Lands D of the quantity of bamboo poles washed ashore on a biweekly basis, thereby facilitating the Lands D to arrange for suitable follow-ups accordingly. He hoped that this approach would help solve the problem.

49. DLM(TW) of the LCSD responded as follows:

- (1) as for the gazetted public beaches with long staircases, the cleansing workers of the LCSD had to carry refuse and bamboo poles to the road using wooden poles before conducting further clearance. Such being the case, it might often fail to clear all refuse collected from a beach on the same day; and
- (2) the LCSD rented a vessel for transporting refuse in 2017. The MD had one similar vessel but only a few vessels provided the service in the market. Due to resource constraint, sometimes, it was unable to arrange for immediate transportation of refuse upon collection from a beach.

50. The Vice Chairman said it was a feasible approach that the FEHD directly notified the Lands D to clear bamboo poles on a biweekly basis. However, it would be undesirable if the bamboo poles were piled up for more than two weeks. The FEHD might need to enhance the frequency of directly notifying the Lands D of the situation if necessary. He also hoped that it would facilitate the establishment of a cooperation mechanism, in order to replace the practice of making report upon accumulation of bamboo poles.

V Item 4: The Refuse and Cleanup of the Beaches in Ma Wan
(CAC Paper No. 12/2019)

51. The Chairlady said that Mr TAM Hoi-pong submitted the paper. She welcomed the government representatives who were responsible for giving response and specially joined the meeting, including:

- (1) Mr CHOI Wai-wing, SHI(C&PC)1 of the FEHD;
- (2) Miss NG Nei-yin, HI(CM)2 of the FEHD;
- (3) Ms SIU Yuen-ching, Sara, DDLM(TW)1 of the LCSD; and
- (4) Mr LEUNG Kam-man, LE/LM4 of the Lands D.

Besides, the MD and Lands D had submitted the written replies on the captioned matter prior to the meeting for Members' perusal.

52. Mr TAM Hoi-pong introduced the paper.

53. SHI(C&PC)1 of the FEHD responded as follows:
- (1) the FEHD had been assigning its staff to conduct cleanup for the non-gazetted beaches in Ma Wan, namely, the beach off Ma Wan Rural Committee Road and beaches at Shek Tsai Wan, Pak Wan, Tung Wan Tsai, Ma Wan Main Street Village and Tai Pai Tsui in Ma Wan. The FEHD had not received complaint about refuse at these non-gazetted beaches between June and August 2019;
 - (2) except the non-gazetted beach at Tai Pai Tsui in Ma Wan, the FEHD arranged cleanup for the above non-gazetted beaches four times a week in summer (approximately from June to October) and three times a week in winter (from November to May in the following year). Also, the FEHD arranged cleanup for the non-gazetted beach at Tai Pai Tsui in Ma Wan twice a week in summer and once a week in winter;
 - (3) the FEHD had not recorded the types of refuse collected. However, it noted that the refuse mainly consisted of bamboo poles, foam plastics and plastic bottles, and wood was found occasionally;
 - (4) in general, the FEHD would deploy additional staff for post-typhoon clearance;
 - (5) the FEHD would assign its staff to inspect the location of the gate mentioned by the Member in due course; and
 - (6) the FEHD had been increasing the resources for cleanup of beaches in recent years and believed that the cleanup frequency was adequate at present. The FEHD would consider enhancing the cleanup frequency where necessary, with a view to improving the environmental hygiene of non-gazetted beaches.
54. DDLM(TW)1 of the LCSD responded as follows:
- (1) the LCSD deployed its staff to clean up gazetted public beaches on a daily basis. Citing Tung Wan Beach in Ma Wan as an example, the LCSD arranged cleansing workers to clean up the sandy and coastal areas two or three times a day;
 - (2) as beach users seldom visited the area near the pier at Tung Wan Beach in Ma Wan, the LCSD arranged its staff to clean up the area four times a month. If the LCSD found that there was an unusually large amount of refuse, it would increase the cleanup frequency subject to the availability of manpower;
 - (3) in 2019, the LCSD collected land refuse of about 37 000 kilogram (kg) and marine refuse of about 39 000 kg in June 2019; land refuse of about 41 000 kg and marine refuse of about 48 000 kg in July 2019; and land refuse of about 42 000 kg and marine refuse of about 45 000 kg in August 2019;
 - (4) from June to August 2019, the LCSD received one complaint about a large amount of refuse on Tung Wan Beach in Ma Wan and in the waters off the beach. At that time, the refuse was carried by wind from other places to Tung Wan Beach in Ma Wan and the LCSD had immediately arranged its staff to conduct cleanup at the beach;

