

Minutes of the 9th Meeting of
the Sixth Term of the Wong Tai Sin District Council, HKSAR

Date: 2 March 2021 (Tuesday) and
18 March 2021 (Thursday)
Time: 2:30 p.m. and
2:30 p.m.
Venue: Conference Room, 6/F, Lung Cheung Office Block,
138 Lung Cheung Road, Wong Tai Sin, Kowloon

Chairman:

Mr. HUI Kam-shing

Vice-chairman:

Mr. WONG Yat-yuk

Present:

Mr. CHAN Chun-yue	WTSDC Member
Mr. CHAN Kai-shun, Gary	"
Mr. CHAN Lee-shing	"
Mr. CHENG Man-kit, JC	"
Ms. CHEUNG Ka-yi, Kathy	"
Mr. CHEUNG Mau-ching	"
Mr. CHONG Ting-wai	"
Ms. KWOK Sau-ying	"
Miss LAU Ka-man, Carmen	"
Mr. LEUNG Ming-hong, Steve	"
Mr. MOCK Ho-chit, Sean	"
Ms. MOK Ka-han, Rosanda	"
Ms. MOK Yee-ha	"
Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy	"
Mr. SHUM Wan-wa	"
Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy	"
Mr. TANG Wai-keung	"
Mr. WAN Chi-chung, Hiroko	"
Mr. WU Chi-kin	"
Mr. YAU Hon-pong	" (Present on 2 March only)

Absent with Apologies:

Mr. CHENG Tsz-kin	WTSDC Member
Mr. LIU Sing-lee	"
Mr. SZE Tak-loy	"

In Attendance:

Ms. NG Chun-wei, Angel	Senior Estate Surveyor/Wong Tai Sin (District Lands Office, Kowloon East)	LandsD) Re:) Item III(i),) (ii) & (iii)
Mr. CHENG Po-ming, Danny	Senior Maintenance Surveyor (Wong Tai Sin, Tsing Yi & Tsuen Wan)	HD) Re:) Item III(ii)
Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP	District Officer (Wong Tai Sin)	WTSDO	
Mr. CHOI Tung-tsoi	District Commander (Wong Tai Sin)	HKPF	
Ms. LAM Yuen-ting, Heidi	Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Wong Tai Sin/Sai Kung)	SWD	
Mrs. TANG FUNG Shuk-yin	Chief Manager/Management (Wong Tai Sin, Tsing Yi & Tsuen Wan)	HD	
Mr. CHAN Wing-yin, Albert	Chief Engineer/E3	CEDD	
Mr. LEUNG Chi-ming	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Wong Tai Sin)	FEHD	
Ms. WONG Heung-hung	District Leisure Manager (Wong Tai Sin)	LCSD	
Mr. HUNG Kin-lok, Thomas	Assistant District Officer (Wong Tai Sin)	WTSDO	
Ms. TANG Kit-wah, Fanny	Senior Executive Officer (District Management)	"	
Ms. LEUNG Wai-chun, Karmen	Senior Liaison Officer (1)	"	
Ms. WONG Wai-fong, Bonnie	Senior Liaison Officer (2)	"	
Mr. LAU Hak-keung, Eric	Executive Officer I (District Council)	"	

In Attendance at the Meeting on 2 March:

Mr. Henry CHAN	Resident Engineer	Binnies HK Limited) Re:) Item II(i)
Mr. William LEUNG	Project Engineer	")
Mr. Tony LAU	Project Manager	")
Mr. LEE Chi-kai	Senior Engineer	WSD)
Mr. CHU Ka-hei	Engineer	")
Mr. TSE Kong-wai, Eric	Chief Transport Officer/Kowloon	TD	
Ms. CHEUNG Wai-ying, Olivia	Chief Leisure Manager (Kowloon)	LCSD	

In Attendance at the Meeting on 18 March:

Mr. LEUNG Man-tik	Public Relations Manager – Projects & Properties	MTRCL) Re:) Item III(iii)
Mr. NG Lap-kei	Senior Construction Engineer - Civil	")
Mr. FUNG Wai-chung	Senior Liaison Engineer	")
Mr. LAU Yan-heng, Henry	Engineer/Wong Tai Sin	TD)
Ms. LEUNG Man-ling, Karen	Senior Transport Officer/Wong Tai Sin	")
Mr. WONG Sik-ming, Sunny	Project Coordinator/SCL(2)	HyD)
Mr. CHU Kwok-ching, Timothy	Senior Engineer/RS(11)	")
Mr. CHENG Chun-tung	Police Community Relations Officer (Wong Tai Sin)	HKPF	
Ms. LEUNG Man-ling, Karen	Senior Transport Officer/Wong Tai Sin	TD	

