

(Translation)

Minutes of the 8th Meeting of
District Planning, Development and Facilities Management Committee (1/21-22)

Date: 26 April 2021

Time: 2:30 p.m.

Venue: Main Conference Room, Tsuen Wan District Office

Present:

Mr LUK Ling-chung, Antonio (Chairman)

Mr TSE Man-chak (Vice Chairman)

Mr MAN Yu-ming, MH

Mr NG Hin-lung, Norris

Mr LI Hung-por

Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus

Mr LAM Sek-tim

Ms CHAN Kim-kam

Mr WONG Ka-wa

Mr KOT Siu-yuen, MH

Mr CHIU Yan-loy

Mr LAU Chi-hung

Mr LAU Cheuk-yu

Mr PUN Long-chung, Roy

Mr LAU Jackson

Mr LAI Man-fai

In Attendance:

| | |
|--|--|
| Mr CHAN Yuen-sum, Sumly | Chairman, Tsuen Wan District Council |
| Mr LAI Yik-wing, Wesley | Assistant District Officer (Tsuen Wan), Tsuen Wan District Office |
| Miss LAM Siu-yung, Daisy | Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Tsuen Wan District Office |
| Mr CHAN Sai-hung | Senior Inspector of Works (Tsuen Wan), Tsuen Wan District Office |
| Mr LAU Shun-tak, Donald (Secretary) | Executive Officer I (District Council), Tsuen Wan District Office |
| Miss LEUNG Ming-sze, Ashley | Executive Officer (Development), Tsuen Wan District Office |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Miss LI Wan-ki, Wanki | Executive Assistant (District Council)3, Tsuen Wan District Office |
| Miss CHAN Hiu-yuen, Virginia | Executive Assistant (District Council)4, Tsuen Wan District Office |
| Ms LIM Ting-ting, Sylvia | Chief Leisure Manager (New Territories West), Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Ms LEE Mei-sheung, Dickie | District Leisure Manager (Tsuen Wan), Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Ms TSE Ka-ye, Carmen | Senior Librarian (Tsuen Wan), Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Ms YUEN Chi-ling, Margaret | Manager (New Territories South) Marketing & District Activities, Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Mr NG Kar-shu | Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan, Planning Department |
| Mr CHENG Ho-yin, Henry | Senior Estate Surveyor/Tsuen Wan (District Lands Office, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing), Lands Department |
| Mr LI Pui-sang | Project Coordinator/2 (New Territories West), Civil Engineering and Development Department |

Absent:

Mr SHUM Lester

For discussion of item 2

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Mr TSUI Ka-kim, Kim | Senior Building Surveyor/D5, Buildings Department |
| Ms LAW Lai-chun, Gladys | Senior Executive Officer (Planning)32, Leisure and Cultural Services Department |

For discussion of item 5

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Ms LAW Lai-chun, Gladys | Senior Executive Officer (Planning)32, Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Ms MAK Siu-kwan, Elly | Senior Executive Assistant (Planning)34B, Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Ms LEE Ka-lai, Jackie | Senior Project Manager 330, Architectural Services Department |
| Ms LAI Pui-yu | Project Manager 352, Architectural Services Department |
| Mr Nelson CHOW | Senior Director, Chows Architects Limited |

Ms Thobea WAN Senior Architect ,Chows Architects Limited

For discussion of item 9

Ms CHUNG Dip-fun, Sarah Senior Housing Manager/Wong Tai Sin, Tsing Yi and Tsuen Wan 2, Housing Department

For discussion of item 12

Mr CHAN Chung-yun, Stephen Senior Town Planner/Kwai Tsing, Planning Department

Mr CHEN Kin-tung, Tommy Senior Estate Surveyor/Special Duty (District Lands Office, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing), Lands Department

Action

I Opening Remarks and Introduction

The Chairman welcomed the Chairman of the Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC), Members and representatives from the government departments to the 8th meeting of the District Planning, Development and Facilities Management Committee (DPDFMC), and introduced Ms YUEN Chi-ling, Margaret, Manager (New Territories South) Marketing & District Activities (M(NTS)M&DA), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), who attended this meeting on behalf of Ms WONG Fan-ni, Jasmine.

2. The Chairman reminded Members of sections 17(1) and 27 of the Tsuen Wan District Council Standing Orders (the Standing Orders) that any Member who wished to move a motion or ask any question at a meeting was required to give the Secretary a notice in writing ten clear working days before the meeting. Thus, he reminded Members that the date of the next meeting was 28 June 2021 and the deadline for submission of papers was 10 June 2021. In addition, according to section 28 of the Standing Orders, unless otherwise agreed by the Chairman, Members could speak once only on each agenda item at the meeting and each Member could speak up to 1.5 minutes. A maximum of five Members could speak on each agenda item. A maximum of four Members could speak on an agenda item under which a motion was moved in order to reserve time for handling the motion. The Member(s) who had submitted a paper would have 2 minutes to make an introduction and 1 minute to draw a conclusion. The representatives of the departments would have up to 2 minutes to give response.

(Note: The Vice Chairman joined the meeting at 2:34 p.m.)

II Item 1: Confirmation of Minutes of the 7th Meeting held on 23.2.2021

3. The Chairman said that the Secretariat received one proposed amendment from Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus before the meeting. The proposed amendment was as follows:

- (1) Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus proposed that in paragraph 72(3) of the captioned minutes, “興建臨時房屋的目的是紓緩生活環境較差者的困難，而現時推行的臨時房屋政策，則是針對正在輪候公屋的人士。政府近年採取見縫插針的方式興建房屋，而現時採用組合屋的建造方法只能提供少量單位，受惠人數有限，因此他建議政府另覓一幅較大的土地興建臨時房屋，而非選擇只有數十個泊車位大小的前聯仁街熟食小販市場用地。此外，他詢問政府可否告知有否就有關用地制訂其他未來發展方案，讓委員作好心理準備(易承聰議員)” (The objective of constructing temporary housing was to alleviate the hardship of those in poor living conditions. The target of the existing temporary housing policies was the PRH applicants. The Government had been constructing housing using an “in-fill needle-type development” approach in recent years. The current approach of modular housing construction could only provide a handful of flats and benefit a limited number of people. As such, he suggested that the Government should not select the site of the former Luen Yan Street Cooked Food Hawker Bazaar, whose size was no more than tens of parking spaces, for the construction of temporary housing. Instead, it should identify a larger site. Besides, he enquired whether the Government could announce other future development proposals for the site so that Members could prepare themselves (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus)) should be amended as “興建臨時房屋的目的是紓緩生活環境較差者的困難，套用香港現時推行的臨時房屋政策，則是針對正在輪候公屋的人士能更快安置。他批評政府近年採取見縫插針的方式興建房屋無助解決社會住屋問題，而現時的考慮用地即使採用組合屋的建造方法亦只能提供少量單位，受惠人數有限，因此他建議政府另覓一幅較大的土地興建臨時房屋以徹實解決問題，而非選擇只有數十個泊車位大小的前聯仁街熟食小販市場用地。此外，他詢問政府會否就有關用地制訂其他未來發展方案時預早告知，讓委員作好心理準備接受政府朝令夕改的政策方向(易承聰議員)” (The objective of constructing temporary housing was to alleviate the hardship of those in poor living conditions. However, the aim of the existing temporary housing policies of Hong Kong was to expedite the allocation of public rental housing (PRH) flats to PRH applicants. He criticised the Government for constructing housing using an “in-fill

needle-type development” approach in recent years, as the approach could not help resolve the housing problem in our society. Even if modular housing construction was adopted for the site under consideration, the development would only provide a handful of flats and benefit a limited number of people. As such, he suggested that the Government should not select the site of the former Luen Yan Street Cooked Food Hawker Bazaar, whose size was no more than tens of parking spaces, for the construction of temporary housing. Instead, it should identify a larger site in order to thoroughly resolve the problem. Besides, he enquired whether the Government would inform Members of other future development proposals for the site in advance so that they could prepare themselves for the Government’s fickle policy directions (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus)).

4. The Chairman asked whether Members endorsed the minutes and proposed amendment. Members unanimously endorsed the minutes and proposed amendment.

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

(A) Paragraphs 5 to 15 of the Minutes of the Meeting held on 23 February 2021: Request for Provision of Rain Shelter at the Staircase of the Government Footbridge connected with Tsuen Fung Shopping Arcade from Kolour Mall

5. The Chairman said that the relevant paper was submitted by Mr PUN Long-chung, Roy for the DPDFMC meeting held on 25 February 2020. The representatives from the departments responsible for giving response were:

- (1) Mr CHENG Ho-yin, Henry, Senior Estate Surveyor/Tsuen Wan (SES/TW), District Lands Office, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (DLO), Lands Department (LandsD);
- (2) Mr TSUI Ka-kim, Kim, Senior Building Surveyor/D5 (SBS/D5), Buildings Department (BD); and
- (3) Mr LAI Yik-wing, Wesley, Assistant District Officer (Tsuen Wan) (ADO(TW)), Tsuen Wan District Office (TWDO).

Besides, the written replies of the Highways Department (HyD) and Transport Department (TD) were tabled at the meeting.

6. SES/TW of the DLO responded as follows:
 - (1) the developer had fulfilled its obligation to construct a covered footbridge according to the land lease conditions. Hence, the DLO did not have any further contractual basis to request the developer to undertake additional work (e.g. providing a rain shelter at the staircase

of the footbridge) apart from the repair, maintenance and cleansing of existing facilities; and

- (2) the said footbridge and staircase were situated on government land. The ownership belonged to the Government. If the department concerned intended to construct a rain shelter at the staircase and would take up the management and repair of the rain shelter in the future, the DLO would make complementary efforts and provide assistance in land administration. For instance, the DLO would take back the necessary part from the developer according to the department's works schedule as well as the terms of the relevant land lease and legal documents to enable the department to construct a rain shelter at that part.

(Note: Ms CHAN Kim-kam and Mr LAU Chi-hung joined the meeting at 2:39 p.m.)

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

- (1) the site in question was a piece of government land. Therefore, it was exempt from the Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 123); and
- (2) the design life of the roads and footbridges constructed by the HyD was 120 years. When the staircase in question was constructed, it was considered a private structure, of which the design life was 50 years. Given that the rain shelter was intended for bringing convenience to the members of the public using the staircase, its design life should be similar to that of the staircase. If the HyD held that there was any conflict or problem within the proposal, it could construct a rain shelter separately.

8. ADO(TW) of the TWDO responded as follows:

- (1) the Works Section of the TWDO was unable to cope with the construction works of a rain shelter at the said location using its techniques; and
- (2) the TWDO learnt that the HyD was currently studying the technical details about the construction of a rain shelter and needed more time to learn about the handling approaches.

(Note: Mr LAU Cheuk-yu joined the meeting at 2:42 p.m.)

9. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:
- (1) on many previous occasions, it was the TWDO, not any lead department, which coordinated meetings of representatives from different departments. In addition, he thought that the elevator was a barrier-free facility not to be confused with a rain shelter. Although anti-skid facilities had been provided at the staircase, many members of the public would still slip on rainy days. He believed that the provision of a rain shelter and handrails could make the said location less slippery. Therefore, he hoped that the TWDO would convey the views to the developer or relevant departments and provide a relevant timetable (Mr WONG Ka-wa);
 - (2) although the HyD stated that an elevator had been constructed at the location concerned, he opined that the construction works of a rain shelter should still be led by the HyD. The HyD should also send officers to attend the DPDFMC meeting to explain the progress of the study on the technical details and tackle the issue in an active manner. In addition, he hoped that the TWDO would convene meetings of the inter-departmental working group promptly so as to urge the HyD to complete the relevant study as soon as possible. Otherwise, Members would definitely receive many requests for assistance from the residents during the rainy season (Mr PUN Long-chung, Roy);
 - (3) the TWDO could not construct a rain shelter due to technical difficulties, and so the works were passed on to the HyD, which surprisingly stated that an elevator had already been provided thereat for public use. This showed that the HyD had not actively explored the feasibility of constructing a rain shelter. In fact, Members all agreed that a rain shelter should be provided at the said location, but they had yet to confirm the method of construction. In this connection, he hoped that the TWDO would assist in inviting the HyD to send its representatives to attend the next DPDFMC meeting to brief Members on the preliminary proposal currently under study (Mr CHIU Yan-loy);
 - (4) in the previous meeting, the BD stated that the HyD and TD both had a responsibility for the construction of a rain shelter, but such departments did not send any representatives to attend the meetings after then. He opined that it was necessary for the TD to take part in the works, and suggested writing a letter to reprimand the TD. He also requested the TD to carry out a detailed study on the construction

works. Besides, he hoped that the TWDO would assist in following up the above issue so as to tackle the problem promptly (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus);

- (5) he understood that the TWDO was unable to undertake the works due to technical issues, and the works had to be passed on to relevant works departments for handling. Surprisingly, the HyD stated that it had already provided an escalator for public use, and so it would not undertake the works in question. He hoped that the TWDO would request the HyD to provide an actual plan for the works, which would include information about the advance works and investigation work, to facilitate Members' understanding of the works to be carried out in the future (the Vice Chairman); and
- (6) he enquired of the departments whether a meeting of the inter-departmental working group had been convened for a discussion on the captioned issue during the period between the previous DPDFMC meeting and this meeting. Besides, he hoped that the Government would pay attention to the views from representatives of the community and residents, and suggested that the TWDO should arrange for Members to conduct a site inspection with the TD's staff, and assist the HyD in taking forward the construction works (the Chairman).

10. ADO(TW) of the TWDO responded as follows:

- (1) the inter-departmental working group had conducted a meeting at the end of last year. The departments should first be allowed time after that meeting for conducting sufficient data collection and studying relevant details before convening the next meeting for discussion so that the work could be implemented more effectively; and
- (2) the TWDO noted Members' views, and learnt that the HyD still needed time to study whether there were other solutions. Thus, the TWDO would try to contact such departments as the TD and HyD through channels other than the working group to learn about the latest progress of their studies.

11. The Chairman trusted the TWDO to assist in following up the matter. Besides, he suggested sending letters to reprimand the HyD for its disrespect to the TWDC and express discontent at the TD.

(Post-meeting note: The DPDFMC conveyed Members' views to the HyD and TD in writing on 10 May 2021.)

(B) Paragraphs 16 to 24 of the Minutes of the Meeting held on 23 February 2021:
Discussion on the Construction of a Walking Trail at Ting Kau

12. The Chairman said that the relevant paper was submitted by Mr LAU Chi-hung for the DPDFMC meeting held on 20 October 2020. The representatives from the departments responsible for giving response were:

- (1) Ms LEE Mei-sheung, Dickie, District Leisure Manager (Tsuen Wan) (DLM(TW)), LCSD;
- (2) Mr LI Pui-sang, Project Coordinator/2 (New Territories West) (PC/2(NTW)), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD); and
- (3) Mr LAI Yik-wing, Wesley, ADO(TW), TWDO.

Besides, the written replies of the Development Bureau (DevB) and HyD were tabled at the meeting.

13. DLM(TW) of the LCSD responded that as the lots concerned not sites for recreational facilities, the LCSD was unable to report on any detail for the time being.

14. PC/2(NTW) of the CEDD responded as follows:

- (1) various government bureaux and departments had their respective areas of work. As one of the works departments in the Government, the CEDD had all along been taking forward the required land infrastructure and building works as commissioned by relevant bureaux or departments; and
- (2) the location of the alignment of the cycle track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun currently undertaken by the CEDD was different from that of the walking trail at Ting Kau proposed by Members. Therefore, the works of the cycle track would not cover the said walking trail.

15. ADO(TW) of the TWDO responded as follows:

- (1) the TWDO had conveyed Members' views to the DevB after the previous meeting, and had invited the DevB to send its representatives to attend this meeting; and
- (2) given the enormous scale of the construction works for the proposed walking trail at Ting Kau, the project should be passed on to a professional bureau or department for follow-up.

16. The Chairman held that the walking trail at Ting Kau was unrelated to the cycle track. Besides, the DevB stated in its written reply that the proposal had to be passed on to the Planning Department (PlanD) and CEDD. He enquired of the PlanD whether it had any response to the matter. He also enquired of the DLO whether the alignment proposed by the Member involved private land, and about the area of the land involved.

17. Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan (STP/TW) of the PlanD responded as follows:

- (1) generally speaking, public works coordinated by the Government were always permitted uses;
- (2) the final alignment of the walking trail at Ting Kau proposed by the Member depended on such factors as the feasibility of the works and construction costs. It was also subject to input from relevant works departments; and
- (3) there should be a lead department to act as the project proponent and bear the construction costs involved. The PlanD would provide support in respect of planning.

18. SES/TW of the DLO responded as follows:

- (1) the DLO had made a written reply on 26 March 2021, stating that there was private land in the southwest of Ting Kau Beach, i.e. the coastal land lying between Ting Kau Village and Ting Kau Sitting-out Area. However, as no works departments could provide information about the proposed alignment of the walking trail at present, the DLO could not advise on the area of the private land; and
- (2) there should be a lead department for conducting studies on the alignment of the walking trail and the feasibility of the works in question. If a department was to implement the construction of a walking trail at Ting Kau, the DLO would provide support in respect of land administration, which included the clearance of land and handling of issues on the allocation of government land.

19. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) given the enormous scale of the works, he opined that the works should be undertaken by the CEDD or LCSD (the Chairman);
- (2) as the DLO stated that the alignment of the walking trail involved

private land, he enquired of the DLO whether there was any precedent for resumption of private land due to construction of a leisure trail, and whether such resumption would be feasible under the existing policy. If the proposal was feasible, he considered that the proposed works should be taken forward by the CEDD (Mr CHIU Yan-loy);

- (3) he pointed out that since the cycle track to be constructed from Tsuen Wan West to the vicinity of Bayview Garden was a one-way track, it should naturally be connected to Sham Tseng. As such, he enquired of the DLO whether it was indeed necessary to construct a cycle track. Besides, he learnt that the limits of the Waterfront Enhancement Scheme by the Harbourfront Commission would be set at Ting Kau. In his opinion, the walking trail proposed by the Member could be transformed into a part of the future Waterfront Enhancement Scheme. This could not only achieve the Harbourfront Commission's goal of enhancing the waterfront, but could also actualise the Member's proposal (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus);
- (4) he understood that there might not be a department willing to take the lead in implementing the proposal for a walking trail at Ting Kau. In addition, he considered that the current planning of the district was far from satisfactory, and thus suggested enhancing the environment through the optimal use of the natural resources in the district. For example, a simple gallery road could be constructed to connect waterfront facilities for the convenience of nearby residents (Mr LAU Chi-hung); and
- (5) although Tsuen Wan had a rather long coastline, coast locations were not connected with each other. Given this undesirable situation, he suggested constructing gallery roads at the private lots to link up the locations and create a continuous promenade (Mr LAI Man-fai).

20. PC/2(NTW) of the CEDD responded that the Waterfront Enhancement Scheme was under the DevB's purview, and so the CEDD was unable to give response to the matter.

21. SES/TW of the DLO responded as follows:

- (1) the DLO did not have information on hand. Therefore, it did not know whether there was a precedent in which land was resumed by invoking the Lands Resumption Ordinance (Cap. 124) for construction of recreational facilities for public use; and

- (2) in virtually every part of Hong Kong, there was private land that should be resumed in accordance with the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370) for the purpose of public road works. Regarding the proposal for a walking trail at Ting Kau, the lead department should first formulate the alignment and conduct a feasibility study to gain an insight into the affected government land and private land. However, the DLO was not in a position to give a response on the applicability of the above Ordinance.

22. DLM(TW) of the LCSD responded that as the alignment of the walking trail at Ting Kau had not yet been confirmed, the LCSD was not sure whether its sites would be involved. After the alignment had been confirmed, the LCSD could proceed to consider support measures accordingly.

23. ADO(TW) of the TWDO responded that the TWDO could convey Members' views to the DevB or relevant departments after the meeting to facilitate appropriate follow-up actions.

24. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) he hoped that the TWDO would convey the proposal to the DevB, and opined that the captioned item needed not to be further discussed (Mr LAU Chi-hung); and
- (2) he stated that the captioned item would not be further discussed (the Chairman).

(C) Paragraphs 43 to 53 of the Minutes of the Meeting held on 23.2.2021: Request for Early Implementation of Tso Kung Tam Valley Ecological Park

25. The Chairman said that the relevant paper was submitted by Mr CHIU Yan-loy for the DPDFMC meeting held on 23 February 2021. The representatives from the departments responsible for giving response were:

- (1) Ms LAW Lai-chun, Gladys, Senior Executive Officer (Planning)³² (SEO(P)³²), LCSD;
- (2) Mr LI Pui-sang, PC/2(NTW), CEDD; and
- (3) Mr CHENG Ho-yin, Henry, SES/TW, DLO.

Besides, the written replies of the HyD and Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department were tabled at the meeting.

26. SEO(P)32 of the LCSD responded as follows:
- (1) the LCSD understood that the TWDC was concerned about the project and wished that it would be implemented promptly;
 - (2) in 2014, the LCSD had consulted the District Facilities Management Committee (DFMC) under the TWDC on the phased implementation of the Tso Kung Tam Valley Ecological Park (TKTVEP) project. At that time, the LCSD proposed adopting the approach of “resolving the simple issues first before the difficult ones” with a view to enabling members of the public to enjoy some of the facilities as early as possible. The first phase would see the construction of simpler proposed facilities, including an outdoor climbing wall, children’s playground, ecological exhibition centre, elderly fitness equipment together with a Tai Chi court, and two reprovisioned tennis courts. In the second phase, large-scale slope stabilisation works and resumption of private land parcels would be implemented in the proposed area for development. The proposed facilities would include a suspension bridge for viewing, a promenade running around most of the attractions in the valley, and more. The proposal was then supported by the DFMC. The LCSD would continue to plan the project according to the procedures for implementing public works;
 - (3) subsequently, the LCSD learnt that the site for the project could be used for other potential development, and relevant departments were reviewing the planning of such potential development. This had rendered the LCSD unable to further implement the TKTVEP project at this stage; and
 - (4) the LCSD had all along been maintaining communication with the relevant departments. After the departments had completed their planning of the potential development, the LCSD would review the impact of the works of the potential development on Phases 1 and 2 of the TKTVEP project, and would consult the TWDC again.
27. PC/2(NTW) of the CEDD responded that the TKTVEP project was not a development project undertaken by the CEDD. The CEDD did not have relevant information nor participate in any studies in relation to other development projects.
28. SES/TW of the DLO responded that if the government department concerned confirmed the implementation of a long-term development project, i.e. the TKTVEP

project, on the site in question, the DLO would adopt matching policies in respect of land administration according to its implementation schedule, including clearance of land and handling of the allocation of government land, to facilitate the implementation of the long-term development project by the department concerned.

29. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) There had been references to the TKTVEP project over the years. Although the LCSD had obtained the TWDC's approval for implementing the project under the approach of "resolving the simple issues first before the difficult ones" in 2014, nothing concrete had been done so far. Thus, he enquired of the LCSD about its work in the past seven years. Besides, he hoped that the LCSD would provide more detailed information about the potential development, including the responsible departments and the potential use of the site in question (Mr LAI Man-fai);
- (2) while the TKTVEP project had received wide support after the consultation with the TWDC in 2014, the project was still under planning to this day, and, in the course of planning, some departments even intended to use the site for other potential development. As those departments were currently conducting a feasibility study, the LCSD was unable to take forward the project. Considering that more than half of the Members in this District Council (DC) term were newly appointed, he hoped that the LCSD would submit an interim report on the project to facilitate Members' understanding of the LCSD's progress in handling the various proposed facilities supported by Members of previous terms of the TWDC. Besides, he enquired whether the CEDD was involved in the project, and whether the first phase of the project involved any private land (Mr CHIU Yan-loy);
- (3) he hoped that the LCSD would introduce the TKTVEP project again so that relevant papers of the works could be filed for record. In addition, he agreed that the approach of "resolving the simple issues first before the difficult ones" should be adopted. He pointed out that although the site in question could be used for other potential development, he believed that the area from Tso Kung Tam Outdoor Recreation Centre to the vicinity of Tsuen Wan town centre was unrelated to such potential development. Therefore, he suggested that the relevant works should be taken forward first (Mr WONG Ka-wa);
- (4) as it was decided that the approach of "resolving the simple issues first

before the difficult ones” would be adopted, he opined that works which would not affect the potential development, such as trail maintenance and the provision of railings, should be taken forward promptly. In addition, if the works involved any changes that would affect Tsuen King Circuit Recreation Ground and Rest Garden, he hoped that stakeholders in the housing estates in the vicinity would be consulted (Mr LI Hung-por); and

- (5) he believed that the CEDD had nothing to do with the project, and hoped that the LCSD would discuss the ways of providing the list of events with Members after the meeting (the Chairman).

30. SES/TW of the DLO responded that the DLO had to first learn about the scope of the first phase of the project from the LCSD in order to find out the private land involved in the project. Thus, the DLO did not have relevant information at the moment.

31. SEO(P)32 of the LCSD responded as follows:

- (1) after making the decision to implement the project in 2014, the LCSD had formulated the Project Definition Statement of the works project according to the established procedures for implementation of major public works, and had subsequently made an application to the policy bureau for approval. The LCSD had also commissioned the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) to conduct a technical feasibility study to explore the technical feasibility of the first phase of the project;
- (2) when the above work was underway, the LCSD learnt that the site in question could be used for certain more important potential development. Consequently, the project was shelved. If the LCSD continued to take forward the project, some of the facilities might have to be demolished due to the potential development, and that would lead to a colossal waste of resources. Such being the case, the LCSD would only proceed to explore ways of implementing works at those parts not affected by the potential development after the relevant departments had reviewed the impact of the potential development on the project;
- (3) the scope of the first phase of the project did not involve any private land. Works that involved private land would be implemented in the second phase;

- (4) as the document on the potential development was confidential, the LCSD could not provide it for Members at this stage; and
 - (5) the LCSD would discuss how it could provide a progress report on the project with Members after the meeting.
32. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:
- (1) he suggested discussing the ways of notifying the public of the project with the LCSD after the meeting (Mr WONG Ka-wa);
 - (2) he believed that the LCSD had done a substantial amount of work since 2014, and hoped that it would report on its work to Members so that they could give an explanation to the residents. Besides, he considered that the potential development would not only affect the TKTVEP, but would also affect the residents in Tsuen King Circuit and along Route Twisk. Thus, he suggested inviting the PlanD to send its representatives to attend the next meeting and explain the details of the potential development. He also demanded that the department responsible for planning should promptly decide whether or not to continue with the project so as to avoid giving Members any false hope about the project (Mr CHIU Yan-loy);
 - (3) the project development was becoming increasingly unclear at present. Nevertheless, he was certain that the Government did pledge to construct the TKTVEP years ago (Mr CHAN Yuen-sum, Sumly); and
 - (4) as the project had been brought up for many years, he hoped that it would make solid progress. Thus, he agreed that the captioned item should continue to be discussed. He also requested the LCSD to have a post-meeting discussion with Members on how it could provide an interim report (the Chairman).

IV Item 3: Funds Allocation for the District Planning, Development and Facilities Management Committee 2021/22
(DPDFMC Paper No. 4/21-22)

33. The Chairman stated that the DPDFMC was allocated a total provision of \$21,204,000 in 2021/22, from which an amount of \$6,645,000 (including 5% deficit budget) was allocated to the LCSD for organising activities, an amount of \$1,600,000 (including 5% deficit budget) was allocated for implementation of DC funds (Community Involvement Projects) and an amount of \$12,959,000 was allocated for implementation of district minor works (DMW) projects. He now proposed that the DPDFMC should allocate equal halves of the \$1,600,000 of funding

for implementation of DC funds (Community Involvement Projects) to the “Working Group on District Development, Planning and Economic Development” and “Festive Activities held in Tsuen Wan District”, i.e. each project item would be allocated an amount of \$800,000.

34. The Chairman enquired whether Members agreed to the proposed funds allocation for the DPDFMC and the administrative arrangements. Members unanimously agreed to the proposed funds allocation and the administrative arrangements.

V Item 4: Proposed New Items under District Minor Works
(DPDFMC Paper No. 5/21-22)

35. DLM(TW) of the LCSD introduced two proposed new items under DMW in Tsuen Wan in 2021-22.

36. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) regarding proposed new project item 1 – Beautification works at Tsuen Wan District Leisure Venues (proposed new project item 1), he hoped that the LCSD would adopt the views in the Report on Innovative Solutions to Urban Greening in Tsuen Wan, which included expanding the lotus pond in Shing Mun Valley Park. Besides, given that there was not much damage found in the toilets and changing rooms of Shing Mun Valley Sports Ground (SMVSG), he opined that the project estimate for proposed new project item 2 – Improvement works of Men’s and Ladies’ Toilets and Changing Rooms at Stand A East Side of Shing Mun Valley Sports Ground (proposed new project item 2) was slightly high. He hoped that in the future the LCSD would discuss its funding applications with the Chairman first before submitting them to the DPDFMC. In addition, he was concerned that the SMVSG would have to be closed for a while because of the works (Mr CHAN Yuen-sum, Sumly);
- (2) he hoped that the LCSD would adopt the views in the Report on Innovative Solutions to Urban Greening in Tsuen Wan so as to enhance the ornamental value of the flowers. In addition, he pointed out that the users of the basketball courts and soccer pitches hoped the LCSD would provide storage cages in the pitches under the LCSD’s purview and basketball court at Princess Alexandra Community Centre. He hoped that the LCSD and TWDO would follow up the matter (Mr

WONG Ka-wa);

- (3) he hoped that the LCSD would draw reference from the views in the Report on Innovative Solutions to Urban Greening in Tsuen Wan, and enquired about the colourful plants to be planted at Tsing Lung Tau roundabout and Ting Kau as stated in proposed new project item 1. In addition, he thought that the project estimate for proposed new project item 2 was a bit high (Mr LAU Chi-hung);
- (4) he was astonished that there were only two proposed new project items at present. Besides, the plants in Tsuen Wan Tin Hau Temple Garden were damaged during the passage of typhoon Mangkhut. He learnt that the LCSD had replanted some plants thereat, and enquired whether the planting works were included in proposed new project item 1, or the LCSD would carry out other beautification works at Tsuen Wan Tin Hau Temple Garden. In addition, he was concerned that when the epidemic situation had eased and proposed new project item 2 was taken forward, SMVSG had to be closed for a while. He hoped that the LCSD would further discuss the works in question with Members (Mr PUN Long-chung, Roy);
- (5) he hoped that the LCSD would provide the locations for beautification works in the paper in the future so that he could know prior to the meeting whether the LCSD had acceded to his request for an improvement to the planters at Hoi On Road Playground and lower road of Castle Peak Road. Besides, some plants that could change colours were planted in the vicinity of Belvedere Garden. Yet, they could do so only upon prolonged exposure to sunlight. As there was a lack of sunlight at the location where they were planted, their appearance changed from bright colours to green. He did not hope that there would be a recurrence of similar incidents at the newly constructed planters. In addition, he enquired of the LCSD whether climbing plants would be planted to serve as a natural noise barrier for reducing noise from illegal road racing. Lastly, the sand in Hoi On Road Playground had been dried by the hot air discharged from the air outlets of the shopping mall nearby. He opined that the LCSD had to discuss the issue with persons in charge of the shopping mall (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus);
- (6) he thought that the LCSD could study the proposal on using climbing plants as a natural noise barrier on Hoi On Road. In addition, he hoped that the LCSD would take the lead in adopting the views in the

Report on Innovative Solutions to Urban Greening in Tsuen Wan to develop Tsuen Wan district into the first greening town for reference by other districts (the Vice Chairman);

- (7) he agreed that floating plants should be planted in the pond at Jockey Club Tak Wah Park. However, there were many tortoises in the pond. As these tortoises might hurt the plants and were prone to carrying bacteria, he hoped that the LCSD would study different methods of handling the tortoises. Besides, he thought that it was necessary to take forward proposed new project item 2, but he hoped that the LCSD would attach importance to the condition of the water pipes when carrying out the works to prevent the recurrence of flooding on roads, which had occurred a few months ago due to a water main burst (Mr MAN Yu-ming);
- (8) he supported the two proposed new project items, and hoped that the LCSD would draw reference from the views in the Report on Innovative Solutions to Urban Greening in Tsuen Wan. Besides, he did not agree that floating plants should be planted in the pond at Jockey Club Tak Wah Park. In addition, considering the relatively high utilisation rate of the changing rooms and toilets in SMVSG and the visible wear on such facilities, he agreed that it was necessary to take forward proposed new project item 2. Lastly, he opined that the south side and west side of SMVSG also required maintenance, and hoped that the LCSD would put forth proposed new project items in this regard (Mr KOT Siu-yuen); and
- (9) he enquired how many of the views put forth in the Report on Innovative Solutions to Urban Greening in Tsuen Wan had been adopted in the details of proposed new project item 1 (the Chairman).

(Note: Mr NG Hin-lung, Norris joined the meeting at 3:44 p.m.)

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

- (1) when selecting plants, the LCSD would choose shrubs with coloured leaves as far as possible, but would also have to consider whether the plants would affect drivers' sightlines. The LCSD would grow copper leaves, Dalechampia and ivy trees at Castle Peak Road roundabout, and would also grow golden leaves and rhododendrons in an alternate pattern in the planters at the central dividing strip of Castle Peak Road – Ting Kau;

- (2) in proposed new project item 1, the LCSD had included some of the plants suitable for growth in Hong Kong that were mentioned in the Report on Innovative Solutions to Urban Greening in Tsuen Wan, such as rhododendrons, jasmines and Swiss cheese plants. In fact, the preparation for proposed new project item 1 was already underway before the LCSD received the above report. Therefore, the LCSD did not draw much reference from it. The LCSD would draw reference from the feasible proposals in the said report as far as possible when making a funding application in the future;
- (3) it was extremely difficult to use climbing plants as a natural noise barrier. The LCSD would liaise with Members to explore the matter after the meeting;
- (4) when the LCSD was about to put forth an improvement works project that incurred relatively huge construction fees in the future, it would discuss with the Chairman first before proposing it at the meeting;
- (5) the changing rooms in SMVSG had been in use for 23 years, during which renovation works had never been carried out. It had already been decided last year that the replacement works of the running tracks in SMVSG would be scheduled for March 2021, which coincidentally was the time when the epidemic was under control. The LCSD hoped to complete the works promptly so as to provide more quality running tracks for public use;
- (6) the LCSD would try to provide suitable storage cages in basketball courts and soccer pitches;
- (7) the water pipes in SMVSG would burst every few years. The water leakage problem was also extremely serious. The LCSD had all along been seeking assistance from works departments in carrying out maintenance works, but no department was willing to undertake the works so far. The LCSD would continue to follow up the issue;
- (8) the LCSD would grow plants only after thorough consideration. For example, when growing water lilies in the pond at Jockey Club Tak Wah Park, the LCSD had also taken into account the issue of tortoises biting the plants. Having drawn reference from past experiences, the LCSD would fence in the plants to prevent tortoises or other fish from entering the fenced area; and
- (9) the trees collapsed during the passage of typhoon Mangkhut in Tsuen Wan Tin Hau Temple Garden had been replanted. The LCSD would carry out other beautification works thereat under proposed new

project item 1.