- (5) the types of refuse collected by the LCSD were similar to those collected by the FEHD, mainly including foam plastics, plastic bottles, bamboo poles and wooden strips; and
- (6) if there was a surge of refuse due to the strike of severe typhoon, the LCSD would deploy additional cleansing workers to clean up beaches, in order to avoid causing impact to the beach users.

55. LE/LM4 of the LandsD said that the clearance of refuse was not under the purview of the LandsD. Having said that, the LandsD would assist in clearing large construction waste pending removal on unleased land which fell beyond the purview of other departments.

56. The Chairlady said that after the passage of typhoon Mangkhut in Hong Kong last year, she cleared refuse at the location concerned together with volunteers. Some bulky refuse was found at the location with complex terrain. She contacted the FEHD back then and the FEHD immediately arranged for clearance of the bulky refuse. She believed that the district councillor of the constituency area could discuss with the departments concerned and establish a mechanism of routine cleanup, with a view to expediting the clearance of refuse. She also believed that Members had learnt from the experience last year that the departments had inadequate manpower to cope with the sudden strike of typhoon. She therefore proposed to mobilise the residents to cut the collapsed trees into smaller logs and then notify the departments to remove the logs with machinery, in order to achieve the greatest efficiency. She hoped that the departments would work in tandem. She also hoped that the Government would introduce new equipment and come up with novel ways to clear marine refuse (e.g. marine refuse bins adopted by foreign countries), in order to save manpower required for clearance of marine refuse.

VI Item 5: Work Progress Report of Working Groups under Coastal Affairs Committee

(A) Working Group on Promoting the Image of the Coastal Area

57. The Chairlady said that the “Tsuen Wan Sea-front Night’s Dream Music Festival” which was co-organised by the Working Group with the Working Group on Management of Facilities in the Coastal Area and a local organisation had been held at the Central Plaza of Tsuen Wan Park from 3 to 7 July 2019. The Music Festival had been well-received by the audience. Many Members had also attended the concert. She thanked Members for their support. She said that many residents who had recently moved to the district could also enjoy the Music Festival, which had been held for three consecutive years.

(B) Working Group on Management of Facilities in the Coastal Area

58. The Vice Chairman said that the “Tsuen Wan Sea-front Night’s Dream Music Festival” had been successfully held in July 2019. The performing groups had staged professional performances at the Music Festival. He thanked all performing groups for their professional performances and Members for their support.

VII Item 6: Any Other Business

59. The Chairlady stated that since the establishment of the CAC in the current term of the TWDC, it had made progress in the pending items such as the cycle track, waterfront enhancement, seawater odour control and refuse problem. Also, the CAC had matured over time in respect of the way it handled and followed up the items. She thanked Members for their participation in the discussions and comments given on various items. In addition, she stated that the project of cycle track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun, which had been under discussion for about 20 years, was one of the major items of the CAC for discussion in the current term. The Working Group on Advance Works for Cycle Track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun was tasked with challenging work. Several rounds of discussion should be conducted because the project had experienced many difficulties. She thanked the Convenor of the Working Group for his contributions to the cycle track project.

60. Members noted the contents of the following information papers:

- (1) Amount of Marine Floating Refuse collected by Marine Department in Tsuen Wan District
(CAC Paper No. 13/2019);
- (2) Promotion and Anti-Marine Littering Operation in Tsuen Wan
(CAC Paper No. 14/2019); and
- (3) Financial Statement of Coastal Affairs Committee as at 22.08.2019
(CAC Paper No. 15/2019).

VIII Adjournment of Meeting

61. The Chairlady reminded Members that this was the last CAC meeting in the current term of the TWDC. She wished the attendees all the best and every success in the future.

62. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Tsuen Wan District Council Secretariat
18 October 2019