Secretary:

Ms. FU San, Flora	Senior Executive Officer (District Council)	WTSDO	
-------------------	---	-------	--

Opening Remarks (Meeting on 2 March 2021)

The Chairman welcomed all to the 9th meeting of the Sixth-term Wong Tai Sin District Council (“WTSDC”). He said since the 7th meeting was conducted less than a month ago, during which there were also Lunar New Year holidays, the minutes of the 7th meeting would be circulated after this meeting.

2. The Chairman enquired whether Members had any comments on the agenda and proposed discussion timetable.

3. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy said he had raised a request to the Chairman for re-discussion of “Work Plan of Lantau Development” (WTSDC Paper No. 31/2015) which had previously been tabled in 2015 but he found that the item not included in the agenda of this meeting and the written reply given by the Secretariat prior to this meeting was confusing. He enquired the reason why the item could be discussed by WTSDC in the past but not at this meeting.

4. The Secretary said the letter of 23 February 2021 to the Chairman had clearly stated that regarding the discussion of “Work Plan of Lantau Development” (WTSDC Paper No. 31/2015) raised by the Chairman, the policy bureau concerned considered the relevant item for discussion and follow-up incompatible with the functions of a DC as prescribed in Section 61(a) of the District Councils Ordinance (“DCO”) since it had neither a specific relevance to nor impact on Wong Tai Sin District. Therefore, no secretariat service could be provided to WTSDC for the discussion and the issue would not be included in the meeting agenda. Nor would there be any follow-ups on the discussion.

5. Mr. CHAN Chun-yue enquired whether the Secretary would take any follow-up actions regarding Paper No. 31/2015.

6. The Secretary reiterated that no follow-up actions would be taken by the Secretariat for the discussion of the Paper.

7. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy opined that based on the Secretary’s saying and unless there was recent amendment to the DCO, the discussion in 2015 was also incompatible with the functions of a DC as prescribed in the DCO either. He enquired whether the minutes and papers of the discussion back then should be scrapped.

8. The Secretary replied that the discussion and follow-up item of “Work Plan of Lantau Development” at this meeting as raised was incompatible with the functions of a DC as prescribed in the DCO, reiterating that no follow-up actions would be taken by the Secretariat for the discussion of the item.

9. Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy called upon the District Officer of Wong Tai Sin (“DO(WTS)”) to respond to the enquiry made by Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy with regard to how the discussion in 2015 would be dealt with, which in her opinion had not been replied to by the Secretary.

10. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of the Wong Tai Sin District Office (“WTSDO”) replied that as explained in the letter issued by the Secretary on 23 February 2021, after consulting the relevant policy bureau and seeking legal advice, the Government was of the view that the discussion and follow-up item of “Work Plan of Lantau Development” (Paper No. 31/2015) as raised this time was incompatible with the functions of a DC as prescribed in Section 61(a) of the DCO since it had neither a specific relevance to nor impact on Wong Tai Sin District. Therefore, no secretariat service could be provided.

11. Mr. YAU Hon-pong said it would then be a mistake to allow the discussion of this item back then if the Secretariat considered that the item was of no relevance to district affairs and should not be discussed at DC meetings after consulting the relevant policy bureau. He enquired whether the Secretariat would correct the mistake by deleting the documents that should not have been handled.

12. The Chairman questioned if something had gone wrong in that the discussion on the item was allowed in 2015 but not at this meeting and enquired whether the Secretariat would take any corrective actions if the practice back then was wrong.

13. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO replied that upon consultation with the Development Bureau, it was considered that the proposed follow-up discussion on the “Work Plan of Lantau Development” (Paper No. 31/2015) was incompatible with the functions of a DC as prescribed in Section 61(a) of the DCO as the discussion had neither a specific relevance to nor impact on Wong Tai Sin District.