38. The Chairman suggested that a ballot should be held for each of the proposed new project items. Members agreed to the proposal.

39. The Chairman asked Members to vote on proposed new project item 1. The voting result was 15 votes in favour, 0 against and 0 abstention. Proposed new project item 1 was endorsed.

40. The Chairman asked Members to vote on proposed new project item 2. The voting result was 11 votes in favour, 0 against and 2 abstention. Proposed new project item 2 was endorsed.

VI Item 5: Improvement of Tsuen Wan Riviera Park and Tsuen Wan Park
(DPDFMC Paper No. 6/21-22)

41. The Chairman said that the LCSD would brief Members on the Improvement of Tsuen Wan Riviera Park (TWRP) and Tsuen Wan Park (TWP). The representatives from the departments attending this meeting were:

- (1) Ms LAW Lai-chun, Gladys, SEO(P)32, LCSD;
- (2) Ms MAK Siu-kwan, Elly, Senior Executive Assistant (Planning)34B, LCSD;
- (3) Ms LEE Ka-lai, Jackie, Senior Project Manager 330 (SPM330), ArchSD;
- (4) Ms LAI Pui-yu, Project Manager 352, ArchSD;
- (5) Mr Nelson CHOW, Senior Director, Chows Architects Limited (CAL);
and
- (6) Ms Thobea WAN, Senior Architect (SA), CAL.

42. SEO(P)32 of the LCSD, SPM330 of the ArchSD and SA of the CAL introduced the Improvement of TWRP and TWP.

43. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) as he received many views from members of the public requesting that the mini basketball court should be kept, he thought that it was necessary to keep it and hoped that a standard basketball court would be provided alongside the conversion of the gateball court in the vicinity for use by residents in the nearby housing estates. The facilities for children were well designed, but he hoped that the slides

would not be of an enclosed design, which would render it difficult to discover in time any child who got stuck when sliding down. He also suggested installing safety protection means at the staircases of the slides. Besides, unless the LCSD could address the problems of dogs fouling and sand loss at the sandpit arising from the inclusive environment for pets, he had reservations about the provision of a sandpit. He also suggested drawing reference from the design of Yi Pei Square Playground and providing additional play equipment. In addition, he thought that it was not necessary to include a wide variety of flowers and trees, and it was better to focus on growing particular plant species. He also suggested providing additional seating. Lastly, he opined that it was necessary for the LCSD to consult the nearby housing estates again, which included the Riviera Gardens Estate Owners' Committee (RGEOC) and other OCs (Mr CHAN Yuen-sum, Sumly);

- (2) he said that there were only two turf soccer pitches in Tsuen Wan district, and expressed concern over the closure period of the turf soccer pitch in question due to the works. In addition, he was concerned about the works cost of the wet play area and the maintenance of order at the skate area, and hoped that more seating would be provided at the roof garden so that residents could use the facility more comfortably. Besides, he opined that the sandpit had to be managed properly, otherwise hygiene problems might arise in the future (Mr LAI Man-fai);
- (3) as the existing recreational facilities at the corner were close to residential premises, he welcomed the conversion of the area into a community garden so as to reduce noise impact on the residents. In his opinion, the recreational facilities constructed by the LCSD in recent years were dull. He thus enquired about the details of the more challenging and inclusive play equipment for children. Besides, given that there would be five toilet facilities provided in TWRP and TWP after the improvement works, he enquired whether the number of toilets was excessive. He also enquired about the cost of the entire improvement works (Mr LAU Cheuk-yu);
- (4) he could not accept that the departments sought Members' support for such a large-scale works project in haste. He pointed out that the departments would not make any further changes in the short term after implementing the improvement works. Therefore, he suggested

tasking the corresponding working group with the matter for further discussion. In addition, he thought that although a large number of facilities would be provided in the parks, they were not challenging (Mr WONG Ka-wa);

- (5) she had repeatedly requested that the newly provided toilet facilities in Tsuen Wan district should include gender-friendly or family-friendly toilets to facilitate their use by different families or sexual minorities. She was glad to learn that the current improvement plan proposed providing gender-friendly toilets for all users regardless of their gender, separate family-friendly toilets and separate baby care rooms. Besides, she enquired about the reason for not providing family-friendly toilets and separate baby care rooms in the toilet facility next to the community garden. In addition, she suggested providing individual rest rooms for cleaners, sufficient barrier-free access and braille information plates in the parks, Urdu translation on the signs, and pet-friendly spaces in the waterfront area. Lastly, she hoped that a meeting of the corresponding working group would be convened for in-depth discussion over the design concept of the improvement project (Ms CHAN Kim-kam);
- (6) he said that the Hong Kong Football Association would organise football matches at the soccer pitch of TWRP. However, only the seats in the middle of the spectator stand were retrofitted with a back rest at present. Thus, he suggested that the LCSD should install back rests for at least 70% of the seats so as to provide a more comfortable environment for the audience to enjoy the matches. In addition, he learnt that there would be a water fountain in the wet play area. He enquired about the details of the wet play area, and whether the LCSD had explored relevant safety issues. Besides, as rinsing facilities were not provided at the sandpit, he was concerned that children would easily become dirty after playing. He also enquired how the wheelchair users could use the sandpit. Moreover, although he agreed to the improvement works, he hoped to learn about whether the LCSD had consulted the residents in the waterfront area about the improvement works (Mr LAM Sek-tim);
- (7) as a District Councillor, he agreed to the improvement works, but he opined that the consultation by the LCSD was insufficient in that it had neither invited all the Members to give views nor consulted the RGEOC. Moreover, as the LCSD failed to provide sufficient

information for Members before the meeting, Members were unable to provide relevant information for the OCs in time, resulting in the OCs' objection to the improvement works. Therefore, if a ballot was to be conducted, he would cast his vote against the improvement works. In addition, he enquired whether it was possible to construct a basketball court near the dry weather flow interceptor, whether a stargazing facility would be constructed at the roof garden, whether the views put forth in the Report on Innovative Solutions to Urban Greening in Tsuen Wan would be adopted to a greater extent in planting work, whether a footpath would be provided in the waterfront area, and whether it was possible to consider adding the area off the basketball court to the improvement project. Besides, he enquired of the LCSD whether a district consultation on the improvement works would be conducted (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus);

- (8) the consultancy team engaged by the ArchSD had earlier conducted a Value Management Workshop (Workshop) to brief some of the Members and residents' representatives of the RG about the improvement works. He learnt that the ArchSD had incorporated some of the views from the members of the RGEOC who had attended the Workshop in the improvement works. He opined that it would be more desirable if a larger number of Members were invited to join the Workshop, and said that he agreed to the current improvement works (Mr LI Hung-por);
- (9) he agreed that a community garden should be provided. However, as the community garden was situated in public spaces, he was concerned about the management and maintenance of the plants. In addition, he agreed that the improvement works of the soccer pitch should be carried out. Given that the soccer pitch was inclined to one side at present, he enquired whether the LCSD would seize this opportunity to carry out improvement works in this regard. Moreover, there were only 300 seats in the soccer pitch, which he considered too little. He suggested providing additional seats and subsequently additional entrances/exits of the soccer pitch to facilitate the dispersal of crowds (Mr MAN Yu-ming);
- (10) he was glad to learn that innovative play equipment was proposed in the improvement works, and believed that no matter how the improvement works were designed, proper management would remain to be the crux of the matter. Thus, he enquired how the LCSD would

manage the facilities. Besides, he was surprised to find that the LCSD did not consult the RGEOC, and opined that if the government departments failed to conduct effective consultation, many issues would have to be followed up in the future. Therefore, he hoped that the LCSD would explain the details of the consultation (the Vice Chairman);

- (11) he welcomed the improvement works, but he opined that the time for consultation was insufficient. Thus, it was difficult for him to support the improvement works at the meeting. In addition, he was glad to learn that a slide of over two metres in height would be provided in the park, and suggested providing thrilling play equipment, such as swings which many residents in Tsuen Wan district had been longing for. Besides, he suggested submitting the improvement works to the corresponding working group for further discussion so as to enable Members to consult the residents during this period (Mr CHIU Yan-loy);
- (12) he thought that the lines in the floor plan were quite satisfactory, but there was still a gap between the proposed height of the buildings and the building height restriction, and the design was unremarkable. In addition, as such relatively exciting facilities as swings and climbing frames were not provided in the parks, children would not find the parks attractive. Moreover, there was already a community garden near Texaco Road at present, but there were no basketball courts near the parks. As such, he regretted that there would not be any basketball courts provided in the parks, and hoped that the LCSD would consider whether there was a need to provide an additional community garden (Mr NG Hin-lung, Norris); and
- (13) he hoped that the LCSD would prepare the presentation more carefully in the future and ensure precise use of words. In addition, as the works were improvement works, the size of the toilets should not increase in logic (the Chairman).

(Note: Mr KOT Siu-yuen left the meeting at 4:24 p.m.)

44. SEO(P)32 of the LCSD responded as follows:

- (1) she thanked the Chairman and Members for their opinions on the works project. The introduction given to the DPDFMC at the meeting was merely about the concept design of the proposed facilities

in the works project. Regarding Members' views on specific facilities including the community garden and children playground, such as the detailed design in relation to whether to provide a sandpit or swings, the LCSD would consider and adopt them as far as possible after listening to them. She hoped that Members would first focus on the discussion about the concept design of the works project and show support to the continued implementation of the works project;

- (2) the LCSD anticipated securing the allocation of resources to the works project this year. If Members supported the concept design, the LCSD would be able to secure funding this year and pass the matter to the corresponding working group for discussion about the design details. On the contrast, if Members did not support the concept design, the works project would have to be delayed for one year, and only by then could the LCSD secure funding; and
- (3) the ArchSD could only estimate the works cost after the detailed design had been completed. Therefore, the estimated cost for Phase 1 of the project was not available for the time being.

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

- (1) the current design was only a concept design. The LCSD hoped to learn about Members' views about the facilities. The detailed design could be further discussed; and
- (2) the LCSD understood that it was relatively difficult to manage a sandpit. However, if the final design proposal included a sandpit, the LCSD would draw reference from the management approach adopted in Tuen Mun Park for managing the facility in question.