14. Mr. CHAN Chun-yue and Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy enquired DO(WTS) whether Paper No. 31/2015 and the relevant discussion in the minutes of the meeting would be scrapped. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy also suggested a note be added to the

document indicating that although the DC of this term had once proposed discussing afresh this item under Paper No. 31/2015, the discussion was not possible because of the incompatibility of the issue with the functions of a DC.

15. Mr. CHAN Chun-yue added that the government representatives should clearly understand what they could do instead of having their professionalism compromised as civil servants for the constant-shifting “red line”. He hoped the public could understand that civil servants were unable to perform their work normally due to the ever-shifting “red line”, and he questioned if the governance of the Administration would be jeopardised as the result.

16. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO replied that the meetings in 2021 should deal with the issues of the current year, and that he had nothing to add.

17. The Chairman said given that the current-term WTSDC was not allowed to discuss the “Work Plan of Lantau Development” without change to the DCO, Hong Kong people could clearly see how the Government repeatedly “moved the goal posts” and impeded the DC’s performance of its function with unjustified decisions time and again.

18. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO said he had just spotted that a placard with slogan related to a case involving the National Security Law was displayed by Miss LAU Ka-man, Carmen at her seat. In his view, the placard concerned might involve violation of the National Security Law and the principle of “One Country, Two Systems” enshrined in the Basic Law. All government staff were required to leave the room until the Member concerned stopped displaying the placard.

(The representatives of government departments left the Conference Room.)

(The representatives of government departments returned to the Conference Room after Miss LAU Ka-man, Carmen removed the placard concerned.)

19. Miss LAU Ka-man, Carmen queried when DO(WTS) had assumed the role of the Department of Justice, and whether he had done so many “nasty stuff” because he conceived himself as “God”.

20. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO pointed out that personal attack was involved in the so-called “nasty stuff” remarks expressed by Miss LAU Ka-man, Carmen. He demanded that she give a clarification, withdraw the remarks and

make an apology before the meeting could be resumed, otherwise, the government representatives would have no choice but to again leave the room.

(Miss LAU Ka-man, Carmen did not withdraw her relevant remarks. The government representatives subsequently left the Conference Room.)

21. The Chairman declared the meeting suspended and an extended meeting be further arranged separately.

Opening Remarks (Meeting on 18 March 2021)

22. The Chairman welcomed all to the extended meeting of the 9th meeting of the Sixth-term WTSDC and drew the attention of the meeting that there were several amendments to the agenda of this extended meeting as compared with that of the original meeting on 2 March, which included:

- (i) Cancellation of the item of “Ground Investigation for Diamond Hill Service Reservoir” (WTSDC Paper No. 15/2021). The Chairman expressed that the Secretariat had already circulated the Water Supplies Department’s reply to Members on the day of the last meeting;
- (ii) Cancellation of the item of “Concerning the Environment & Recycling in Wong Tai Sin District and Site Selection for Green@Wong Tai Sin” (WTSDC Paper No. 17/2021). The Chairman expressed that this item had already been discussed at meeting of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Committee on 9 March;
- (iii) Addition of an item of “Follow-up on the Works of Wong Tai Sin Public Transport Terminus and the Temporary Traffic Management Measures at Shatin Pass Road” (WTSDC Paper No. 21/2021); and
- (iv) Addition of an item of “Concerning the Following-up of Area Committees Reports” in the “Any Other Business” session later.

23. Members noted the agenda and proposed discussion timetable on table.
- I. Confirmation of the Minutes of the 8th Meeting of Wong Tai Sin District Council held on 5 February 2021
24. Members noted that no comments on the minutes of the last meeting were received prior to the meeting and endorsed the confirmation of the minutes of the last meeting.
- II. Progress Report of the 8th Meeting of the Wong Tai Sin District Council held on 5 February 2021
(WTSDC Paper No. 14/2021)
25. Ms. MOK Yee-ha enquired about the follow-ups on the District-led Actions Scheme (“DAS”). She said she had reiterated during the last meeting that WTSDO should conduct an in-depth review on DAS to analyse in details the pros and cons of the Scheme and make improvements accordingly. However, WTSDO had not given an account on the review details in the progress report, nor did it report the review progress to this meeting. She hoped that WTSDO could give a reply in this regard.
26. Mr. HUNG Kin-lok, Thomas of WTSDO responded that WTSDO was for the time being conducting a thorough review on the progress and effectiveness of all the projects under DAS in 2020-21, and mapping out the work directions of DAS in 2021-22. He continued that WTSDO had noted and was actively considering Members’ comments on DAS and hoped to finish the review as quickly as possible.
27. Mr. SHUM Wan-wa opined that WTSDO’s response reflected that the Office did not have any specific directions for DAS. He pointed out that the Scheme, in particular its project of the Community Resource Centre (“CRC”), would end at the end of June 2021, and Members were therefore very much concerned about the provision of future services and the impact on the residents in Wong Tai Sin District. He hoped WTSDO could give a detailed account to Members on the future direction of the Scheme.
28. Ms. MOK Yee-ha noted WTSDO’s response but queried why WTSDO did not give an account on the issue in the progress report. To her, WTSDO’s response,

be it just one sentence, was a very important update on the progress. Therefore, she strongly requested the response be added in the progress report.

29. The Chairman expressed that the CRC would cease operation in June 2021. He hoped WTSDO could give an account on the future development direction of the project, including whether non-governmental organisations (“NGOs”) would be invited to bid for the operation of the CRC or participation in the scheme project. Saying that the cessation was just three months away, he hoped WTSDO would promptly give an account on the future development directions of DAS.

30. Mr. SHUM Wan-wa called upon DO(WTS) to make a response.

31. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO expressed that Members’ comments on DAS were noted and that the Office was currently conducting a comprehensive review on the Scheme. WTSDO was willing to give Members a detailed account on the progress made, if any, at the next DC meeting.

32. Mr. TANG Wai-keung expressed that tendering exercise could not be done overnight. As the current DAS would end in June 2021, he hoped WTSDO would listen to Members’ views by allowing sufficient time for expeditious completion of the review and tendering exercise.

33. Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy expressed that there were only three months left before the end of June 2021 and WTSDO should refrain itself from being sluggish in handling the issue of DAS. She opined that WTSDO did not get itself well-prepared to allay Members’ concerns over the Scheme.

34. Ms. KWOK Sau-ying shared the view of Mr. TANG Wai-keung on the progress of tendering exercises. She pointed out that if WTSDO still did not have the future directions for DAS finalised and expeditiously commence tendering exercises, it would not be possible to complete the work for smooth transition of CRC before the end of June 2021. She would express deep regret if unnecessary impact was caused to CRC due to WTSDO’s failure in expeditiously completing the review and commencing tendering exercises, and WTSDO would by then owe the residents in Wong Tai Sin District an explanation.

35. Mr. CHAN Kai-shun, Gary enquired with WTSDO about the review work timetable for DAS.

36. Ms. MOK Ka-han, Rosanda expressed that it had been more than one month since the last WTSDC meeting but WTSDO still could not give Members a clear account on the future directions for DAS and CRC. She pointed out that while many residents were expecting an early decision of Members and WTSDO on the way forward of the Scheme, WTSDO just responded that it would give an account at the next DC meeting. She considered DO(WTS)'s response illogical. Besides, although WTSDO had briefly expressed in the Paper that inclusion of "elements of community health services" in the Scheme could be explored, up to then it still failed to give a concrete response as to whether the elements concerned could be included. She found this puzzling and hoped WTSDO would give a concrete response as soon as possible.

37. Mr. SHUM Wan-wa expressed that all Members expected inclusion of elements of community health services in DAS and enhancement of district mobile services in response to the demand of the community amidst the epidemic. He hoped that WTSDO could take forward the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region's policy vision of "capitalising on local opportunities". He also expressed regret over WTSDO's failure to make concrete and clear decision on the future directions of DAS, considering that WTSDO had failed to meet the public's expectations.

38. The Chairman enquired how WTSDO could ensure a smooth transition of CRC after the end of June 2021, and enquired about the specific future directions for DAS.

39. In response, Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO stated that CRC was one of the projects under DAS in Wong Tai Sin District. WTSDO would make use of the remaining few months to make a thorough review on the effectiveness of the whole Scheme. Besides, WTSDO had taken note of Members' views on CRC and was making active efforts for the preparation. WTSDO would give WTSDC a detailed account on the Scheme as quickly as possible after assessing all the views received.