46. SPM330 of the ArchSD responded as follows:

- (1) the provision of a community garden, improvement of the turf soccer pitch, and re-design of the children playground and toilets were proposed in the current concept design according to the LCSD's consultation on the project scope conducted in 2018;
- (2) the ArchSD proposed providing toilet facilities including male and female toilets, barrier-free toilets and universal toilets at the children playground and community garden as requested by the LCSD. The toilet facility at the children playground also included changing rooms and family toilets so as to bring convenience to the users of the soccer pitch and children playground. The ArchSD would also provide toilet

facilities on the LCSD's request;

- (3) the ArchSD would carry out the improvement works in phases so that some of the facilities in TWRP could be opened for public use as usual. It was anticipated that the Phase 1 of the project could be completed in three years. The ArchSD planned to first implement the works in relation to the community garden and improvement of the soccer pitch. The works concerning the children playground would be implemented only after the community garden had been opened;
- (4) the improvement works of the natural turf soccer pitch would include re-laying the underground drainage and irrigation facilities of the entire soccer pitch and resurfacing the venue with natural turfs. The ArchSD would also take this opportunity to adjust the level of the venue to solve the inclination problem. Therefore, it would require a relatively long time for the works. The cover of the spectator stand of the soccer pitch would also be extended under the improvement works to increase the area of the spectator stand with cover, thereby providing a more comfortable environment for the audience to enjoy the matches. The ArchSD could also arrange for installation of back rests at the seats;
- (5) the ArchSD would provide rinsing facilities at the sandpit of the children playground on the LCSD's request so that children could immediately clean themselves after playing. Also, as there were toilets next to the children playground, members of the public could clean themselves thereat. The ArchSD would discuss the design of the sandpit with the LCSD to tie in with the management and cleaning arrangements adopted by the LCSD; and
- (6) currently, there were two characteristic slides made of iron in TWRP. To preserve this feature, different types of slides would be provided upon completion of the improvement works. A zip line which was relatively exciting would also be provided at the back of the slides. The ArchSD could also provide facilities such as swings in response to Members' views.

47. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) the major users of the parks were the nearby residents, i.e. residents of RG and nearby housing estates. He hoped that the LCSD would consult them. Besides, he requested the LCSD to keep the mini basketball court (Mr CHAN Yuen-sum, Sumly);

- (2) he thought that TWP and TWRP were related to the entire Tsuen Wan district, and so the ArchSD should not invite the District Councillors of the constituencies near the two parks only to join the Workshop. In addition, given the enormous scale of the works project, the TWDC should be tasked with handling the matter, and the department concerned should not seek Members' support without conducting any prior consultations. As such, he requested sending a complaint letter to the LCSD (Mr WONG Ka-wa);
- (3) he thought that the playground should be able to take care of the needs from younger children as well as from older children. In addition, he thought that although the concept design was merely a fundamental concept, it was of utmost importance to the entire project. Considering the lack of consultation on the works project, he could not make a decision (Mr LAU Chi-hung);
- (4) he had seldom criticised the LCSD and works departments in the past. However, speaking of this improvement works project, it was genuinely difficult for him to trust the LCSD. He enquired whether the LCSD would still consult the residents of RG if the works project was supported, and whether Members could support the improvement works of the facilities selectively and discuss the details of the facilities in the future. He believed that residents of RG hoped to have proper communication with the LCSD before the implementation of the improvement works, and they would not mind delaying the implementation of the works for one year. In addition, he enquired of the LCSD whether the residents' representatives had been invited to the Workshop for once only since 2018 (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus);
- (5) he thought that the improvement works should not receive any objections, but the LCSD's time management was poor, and it failed to consult Members in advance. In addition, he thought that the departments were not introducing the concept design in a standard manner today, and had thus misled people into thinking that it was an introduction of the detailed design of the project. Besides, he opined that the LCSD should not force Members to support the project using the possibility of delaying the works for one year as an excuse. He suggested that the departments should make another introduction in the next meeting, and that the LCSD should be reprimanded in this regard (Mr LAU Cheuk-yu);

- (6) she was surprised at the LCSD's failure to consult the OCs or residents' representatives of the waterfront area. If the LCSD was to conduct a further round of in-depth consultation on the improvement works, she requested that the residents' representatives of the constituencies concerned should be invited for participation (Ms CHAN Kim-kam); and
- (7) he understood that the LCSD certainly wished Members to support the improvement works, and pointed out that the implementation of the proposed improvement works might have to be delayed for a year if Members did not support the works. In addition, as far as he knew, the LCSD had consulted the residents' representatives of the waterfront area. Besides, he suggested tasking the corresponding working group with following up the captioned item (the Chairman).

48. SEO(P)32 of the LCSD responded as follows:

- (1) the LCSD and ArchSD had invited the Chairmen of the RGEOC, Waterside Plaza OC, City Point OC and The Pavilia Bay OC to attend the Workshop held on 7 April 2021 with a view to listening to their views on the works project. In the end, the representatives from the RGEOC and The Pavilia Bay OC attended the Workshop and put forth their views;
- (2) the LCSD had earlier conducted a consultation via the TWDO to collect views from the residents nearby on the improvement works of the 11-a-side soccer pitch under the works project; and
- (3) after listening to the DPDFMC's views, the LCSD and ArchSD would enhance the design of the improvement works project to facilitate a thorough discussion in the meeting of the corresponding working group.

49. The Chairman said that the captioned item would be passed on to the corresponding working group for handling.

(Note: Mr MAN Yu-ming and Mr LAU Jackson left the meeting at 5:22 p.m.)

VII Item 6: Request for an Examination of the Feasibility of Providing “Barrier Free /Bicycle Ramps” to Alleviate the Difficulties Faced by Bicycle Users When Travelling within the District
(DPDFMC Paper No. 7/21-22)

50. The Chairman said that Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus submitted the paper. The representatives from the departments responsible for giving response were:

- (1) Mr LI Pui-sang, PC/2(NTW), CEDD;
- (2) Ms LEE Mei-sheung, Dickie, DLM(TW), LCSD; and
- (3) Mr LAI Yik-wing, Wesley, ADO(TW), TWDO.

Besides, the written replies of the TD and HyD were tabled at the meeting.

51. The Chairman said that due to the tight schedule of the meeting, the Member who submitted the paper had up to 1.5 minutes to introduce the paper, and each Member could speak up to 1 minute.

52. Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus introduced the paper.

53. PC/2(NTW) of the CEDD responded that the cycle track under the first stage of the Advance Works for Cycle Track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun would be opened for public use at the end of this month. Upon its opening, residents of Belvedere Garden could use the elevator at the footbridge at Belvedere Garden Phase III or the crossing near Tsuen Wan West Sports Centre, i.e. Hoi On Road and Lai Shun Road, to push their bicycles to the newly constructed cycle track.

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

- (1) members of the public could make use of the barrier-free access and bring their bicycles to venues with cycling facilities under the LCSD's management; and
- (2) if any departments intended to provide barrier-free bicycle ramps at footbridges, the LCSD was willing to act correspondingly.

55. ADO(TW) of the TWDO responded as follows:

- (1) cyclists could use the existing barrier-free access in the venues to take their bicycles to such facilities as the community halls and community centres under the TWDO's purview; and
- (2) regarding the provision of barrier-free bicycle ramps at locations such as footbridges or staircases, it had to be studied and planned by relevant departments.

56. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) although an elevator was provided at Belvedere Garden Phase III, there was no fallback plan at present. Therefore, if the elevator was out of

order, members of the public would not be able to bring their bicycles to the waterfront. In his opinion, the provision of barrier-free bicycle ramps was a cost-effective approach. He enquired whether the existing legislation had imposed constraints on provision of barrier-free bicycle ramps. If there was no such constraint, he suggested providing barrier-free bicycle ramps by means of a DMW project under the TWDC. Besides, he enquired of the LCSD whether barrier-free bicycle ramps would be provided in its venues in the future as a supplementary measure (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus);

- (2) upon commissioning of the cycle track, many members of the public would visit there to ride a bicycle. However, as many roads in Tsuen Wan were not suitable for cycling activities, and there were many footbridges in Tsuen Wan district, cyclists had to push their bicycles to the cycle track. He thus suggested that the TD and other relevant departments should explore the provision of barrier-free bicycle ramps next to the staircases of the footbridges to bring convenience to the cyclists who had to push their cycles or elderly people who had to push their carts (Mr CHIU Yan-loy); and
- (3) he requested the TWDO to convey Members' views to the TD (the Chairman).

57. PC/2(NTW) of the CEDD responded as follows:

- (1) regarding the proposal on providing ramps near the staircases of the footbridges for bringing convenience to people with large pieces of baggage with wheels, it involved the long-term repair and maintenance of the facilities, which were under the purview of other government departments; and
- (2) if ramps were to be provided at existing footbridges retrofitted with elevators for the convenience of members of the public pushing their bicycles up and down footbridges or across roads, the CEDD should proceed to explore the possibility with the relevant departments.

58. ADO(TW) of the TWDO responded that the relevant departments were obliged to follow certain professional standards when constructing footbridges. It would therefore not be entirely appropriate to task the Works Section of the TWDO with the provision of barrier-free bicycle ramps considering the construction and maintenance requirements. Therefore, the proposal had to be passed on to the departments responsible for constructing or maintaining footbridges for follow-up.

59. The Chairman enquired of the TWDO about the responsible departments.

60. ADO(TW) of the TWDO responded that the management and repair of different footbridges were undertaken by different departments. Some of the footbridges were even managed and repaired by private developers. Therefore, the TWDO could not point out the responsible departments.

61. The Chairman asked Members to learn about the departments responsible for the proposed locations for barrier-free bicycle ramps from the TWDO after the meeting.

VIII Item 7: Direction for Development of Spaces under Bridges, and Request for Additional Pet Gardens in Tsuen Wan

(DPDFMC Paper No. 8/21-22)

62. The Chairman said that Mr WONG Ka-wa submitted the paper. The representative from the department responsible for giving response was Ms LEE Mei-sheung, Dickie, DLM(TW), LCSD. Besides, the written reply of the HyD was tabled at the meeting.

63. Mr WONG Ka-wa introduced the paper.

64. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

(1) he agreed that there was a lack of pet gardens in Tsuen Wan district. He also said that many dog owners told him that the lack of suitable places for walking dogs in the district had rendered them prone to conflicts with other residents. Thus, he agreed that the LCSD should make optimal use of the land resources and use public spaces in the district for additional pet gardens (Mr LAI Man-fai);

(2) although residents agreed that the number of pet gardens should increase, they objected to the provision of pet gardens near their dwellings. Similarly, pet owners would support the construction of pet gardens, while people who did not keep a pet would object to such a proposal. Therefore, some people considered the pet garden as an obnoxious leisure facility. He opined that it was necessary to strike a balance between the pros and cons. In addition, he agreed that areas under bridges or other idle sites could be optimally used for constructing parks or leisure facilities. However, he suggested a

holistic approach to planning local development with the inclusion of such facilities as schools and hospitals at the planning stage, or else it would be extremely difficult to add these facilities upon the completion of planning (Mr CHIU Yan-loy);

- (3) he agreed that areas under bridges or other idle sites should be converted into pet gardens, but the venue management issue must be addressed properly in advance to prevent the recurrence of such incidents as the continuous water leakage from the bridge piers above Hoi Shing Garden, or else nobody would use the pet gardens. Besides, although the waterfront was now an inclusive environment for pets, there was a lack of play equipment for pets. Pet owners could only walk their dogs or cats thereat. He suggested that the LCSD should construct a pet garden with turfs and provide play equipment for pets therein by drawing reference from the pet garden at Tseung Kwan O Waterfront Garden (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus);
- (4) at present, dog owners would have a walk with their dogs around Tsuen Wan waterfront area. Although the waterfront was a vast area, some people who were afraid of dogs were still concerned that dogs would run around. He believed that it would not cost much to construct a pet garden, and so he agreed that pet gardens should be constructed at idle sites under bridges prior to their rezoning for other developments so as to provide spaces for pets to move around freely (the Vice Chairman); and
- (5) according to the HyD's written reply, the issue was under the area of land management, which was within the DLO's purview (the Chairman).