40. The Chairman said the residents in Wong Tai Sin who were watching the Facebook live broadcast at the moment could see that WTSDO did not in effect give any concrete responses to the questions raised and that as a matter of fact, WTSDC did not obstruct WTSDO from doing the work concerned. He continued that Members had repeatedly expressed their views on DAS during the meetings of District

Management Committee and WTSDC last year but it seemed that WTSDO was not willing to listen to and take care of Members' concerns.

41. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO responded that WTSDO noted and would consider Members' views as well, stating that WTSDC would be informed of the update once available.

42. The Chairman opined that Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO did not give any concrete response, and he believed that justice lay in the heart of everyone and members of the public had a clear idea of WTSDO's performance.

43. Mr. TANG Wai-keung requested WTSDO to give Members an account on the administrative procedures regarding DAS in writing, and hoped that WTSDO could familiarise itself with the tendering procedures of the Government Logistics Department.

44. Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy pointed out that according to the website of Home Affairs Department ("HAD"), the DO(WTS) should ensure that the advice of the DC was properly followed up and should act as a link between DC and government departments. While Mr. TSUI Ying-wai, Caspar, JP, the Secretary for Home Affairs, had mentioned on the internet a few months ago that the DCs had already lapsed and lost their function by always obstructing the Government from doing its work, it was her opinion that one could see from the way WTSDO handled the DAS issue that its performance should be considered "maladministration" as it handled the issue in a perfunctory manner and refused to listen to Members' views, which was a clear violation of the duties set out on HAD's website.

45. Mr. SHUM Wan-wa enquired with WTSDO whether it had made contact with NGOs to discuss the future development of CRC, whether it had commenced the tender exercise for CRC, and whether it would cease the operation of CRC.

46. Ms. KWOK Sau-ying hoped WTSDO would also review the service quality of the service contractors of CRC, opining that this issue was also of considerable importance.

47. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO said he, as DO(WTS), would definitely ensure that the views of DC were properly followed up. He also expressed that WTSDO would consider whether or not to continue the CRC project under DAS

after reviewing its operation. If continued, WTSDO would consider whether the same operation mode would be adopted, and whether the same NGO should continue to run the Centre or other NGOs would be invited by way of tender to participate in the project. If not continued, WTSDO would consider how the resources concerned should be re-allocated. He reiterated that WTSDO would, after considering all the views and possible situations as well, inform WTSDC of the decisions made as soon as possible. Regarding the service quality of the service contractor of CRC, he expressed that as the service agreement with the current service contractor would expire at the end of June 2021, WTSDO would by then conduct a review and examine the issue.

48. The Chairman believed WTSDO would just keep repeating the same response even if further enquiries were made. Members of the public could tell from this meeting who were making efforts to fight for the community's well-being. He expressed that WTSDC would continue to follow up on the issues and he hoped WTSDO could provide a written response to Members' enquiries before the next meeting.

49. Mr. SHUM Wan-wa said that if WTSDO could not give any concrete responses to the enquiries, DC would have no choice but to instruct the Secretariat to write to the Office of Ombudsman and file a complaint against WTSDO for its perfunctory handling of DAS. He pointed out that WTSDO and WTSDC were currently in a state of deadlock and that WTSDC did not have an independent Secretariat to handle such affairs, which would, in his view, cause loss to the residents in Wong Tai Sin District.

50. Mr. CHENG Man-kit, JC expressed that according to the Government's Budget, the funding allocation would be increased for optimisation of DAS in 18 districts, and it was noted that the estimates for DAS for the next financial year would increase by \$3,340,000 with a creation of 35 new posts to implement the Scheme. Thus, one could see that DAS would continue to exist after June 2021. While enquiring whether some of these 35 new posts would be assigned to help the implementation in Wong Tai Sin District, he also wanted to know the current progress of the recruitment work, and the duty scope of those posts.

51. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO expressed that WTSDO was actively conducting a comprehensive review on the work of DAS. Therefore, he disagreed to Members' accusations against WTSDO and opined that the so-called "maladministration" did not exist.

52. Mr. HUNG Kin-lok, Thomas of WTSDO expressed that the Office would still plan the work basing on last year's budget estimates and that the final funding allocated for DAS in the financial year 2021-22 would be subject to the approval of HAD, which was still pending. WTSDO had received no notification concerning the increase of funding allocation for Wong Tai Sin District and the creation of related posts.

53. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy enquired with WTSDO by which date the review was expected to be completed.

54. In response, Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO said that he understood the time-limited nature of the Scheme and that WTSDO would, after expeditiously completing all the review work, give Members a full account.

55. Mr. LEUNG Ming-hong, Steve enquired about the surveillance issue in Wong Tai Sin District. He called upon the Police and the Transport Department ("TD") to tell Members if the electronic audible traffic signals ("eATS") device had surveillance function.

56. Mr. CHOI Tung-tsoi of the Hong Kong Police Force ("HKPF") expressed that the Police did not install and was not responsible for the eATS device, nor did it have any relevant information.

57. Ms. LEUNG Man-ling, Karen of TD expressed that there was no relevant information available at the moment and she would provide Members with the information after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The eATS device mounted at pedestrian signal poles would only indicate the prevailing pedestrian signal states to visually-impaired persons by means of different vibrating patterns and it did not have any surveillance function. For the detailed information on the device, Members might refer to TD's pamphlet at <https://www.td.gov.hk/filemanager/tc/publication/electronic%20audible%20traffic%20signals%20chi.pdf>.)

58. Members noted the Paper.

III. Discussion Items

(i) Site Arrangement for the Redevelopment of Wong Tai Sin Hospital
(WTSDC Paper No. 16/2021)

59. Mr. TANG Wai-keung presented the Paper on behalf of Mr. CHEUNG Mau-ching, Ms. MOK Ka-han, Rosanda, Mr. SHUM Wan-wa, Mr. CHAN Lee-shing and Mr. WU Chi-kin.

60. The Chairman expressed that the written replies (Annex I) by the Planning Department (“PlanD”) and Hospital Authority (“HA”) were placed on the table for Members’ reference. Both Departments expressed that they were unable to deploy staff to attend the meeting.

61. Ms. NG Chun-wei, Angel of the Lands Department (“LandsD”) expressed that the Department had the established procedures in place for handling the public works concerned. Generally speaking, the responsible department was required to conduct feasibility study and have the report circulated among government departments for professional advice before the commencement of works project. LandsD would give comments on the site arrangement upon receipt of the feasibility study report. Taking the redevelopment project of TWGHs Wong Tai Sin Hospital (“WTSH”) as an example, she said the suggestions contained in the Paper had to be conveyed to HA for consideration and the Department would make appropriate arrangements accordingly.

62. Mr. WU Chi-kin expressed that although the redevelopment project of WTSH fell under the Second Ten-year Hospital Development Plan of HA, he was of the view that the Authority should expeditiously work on the planning of WTSH, especially for the formation of a cooperative “hospital group” between WTSH and Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital (“OLMH”). Therefore, he suggested HA deploy staff to attend the next meeting. Besides, he enquired with LandsD about the approximate time required to review the feasibility study report, and the knowledge of which could facilitate his follow-up with HA and the discussion on issues concerning the relocation of Evangel Children’s Home (“ECH”).

63. Ms. KWOK Sau-ying expressed that the sites of the former Diamond Hill Kwong Yum Home for the Aged and ECH were located between OLMH and WTSH. She pointed out that Wong Tai Sin District lacked sufficient sites for medical and

healthcare services to meet the medical demands of residents in the district. She, stressing that Wong Tai Sin District was still in need of elderly and children services, suggested HA make appropriate use of the sites and conduct early planning. Besides, she also enquired about the current number of service places available in ECH.

64. Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy expressed that the 2019 Legislative Council Paper was prepared based on the information in 2016, which was 5 years ago already. There were many elderly persons in Wong Tai Sin District along with a problem of shortage in bed places. She enquired whether LandsD had, after five years upon completion of the feasibility study report, reviewed the current shortage of bed spaces. Pointing out that Members had been making efforts to fight for the public, she expressed disappointment in HA for not deploying staff to attend the meeting and the departments for not being cooperative.

65. The Chairman explained that HA was in charge of the project concerned.

66. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy said that he had already raised such suggestion before he was elected as a DC Member and such suggestion was supported by many members of the public. Thus, he was in support of the Paper. Although HA had replied that it planned to reserve the current sites of the service reservoirs for the redevelopment and expansion of WTSH at this stage, the relocation of the service reservoirs was dateless and the location was very far from OLMH, which ran athwart the suggestion in the Paper.

67. Mr. TANG Wai-keung wanted to confirm whether the usage duration by the youth residential home for provision of temporary shelter at the site of the former Kwong Yum Home for the Aged was 7 years. Besides, he added that OLMH had already been planned to link with WTSH according to the papers of the Town Planning Board. He hoped that in view of the availability of sites in Wong Tai Sin District for re-planning, the service users of ECH could be allowed to have early preparation if the Home was to be relocated. He also hoped to discuss the issue with HA.

68. In response, Ms. LAM Yuen-ting, Heidi of the Social Welfare Department (“SWD”) said that ECH was a SWD-subsidised service unit providing residential care service for children aged 6-18 with 81 subsidy places. Besides, since the site on which this service unit was also providing self-financing residential service was granted by private treaty, the Department did not have the information about the number of places in this regard.

69. Ms. NG Chun-wei, Angel of LandsD responded that the site of the former Kwong Yum Home for the Aged would be granted to SWD through short term government tenancy with duration up to 7 years. She explained that HA's feasibility study report would be submitted to the departments not for the purpose of vetting and approval but for seeking departments' comments on the project works. HA would have further study in details after gauging views from different parties, and the time of completion would be decided by the responsible department itself. Upon receipt of the feasibility study report on the project works, LandsD would give advice on the site involved in the project works, such as whether the site was on private land or Government land, as well as the land use of the site, for other departments' reference.

70. Ms. LAM Yuen-ting, Heidi of SWD added that the site of the former Kwong Yum Home for the Aged would be temporarily used by Holland Hostel which was originally located in Kwun Tong.

71. Ms. CHEUNG Ka-yi, Kathy said that during a meeting she had attended earlier on behalf of WTSDC, HA had expressed to her that the Authority would not attend this meeting as it had no supplementary information to provide in addition to the written reply. She hoped that DC would invite HA to the meeting again.

72. Mr. CHAN Kai-shun, Gary expressed support for the suggestion in the Paper but showed his disappointment with HA's written reply. He pointed out that it had already been 2 years since the Legislative Council Paper was put on the table in 2019 but HA still stated in paragraph 3 of its current reply that there was no confirmed timetable at this stage. It seemed that HA was taking this issue lightly. He called upon the government departments to attach importance to people's basic livelihood issues.

73. Ms. KWOK Sau-ying enquired about the current number of persons staying in ECH.

74. Mr. TANG Wai-keung enquired about the tenancy status of the temporary carpark near WTSH and Wu York Yu Maternal & Child Health Centre.

75. In response, Ms. LAM Yuen-ting, Heidi of SWD said that she did not have the relevant information on the number of persons staying at the moment but could provide the relevant information after the meeting for Members' reference. However,

the number concerned might vary each day. According to her understanding, there was a rather strong demand for the service.

76. Ms. NG Chun-wei, Angel of LandsD responded that she did not have the relevant information on the temporary carpark concerned at the moment but could provide it after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: Ms. LAM Yuen-ting, Heidi of SWD expressed to the Secretariat that according to the Department's records in early March, there were 72 children residing in ECH and 2 others undergoing the admission procedures. Besides, Ms. NG Chun-wei, Angel of LandsD expressed after the meeting that according to the records, the temporary carpark located south of the Wu York Yu General Out-patient Clinic was rented out on Short Term Tenancy (STT No. KX3108) to an operator in 2019 as fee-paying public car park. The STT was currently renewed on a quarterly basis.)

Impromptu Motion: "The Council Proposes the Sites of the Former Diamond Hill Kwong Yum Home for the Aged and Evangel Children's Home be Appropriated for the Redevelopment of TWGHs Wong Tai Sin Hospital in the Future"

77. The Chairman expressed that this motion was moved by Mr. TANG Wai-keung and seconded by 12 DC Members (Annex II).

78. The Chairman confirmed that no amendment to the motion was proposed by Members present.

79. The Chairman said that the motion raised by Mr. TANG Wai-keung would be voted on in accordance with the Standing Orders. The results were as follows:

For:	14 votes
Against:	0 vote
Abstention:	1 vote
<hr/>	
Total:	15 votes

80. The Chairman announced the passage of the motion and tasked the Secretariat to convey it to HA for follow-up actions. HA was to be invited to the next DC meeting for discussion on the site arrangement for the redevelopment of WTSH.