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

- (1) there were four pet gardens in Tsuen Wan at present. The LCSD was open to the provision of additional pet gardens. Members could advise the LCSD of any suggested locations suitable for pet gardens. The LCSD could also conduct site inspections with Members; and
- (2) after selecting a suitable location for a pet garden, the LCSD needed to consider a host of factors, including technical feasibility, demand for such kind of facility from the residents of the constituency concerned, land area available, and the impact of such a facility on the vicinity. The LCSD was also willing to collaborate with relevant departments and explore the proposal.

66. SES/TW of the DLO responded that if a department was to implement permissible long-term developments on government land under bridges, such as pet gardens and play equipment for elderly people and children, the DLO would act correspondingly according to its development timetable, including handling the allocation of government land, for implementation of the long-term developments.

67. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) as far as he knew, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals would set up an office near RG shortly. To avoid the impact of pets on Tsuen Wan residents, he suggested constructing pet gardens under bridges as gathering places for pets. He also suggested that the LCSD should draw reference from Lam Tei Pet Garden, which was also located under a bridge (Mr WONG Ka-wa); and
- (2) Members could submit suggested sites for pet gardens to the LCSD directly or via the Secretariat after the meeting (the Chairman).

68. The Chairman said that as the next agenda item was raised by him, the Vice Chairman would take over the chair temporarily.

IX Item 8: Proper Operation of Facilities Built under the District Minor Works Programme with Funding Support from the District Council
(DPDFMC Paper No. 9/21-22)

69. The Acting Chairman said that Mr LUK Ling-chung, Antonio submitted the paper. The representatives from the departments responsible for giving response were:

- (1) Ms LEE Mei-sheung, Dickie, DLM(TW), LCSD; and
- (2) Mr LAI Yik-wing, Wesley, ADO(TW), TWDO.

70. Mr LUK Ling-chung, Antonio introduced the paper.

71. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) he agreed to the Member's proposals. He was not aware that the roadside planters were managed by the LCSD but not the TWDO until now. To clarify the management responsibility of the facilities, he hoped that the department concerned would provide a list of facilities constructed with funding support from the DMW Programme. In addition, there were some DMW facilities at the waterfront, such as

fitness equipment and rain shelters. Upon the completion of the cycle track, there would be a gap between these facilities and the roadside. As such, he enquired of the TWDO whether these facilities could be moved nearer to the edge, and whether such relocation works would be counted as a new DMW project. Besides, the fitness equipment in the waterfront area had been damaged for more than two months, but the TWDO still could not manage to purchase the parts for maintenance. He enquired whether it was possible to pass the matter on to the LCSD for handling or request the LCSD to assist in purchasing the parts (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus);

- (2) she pointed out that many planter pots constructed with funding support from the TWDC around Tsuen Wan Town Hall were in poor hygiene condition, and the plants were also poorly maintained. In her opinion, it was necessary for the LCSD to solve these issues. She pointed out that the facilities constructed with funding support from the TWDC should be properly managed and maintained. Otherwise, it would constitute a waste of DC funds (Ms CHAN Kim-kam);
- (3) he thought that it was of utmost importance to provide an appropriate list to Members to facilitate their monitoring work. With such a list, Members could consider what maintenance works would be appropriate for any DC facilities they found to have fallen into disrepair, and avoid public sight of unpleasant-looking, dilapidated DC facilities (Mr LAU Chi-hung);
- (4) there were many unusual DMW facilities in his constituency. For example, a gate was constructed at the vacant site next to Luk Yeung Sun Chuen with funding support from the TWDC. He had written a letter to the Works Section of the TWDO in this regard to enquire about the reason for constructing a DC facility on a private land. In addition, there was a rain shelter at Route Twisk off Muk Min Ha Tsuen. However, as crash barriers were provided thereat, no minibuses would pick up or drop off passengers there. The rain shelter was thus rendered useless. As such, he hoped that a list setting out the DMW projects implemented in previous DC terms would be provided (Mr PUN Long-chung, Roy);
- (5) every year, the TWDC would allocate funding for implementation of DMW. However, the maintenance of the facilities was far from satisfactory. This morning, he received a complaint from a resident of Lo Wai Tsuen about a damaged wooden bench therein. If the TWDO

was tasked with repairing the bench, it would often take a long time for the vetting and tendering procedures before the implementation of the repair work could be taken forward. Therefore, he thought that it was necessary to streamline the repair and maintenance procedures (Mr LAI Man-fai);

- (6) currently, upon completion of a DMW project with funding support from the TWDC, a label printed with a QR code would be posted on the facility to allow enquiry about the relevant works information. However, he could not find such information on the websites of the Home Affairs Department (HAD) or TWDC. He believed that the HAD should have the list of the works in order to make the QR codes. Thus, he suggested that the list in question should be uploaded onto the HAD's or TWDC's website for inspection. This could also help eliminate Members' confusion as to whether a facility was constructed with funding support from the TWDC. Besides, he hoped that the previous records of DMW would be provided for public access (Mr CHIU Yan-loy); and
- (7) as far as he knew, the TWDO would renovate the rain shelters on a regular basis in addition to undertaking their follow-on management and inspection. Sometimes, residents might directly approach the TWDO to relay views instead of doing so through the District Councillors. Some of these views, however, might not be able to reflect the needs of the residents in the constituencies concerned. For example, there were many rain shelters at the bus stop below Luk Yeung Sun Chuen, and these rain shelters were retrofitted with horizontal railings. Some members of the public complained that the horizontal railings were blocking their ways, and so the department concerned removed all the horizontal railings during the renovation works carried out this year. He then received views from members of the public pointing out that the demolition of the horizontal railings had caused inconvenience to them. In this connection, he opined that the management work would be much easier in the future so long as government departments could conduct consultations properly in advance (the Acting Chairman).

72. DLM(TW) of the LCSD responded that the roadside planter pots constructed with funding support from the DMW Programme were managed by the LCSD. The LCSD had a detailed record of the number of planter pots and their locations, and

could liaise with the TWDO to compile a list and provide it for Members if necessary.

73. ADO(TW) of the TWDO responded as follows:
- (1) the Works Section of the TWDO would carry out regular maintenance and inspection for the facilities constructed with funding support from the DMW Programme in the district according to such factors as the pedestrian flow and utilisation rate of the facilities;
 - (2) upon receipt of views or complaints from residents or Members, the TWDO would also take follow-up actions; and
 - (3) facilities constructed with funding support from the TWDC were all recorded in full details in the minutes. The TWDO would also attach relevant papers in each meeting to explain on the details of such facilities.
74. Senior Inspector of Works (Tsuen Wan) of the TWDO responded as follows:
- (1) as the level of usage of different facilities varied, the Works Section would not inspect all facilities in a row. The TWDO would review the condition of each of the facilities individually according to the actual situation. In addition, upon receipt of views or complaints from members of the public, Members or village representatives, the TWDO would visit the sites concerned for inspection. If the sites were under the TWDO's purview, it would take follow-up actions;
 - (2) transporting fitness equipment was a major works project which might involve breaking up the entire set of fitness equipment and reinstalling it. It was also necessary to consult the residents of the constituencies concerned and obtain the DPDFMC's approval. Whether or not it was necessary to propose a new minor works project was subject to the nature of the works;
 - (3) as the fitness equipment was imported from overseas, the TWDO had to purchase the parts from overseas. Thus, it would take time for the maintenance work;
 - (4) the hardware of the planter pots was repaired and maintained by the TWDO, whereas the plants were maintained by the LCSD. If any damage was found on the planter pots, the TWDO would take follow-up actions; and
 - (5) DMW facilities constructed a few years ago bore a sign only, whereas newly constructed DMW facilities would bear a QR code. After scanning the QR codes, members of the public could find out the

departments responsible for managing and maintaining the facilities as well as detailed information on the facilities. As the QR code arrangement was coordinated by the HAD, the TWDO had to discuss with the HAD whether it was possible to upload the list onto the websites.

75. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:
- (1) he hoped that the LCSD would provide relevant information to Members directly or via the Secretariat after the meeting. In addition, he was discontented with the TWDO which only asked Members to refer to the minutes and did not provide the relevant list. He hoped that the TWDO would discuss with him the list which could be made available after the meeting to facilitate Members' inspection and monitoring. Besides, he enquired about when the sign bearing the words "Welcome to Tsuen Wan District" was constructed (Mr LUK Ling-chung, Antonio);
 - (2) he thought that the TWDO should not consider the matter from the administrative perspective, and should instead provide the list to Members so that the facilities could be repaired in time when they were damaged (Mr LAU Cheuk-yu); and
 - (3) he believed that the TWDO should have the list of the facilities when it carried out repair and maintenance works every year. Uploading the list onto the websites might be relatively complicated, but providing the list for Members should not involve a heavy workload. He hoped that the TWDO would discuss this with Members further after the meeting (the Acting Chairman).
76. ADO(TW) of the TWDO responded as follows:
- (1) the works to be carried out every year would be set out in details in a clear list in the papers of the DPDFMC and Environment, Health and Climate Change Committee. If Members wished to review the newly proposed works of each year, they could refer to relevant minutes; and
 - (2) as there were a considerable amount of works projects which had been taken forward in the past, it was difficult for the TWDO to list out all of them one by one. However, the TWDO could discuss with Members the ways of providing the information they requested after the meeting.

77. The Acting Chairman requested the TWDO to discuss with Members the issue concerning the provision of the list of facilities after the meeting.

78. The Chairman resumed the chair.

X Item 9: Request for Clarification of the Restrictions on Construction of Covers for Public Housing Estates in Tsuen Wan Based on Gross Floor Area (DPDFMC Paper No. 10/21-22)

79. The Chairman said that Mr LAI Man-fai submitted the paper. The representatives from the departments responsible for giving response were:

- (1) Ms CHUNG Dip-fun, Sarah, Senior Housing Manager/Wong Tai Sin, Tsing Yi and Tsuen Wan 2 (SHM/WT&T2), Housing Department (HD); and
- (2) Mr CHENG Ho-yin, Henry, SES/TW, LandsD.

Besides, the written replies of the ArchSD, HD and BD were tabled at the meeting.

80. Mr LAI Man-fai introduced the paper.

81. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) he thought that the Member's purpose of submitting the paper was not to clarify the restrictions on the construction of covers, but to find out the reasons for failing to construct covers. As far as he knew, the HD's facilities were constructed in accordance with the Housing Ordinance (Cap. 283) and were not regulated by the Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 123). An unsold housing estate should not have a land lease and should not be subject to any restriction on gross floor area. Thus, he believed that the HD would actually be glad to construct the relevant facilities as long as it consented to them and was willing to pay for the fees, and the new structures would not constitute any danger or contravene any legislation (Mr CHIU Yan-loy);
- (2) he pointed out that covers had been provided in many buildings of public housing estates at present, but they could not serve as rain shelters. As such, Members had to put forth the request for construction of covers to the HD, which surprisingly pointed out that it could not handle the matter because the proposed covers were not in compliance with the gross floor area requirement. This statement, however, was different from its written reply. He thus hoped to learn about the relevant reasons to facilitate the optimal use of resources and

bring convenience to the residents. Besides, he thought that it might not be feasible to construct covers with funding support from the DMW Programme, but he hoped to know whether it was necessary to take into account the gross floor area for the works undertaken with funding support from the DMW Programme (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus);

- (3) the housing estates in question had been completed for some time. With social advancement with the times, residents would have higher expectations for the facilities accordingly. For example, some elderly people with impaired mobility had to walk with the aid of a stick, and so they could not use an umbrella when it rained. Thus, he hoped that the HD would provide rain shelters at pedestrian walkways. In addition, he reminded the HD to pay attention to the underground public utilities, if any, when vetting the works, and suggested that the HD should conduct site inspections with Members to explain the reasons for not constructing covers. Besides, he enquired whether it was possible to construct rain shelters at Lok Shue House and Yeung Shue House as well as other locations in Lei Muk Shue Estate (Mr WONG Ka-wa); and
- (4) he pointed out that the BD's written reply had stated that public housing estates were exempt from the provisions of the Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 123), in contrast with the HD's written reply which stated that the provision of covers in public housing estates should comply with the Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 123). As the two written replies contradicted each other, he hoped that the departments would explain the matter (the Chairman).

82. SHM/WT&T2 of the HD responded as follows:

- (1) before constructing covers in public housing estates, the HD was required to go through a technical feasibility study (e.g. whether the proposal would be affected by underground public utilities) apart from complying with the relevant legislation. If a housing estate was granted by way of a land lease, it should also comply with the terms of the land lease, such as the restriction on gross floor area;
- (2) among the four public housing estates in Tsuen Wan district, Shek Wai Kok Estate and Fuk Loi Estate were public housing estates granted by way of a government lease, and the former one was also a divested public housing estate. Such being the case, construction of covers in

these housing estates was restricted by the land leases. As the permissible floor area of the housing estates had almost reached the ceiling set out in the land leases, the HD had to seek the DLO's approval before implementing any construction works. Unfortunately, the HD did not have information about the remaining floor area of the above housing estates for the time being; and

- (3) Lei Muk Shue Estate and Cheung Shan Estate were public housing estates vested through a vesting order, so they were not restricted by a land lease. Although the ceiling of the permissible floor area was not stipulated in the vesting orders, it was necessary to comply with relevant ordinances, be cost-effective and obtain approval from other stakeholders.

83. SES/TW of the DLO responded as follows:

- (1) the control and management of some of the public rental housing estates under the purview of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), such as Lei Muk Shue Estate and Cheung Shan Estate, were vested in the HKHA through vesting orders in accordance with the Housing Ordinance (Cap. 283). As a public rental housing estate vested through a vesting order was not restricted by a land lease, the HKHA was not required to make an application to the DLO for changing the gross floor area;
- (2) other public rental housing estates, such as Fuk Loi Estate and Shek Wai Kok Estate, were restricted by their respective land leases. The terms of each land lease varied in terms of the restriction on maximum gross floor area, if any, the definition of gross floor area and the residual gross floor area of the respective lot;
- (3) if the HD intended to construct covers and had to make an application to the DLO in accordance with the relevant terms of the land lease, the DLO would adopt complementary measures. However, the time required for handling the matter varied depending on individual circumstances. The DLO was also required to consult relevant government departments, and would take into account such factors as the terms of the land lease, size and location of the facilities and required floor area. If the lot in question involved other land owners, the rights in relation to the floor area held by each land owner would also have to be taken into consideration; and
- (4) the DMW Programme was a funding procedure by nature. The DLO

would only process applications lodged by the HKHA as a land owner in accordance with the terms of the land leases. The DLO would generally not consider the procedures for submission of funding applications by the HKHA or HD.

84. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:
- (1) he hoped that the HD would in the future not reject applications for construction of covers using floor area as an excuse without applying for exemption or ascertaining whether the gross floor area had been fully used. He cited Lei Muk Shue Estate as an example. Covers were only provided in the aged parts thereof, and were not provided in the redeveloped parts. Consequently, residents of Chuk Shue House, Lok Shue House and Kin Shue House would get wet in rain. Residents of Shek Wai Kok Estate also faced the same problem. Thus, he hoped that the HD would seriously take into account the residents' wellbeing and respond to the residents' demand for provision of covers (Mr LAI Man-fai); and
 - (2) he hoped that the HD would consider Members' views (the Chairman).

XI Item 10: Request for Provision of an Elderly Fitness Corner at Sam Pei Square by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department
(DPDFMC Paper No. 11/21-22)

85. The Chairman said that Mr LAM Sek-tim and Mr LI Hung-por submitted the paper. The representatives from the department responsible for giving response was Ms LEE Mei-sheung, Dickie, DLM(TW), LCSD.

86. Mr LAM Sek-tim and Mr LI Hung-por introduced the paper.

87. DLM(TW) of the LCSD responded as follows:
- (1) the LCSD demolished the chess tables and pavilion in Sam Pei Square Playground in December 2020. The height of the flower bed had also been lowered with a view to combatting illegal gambling activities effectively;
 - (2) there were six sets of fitness equipment and two sets of facilities for children at Sam Pei Square Playground. As the facilities for children in Yi Pei Square Playground were already open to the public and were rather attractive, the LCSD would liaise with works departments to explore the possibility of a focus on additional fitness equipment for

elderly people at Sam Pei Square Playground; and

- (3) after studying the possibility of the above proposal and confirming the works budget, the LCSD would proceed to consider providing the said facilities through the DMW Programme or by other means.

88. Mr LAM Sek-tim moved a motion on “request for the provision of an elderly fitness corner at Sam Pei Square by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department”. Mr LI Hung-por seconded.

89. The Chairman asked if Members would move a revised motion. No Members moved a revised motion.

90. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the motion. The voting result was 10 votes in favour, 0 against and 0 abstention. The motion was endorsed.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat conveyed the endorsed motion to the LCSD in writing on 28 April 2021.)

XII Item 11: Request for Priority Implementation of the Public Open Space and Recreational Facilities Adjacent to Summit Terrace
(DPDFMC Paper No. 12/21-22)

91. The Chairman said that Mr CHIU Yan-loy submitted the paper. The representatives from the departments responsible for giving response were:

- (1) Ms LEE Mei-sheung, Dickie, DLM(TW), LCSD;
- (2) Mr NG Kar-shu, STP/TW, PlanD; and
- (3) Mr CHENG Ho-yin, Henry, SES/TW, DLO.

Besides, the written reply of the PlanD was tabled at the meeting.

92. Mr CHIU Yan-loy introduced the paper.

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

- (1) the site in question was not an open space but a site designated for community facilities at present; and
- (2) the change of use of a site was under the PlanD’s purview. The LCSD had no comments.

94. STP/TW of the PlanD responded as follows:

- (1) the site was a Government, Institution or Community site (GIC site)

which could be used for provision of social welfare facilities that residents needed or be used by social service organisations in the district. An open space was an always permitted use;

- (2) although the Water Supplies Department (WSD) would no longer construct a raw water pumping station, spaces still had to be reserved in the area about 5 metres away from the pipelines for maintenance of the pipelines. After deducting the above reserved spaces, the site in question covered an area of more than 10 000 square metres;
- (3) in response to the Members' proposal on constructing social welfare facilities in the site concerned put forth in October 2020, the PlanD had contacted the Social Welfare Department (SWD) and requested it to explore whether to construct such facilities at the site in question. The current study was underway; and
- (4) given that the site in question was a GIC site, if the WSD held that it was possible to release some of the spaces for other uses, the relevant government department would review the implementation of relevant long-term uses according to the existing mechanism. Even if the SWD intended to construct social welfare facilities there, it would take a considerable amount of time. Thus, the PlanD did not object to using the site for constructing temporary leisure facilities for residents' use, as suggested by Members, before the commencement of the SWD's project.

95. SES/TW of the DLO responded that if a relevant government department was to implement permissible developments at the site concerned, the DLO would act accordingly in respect of land administration according to the department's development schedule, including arranging with the land owner about the handover of the site in question and handling the allocation of government land.

96. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) he hoped that the vacant sites would be used properly, and suggested including the captioned item into the Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting so that the departments concerned could report on whether the site concerned would be used in the next meeting (Mr WONG Ka-wa);
- (2) he supported the Member's proposal, and pointed out that it might take a relatively long time for the SWD to study the construction of social welfare facilities. To prevent wasting the site concerned,

considerations could be given to constructing temporary passive facilities thereat. He hoped that the departments would make a decision promptly (Mr LI Hung-por);

- (3) as far as he knew, the site should be an open space in order for the LCSD's Planning Section to construct a park thereat. Thus, he enquired whether parts of the site could be released and converted into open spaces for the construction of a park when the site was given to the SWD for new social welfare facilities. In addition, the Planning Section of the LCSD had stated that it would follow up any proposal from Members as long as DLM(TW) considered it feasible. He enquired whether this was true (the Chairman); and
- (4) according to the PlanD, the construction of leisure facilities on a government site required no change in the land use of the site, regardless of whether the facilities were permanent or temporary. However, if the site was not an open space, the Planning Section of the LCSD would not implement the construction works. He pointed out that the site in question had been left idle for 17 years. Although parts of the site were fitted with water pipes and did not permit the construction of facilities, there was still more than 10 000 square feet of space available. As it was rare for the WSD to release the site in question, he hoped that the LCSD would consider constructing simple leisure facilities such as pavilions, lawns and play equipment for children thereat for public use before the SWD made any decision on whether to construct social welfare facilities (Mr CHIU Yan-loy).

97. STP/TW of the PlanD responded that as the area of the site in question was not large, the PlanD believed that the SWD would face certain difficulties in using the site if part of it was isolated for use as open space.

98. DLM(TW) of the LCSD responded that the Planning Section was mainly responsible for endorsed works. The LCSD would continue to discuss works which were yet to be endorsed with Members, and examine whether the land use planning for such works was appropriate. Upon completing the examination, the LCSD would carry out a feasibility study of the works.

99. The Chairman stated that the captioned item would be included in the Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting, and requested the LCSD to examine whether there were any parks in the vicinity which might affect the

implementation of the proposal.

(Note: Mr NG Hin-lung, Norris left the meeting at 6:37 p.m.)

XIII Item 12: Concern about the Development Plan for Ma Wan Park Phase 2
(DPDFMC Paper No. 13/21-22)

100. The Chairman said that Mr PUN Long-chung, Roy submitted the paper. The representatives from the departments responsible for giving response were:

- (1) Mr CHEN Kin-tung, Tommy, Senior Estate Surveyor/Special Duty (SES/SD), DLO;
- (2) Mr NG Kar-shu, STP/TW, PlanD; and
- (3) Mr CHAN Chung-yun, Stephen, Senior Town Planner/Kwai Tsing (STP/KwT), PlanD.

Besides, the consolidated written reply of the DevB, LandsD, PlanD, TD and Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) was tabled at the meeting.

101. Mr PUN Long-chung, Roy introduced the paper.

102. SES/SD of the DLO responded that in view of the development of Ma Wan Park (MWP) Phase 2, the revised plan of the Roads Providing Access to the Development on Ma Wan Island had been gazetted and authorised in 2010 upon endorsement by the Executive Council. The revised plan stipulated that the developer had to construct an emergency access of 4.5 metres in width stretching from Fong Yuen Road to the existing square at the waterfront of Old Ma Wan Village. Given the design requirement of the emergency access, the works would involve some of the existing small beaches in the waterfront. Thus, it was necessary to carry out small-scale reclamation works. Such reclamation works were authorised works indicated in the drawing gazetted in 2010. To tie in with the implementation of the works of MWP Phase 2, the Government was carrying out the gazettal exercise according to the procedures stipulated in the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370).

103. STP/KwT of the PlanD responded that the overall development of MWP was restricted by the Master Layout Plan of MWP. The planning permission also came with planning conditions requiring the applicant to submit and implement arrangements for archaeological investigation or detailed plans for the preservation and restoration of historical relics, buildings and structures, which should be in compliance with the requirements laid down by the Heads of relevant departments or

the Town Planning Board (TPB).

104. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) the Report Summary on the Residents' Views Collected (Report Summary) attached to the paper could truly reflect the residents' opinions. He hoped that the Government would pay special attention to the Report Summary. In addition, he was concerned about the issue of cultural preservation. He pointed out that there were originally four Stone Tablets of the Old Kowloon Customs, but only two could be found at the moment. He hoped that large-scale archaeological research would be carried out during the works period. Besides, he hoped that the DPDFMC would continue to follow up the development plan for MWP Phase 2 (Mr LAU Chi-hung);
- (2) the Government had previously stated that it would send representatives to the TWDC to introduce the development of MWP Phase 2, but then it signed a relevant paper on 31 March 2021 without notifying Members in advance. As such, he hoped that the departments would give the DPDFMC a full picture of the development plan for MWP Phase 2 in the future to fulfil their previous promise (Mr WONG Ka-wa);
- (3) he enquired of the TWDC whether it was possible to assign a Member to join the Board of Directors of MWP Limited to speak on behalf of the TWDC. In addition, he believed that if the archaeological investigation was conducted by the developer at its own expense, it might result in the demolition of all the structures. Thus, he suggested that the Government should send officers for monitoring purposes. Besides, according to the Report Summary, residents did not wish that modular housing would be provided thereat. He thus enquired whether there was a plan for constructing modular housing at present. He received a consultative paper from the TD earlier stating that vehicles would be permitted to enter Ma Wan during specific opening hours. However, he only agreed that taxis should be allowed in Ma Wan, and hoped that the department concerned would follow up the issue (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus);
- (4) last year, she conducted an inspection at Old Ma Wan Village with the residents of Ma Wan and found that many buildings had collapsed. According to past experiences, the Government might overhaul monuments that could still be restored. She thought that this act

could not preserve the local cultural characteristics, and thus hoped that relevant departments would first carry out archaeological excavation before implementing the development so as to identify other monuments, if any, at the site concerned, and restore and preserve the existing monuments and buildings in Old Ma Wan Village. Besides, she requested that an elected representative of the constituency concerned should be assigned to undertake the monitoring of the preservation work under the development project and assist in revitalising the cultural heritage therein so as to benefit the residents of the constituency concerned (Ms CHAN Kim-kam);

- (5) he opined that the preservation work carried out by the Hong Kong Government was insufficient in the past twenty and more years, which had led to the failure to preserve some of the objects of historical value. In addition, the Report Summary pointed out the residents' concern over the traffic problems arose from the increase in population and tourists. Many of them agreed that Ma Wan should be the back garden of Hong Kong, and thus should not be overdeveloped. At present, there were already problems with the traffic in Ma Wan. He could hardly imagine the future situation (Mr LAM Sek-tim); and
- (6) the development plan had been implemented for more than twenty years. He was glad to see that the developer could finally resume the squatter structures thereat and arrange for the relevant persons to leave the squatter area. He pointed out that Ma Wan was a customs checkpoint of Hong Kong in the past, and believed that there were still some monuments yet to be discovered. He hoped that a committee on monuments established in the community would be tasked with investigation work to confirm whether there were still some monuments in Ma Wan, so that the TWDC and members of the public could monitor the monuments to prevent the developer from turning the them into a business for making money. Besides, he also hoped that the departments concerned would brief Members on the details of the development promptly (Mr CHIU Yan-loy).

105. SES/SD of the DLO responded as follows:

- (1) the DLO had already briefed the TWDC on the concept of the development of MWP Phase 2 in 2010. Members could refer to TWDC Paper No. 129/09-10 for details. The contents in the introduction were substantially consistent with the current Master

Layout Plan of MWP which was approved by the TPB in 2014. The concept and design details therein were still applicable in general;

- (2) The Hong Kong Polytechnic University had conducted an academic research on transitional housing in 2018, and proposed constructing temporary housing at Old Ma Wan Village. The DLO believed that the plan to construct modular housing mentioned in the investigation report in 2019 might be related to this academic research;
- (3) regarding the preservation arrangement, the land lease had already stipulated the historical monuments that had to be preserved, which included the stone tablet inscribed with “The Kowloon Customs”, Ma Wan Tin Hau Temple, stone tablets inscribed with "Kowloon Customs leased seven feet of land" and "Kowloon Pass", and “Mui Wai” rock inscription. The developer was required to submit a detailed preservation plan to the Government within 12 months, and had to implement the preservation work according to the plan upon approval. If other monuments were found thereafter, the developer also had to preserve them according to the laws; and
- (4) the DLO would convey Members’ concern over the appointment of directors of MWP Limited to the DevB.

106. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) despite the enormous scale of the development project of MWP Phase 2, only the representatives from the DLO and PlanD had attended this meeting to answer Members’ enquiries. Both the DevB and AMO had failed to send its representatives to attend the meeting to give response to enquiries about preservation of monuments and ways to monitor future developments. Feeling discontented with their absence, he hoped that the Chairman or TWDO would assist in handling the above issue. In addition, he enquired about how the current development plan for MWP Phase 2 differed from the plan launched in 2014, and what coordination work for the residents was being conducted. He hoped that relevant officers from the departments would give a presentation at the meeting (Mr PUN Long-chung, Roy);
- (2) although the department concerned stated that the plans launched in 2010 and 2014 were same as the current plan, he hoped that it would arrange a site inspection to give Members of this DC term a comprehensive introduction as most of them were newly appointed.

He also suggested passing the issue to the corresponding working group for handling (Mr WONG Ka-wa);

- (3) he asked the Secretariat to go through previous records to see whether the Government had indeed made a promise to send officers to a full council meeting of the TWDC again for giving an introduction at that time. If so, he requested the TWDO to assist in reminding relevant departments. In addition, the paper mentioned by the DLO was dated more than 10 years ago. He hoped that the DLO would send officers to attend the TWDC meeting again for giving an introduction. Besides, he requested the Secretariat to arrange an inspection, and asked the departments concerned to invite the developer to send its representatives to attend the meeting (the Chairman); and
- (4) she suggested inviting the residents' representatives of Ma Wan to join the site inspection (Ms CHAN Kim-kam).

XIV Item 13: Work Progress Report of Working Groups under District Planning, Development and Facilities Management Committee Meeting

107. Mr CHIU Yan-loy said that the Working Group on District Development, Planning and Economic Development had convened a meeting on 25 March 2021, during which a representative from the Institute of Future Cities, The Chinese University of Hong Kong was invited to brief on the Health•Sustainable Development in Tsuen Wan Report. Members praised the research report and expressed concern over the matter in relation to urban renewal, traffic and transport in the district. Besides, Members opined that the report provided data and professional advice on district matters. Thus, he suggested providing an electronic version of the report and a report summary for publicity purpose.

XV Item 14: Information Papers

(A) Report on Progress of District Minor Works
(DPDFMC Paper No. 14/21-22)

108. ADO(TW) of the TWDO reported on the relevant information.

109. Mr WONG Ka-wa suggested providing electronic display panels in venues under the TWDO's purview and outside the door of the TWDO office for showing the agendas of the TWDC meetings and papers submitted by Members, which could enable residents who passed by to learn about the functions of the TWDC and its relevant work. He hoped that the TWDO would follow up the matter after the meeting.

110. The Chairman asked the TWDO to follow up the matter after the meeting.
- (B) Report on Recreational and Sports Activities and Facilities Management in Tsuen Wan by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department
(DPDFMC Paper No. 15/21-22)
111. DLM(TW) of the LCSD introduced the paper.
112. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:
- (1) Upon a broad analysis of residents' views, he suggested naming the venue "Tsuen Wan Waterfront Cycling Entry/Exit Hub" (Mr LAU Cheuk-yu);
 - (2) he opined that the name of the venue would affect residents' sense of belonging towards the venue. Upon a broad analysis of residents' views, he suggested naming the venue "再會藍巴勒" ("See You Again Rambler"), "單眺藍巴勒" ("Gaze on Rambler on Cycles") or "單戀藍巴勒" ("In Love with Rambler on Cycles"). Alternatively, words such as "青公不要單車徑" ("No Cycle Track at Castle Peak Road") and "濱繪單車徑" ("Painting a Cycle Track along the Waterfront") could be appended to the venue's name to express people's demands in relation to the cycle track. In addition, he suggested that the LCSD should draw reference from elements used in naming residential properties in recent years, and name the venue "匯聚藍巴勒/The Meet·Rambler", "夕·西岸/Sunset Harbour" and so on. Besides, he hoped that the departments would conduct more in-depth consultation exercises on the Sham Tseng section of the cycle track (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus);
 - (3) she enquired whether the renovation works for the toilets at Sha Tsui Road Playground would include the provision of separate breastfeeding rooms, rest rooms for cleaners and family-friendly toilets (Ms CHAN Kim-kam);
 - (4) he considered that the area covered by "Tsuen Wan West" in the name of the venue was exceedingly wide. He suggested naming the venue using the names of the roads near the cycling entry/exit hub, for example "Hoi On Road Cycling Entry/Exit Hub" or "Rambler Cycling Entry/Exit Hub" (Mr WONG Ka-wa); and
 - (5) he held that it was not necessary to vote on the proposals for naming the venue, and suggested that the LCSD should draw reference from

Members' views and make its ultimate decision (the Chairman).

113. DLM(TW) of the LCSD responded as follows:
- (1) the LCSD noted Members' views on the name of the cycling entry/exit hub. It would make the ultimate decision in accordance with its usual approach for naming venues after an overall analysis of the above views, and proceed with the gazettal procedures; and
 - (2) the LCSD would provide details on the renovation works for the toilets at Sha Tsui Road Playground for Members after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The LCSD named the cycling entry/exit hub “荃灣海濱單車匯合中心／Tsuen Wan Waterfront Cycling Entry/Exit Hub”.)

- (C) Report on Cultural Activities in Tsuen Wan District by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department
(DPDFMC Paper No. 16/21-22)

114. M(NTS)M&DA of the LCSD introduced the paper.

- (D) Report on Promotional Activities and the Enrolment Rate in Tsuen Wan District Public Libraries by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department
(DPDFMC Paper No. 17/21-22)

115. Senior Librarian (Tsuen Wan) of the LCSD introduced the paper.

- (E) Report of Planning Applications of Working Group on District Development, Planning and Economic Development
(DPDFMC Paper No. 18/21-22)

116. Executive Assistant (District Council)4 of the TWDO introduced the paper.

117. Mr CHIU Yan-loy enquired whether the planning applications would be submitted to the DPDFMC for discussion.

118. The Chairman said that the planning applications would be submitted to the DPDFMC for discussion starting from June 2021.

- (F) Items Resolved by Circulation by the District Planning, Development and Facilities Management Committee during the Period from 12 February 2021 to 16 April 2021
(DPDFMC Paper No. 19/21-22)

119. The Secretary introduced the paper.

(G) Financial Summary of District Planning, Development and Facilities Management Committee Funds 2020/21
(DPDFMC Paper No. 20/21-22)

120. The Secretary introduced the paper.

XVI Item 15: Any Other Business

121. The views and enquiries of Members were summarised as follows:

- (1) he hoped to discuss the problems concerning Yi Pei Square Playground with the LCSD after the meeting (Mr LAM Sek-tim);
- (2) some residents pointed out that the basketball court in TWRP was often borrowed by schools given the priority accorded to their physical education lessons. He understood that this was in line with the existing policies of the LCSD, but hoped that the LCSD's Headquarters would conduct an appropriate review to strike a balance between the schools' priorities and the rights of other people to play basketball at certain times of the day (the Chairman); and
- (3) last year, he already discussed with the LCSD and DLO the issue of opening the access to the basketball court in Hoi On Road Playground. He learnt that the departments had agreed to opening the access, and hoped that a department would take up the related work shortly (Mr YICK Shing-chung, Angus).

(A) Date of Next Meeting

122. The Chairman reminded Members that the next meeting was scheduled for 28 June 2021 and the deadline for submission of papers was 10 June 2021.

XVII Adjournment of Meeting

123. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:19 p.m.

Tsuen Wan District Council Secretariat
1 June 2021