(ii) Impact of the Gross Floor Area Requirement of the Public Rental Housing Estates and Private Housing Estates in Wong Tai Sin District on the Provision of Covered Facilities
(WTSDC Paper No. 18/2021)

81. The Chairman welcomed Ms. NG Chun-wei, Angel, Senior Estate Surveyor/Wong Tai Sin (District Lands Office, Kowloon East) of LandsD, and Mr. CHENG Po-ming, Danny, Senior Maintenance Surveyor/WTT of the Housing Department (“HD”) to the meeting for this agenda item. He expressed that the Secretariat had already circulated to Members the written replies from LandsD, HD and the Buildings Department (“BD”) in regard to the above Paper for Members’ information.

82. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy presented the Paper.

83. Mr. CHENG Po Ming, Danny of HD responded that he could not provide Members with the actual figures at the moment as it took time to calculate the gross floor area (“GFA”) of the public rental housing (“PRH”) estates concerned.

84. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy expressed that while many DC Members kept receiving views from residents on the provision of covered pedestrian facilities in the PRH estates, HD often refused the provision on the excuse that the GFA of the PRH estates had already been used up. He enquired about the relevance between the maximum allowable GFA and the provision of covered facilities, and whether the provision of covered pedestrian facilities in estates, as appropriate, could be allowed even when the GFA was used up. He pointed out that the PRH estates were currently held by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (“HKHA”) under vesting order or in the form of land leases. According to the written reply of HD, while there was no cap on the allowable GFA set for PRH estates held under vesting order (unlike the ones under land leases), such as Mei Tung Estate, Tung Wui Estate and Shatin Pass Estate mentioned in the Paper, relevant legislations such as the Town Planning Ordinance and the Buildings Ordinance had to be complied with. However, according to the written reply of BD, PRH estates including Mei Tung Estate, Tung Wui Estate and Shatin Pass

Estate did not fall within the regulatory ambit of the Buildings Ordinance and the purview of BD. Therefore, he opined that HD had given a misleading reply and failed to answer Members' enquiries. According to his understanding and the replies of the departments, Mei Tung Estate, Tung Wui Estate and Shatin Pass Estate were neither under the land leases' restrictions nor the regulatory ambit of the Buildings Ordinance. Therefore, theoretically speaking, the provision of covered pedestrian facilities in these estates should be of no relevance to their GFA.

85. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy continued that regarding the PRH estates granted in the form of land leases such as Tsz Man Estate and Tsz Ching Estate, normally their GFA were specified in the land leases and had already reached the maximum allowable cap set out in the leases. He pointed out that the building located behind Ching Yi House of Tsz Ching Estate had already been demolished and released some GFA. Covered pedestrian facilities near Ching Hong House of Tsz Ching Estate would be provided in response to the request of Mr. WONG Yat-yuk, the Vice-chairman. In his opinion, Mr. WONG's suggestion should not have been accepted by HD theoretically according to the Department's written reply. He opined that HD should consider exempting covered pedestrian facilities from the calculation of GFA in accordance with the reply of LandsD and Section 42 of the Buildings Ordinance. He hoped HD could more actively consider exempting these facilities from the calculation of GFA, instead of refusing the provision of covered pedestrian facilities for the benefit of residents simply on the pretext that the GFA of the estates had been used up.

86. Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy considered that the Paper reflected how the views and suggestions of local communities were often neglected by the government departments. She expressed that she had been striving for the provision of a pedestrian cover for the kindergarten in the Lung Poon Court Commercial Centre from HD for many years but the Department kept on using the pretext that there was no more GFA left. In her view, the Department did not need to consider the estates' GFA but should directly exempt these facilities from the calculation of GFA and amend the outdated provisions of the Buildings Ordinance instead.

87. Mr. CHAN Lee-shing expressed concern over the difficulties of the provision of covered pedestrian facilities in aged estates, saying that the residents of these estates were not provided with covered pedestrian facilities due to insufficient GFA of the estates. He said the Chief Executive had mentioned in the 2020 Policy Address that HKHA and the Hong Kong Housing Society would be invited to increase the plot ratio of future public housing projects so that 5% of the GFA could be set aside

for the provision of social welfare facilities. As there were many aged PRH estates in Wong Tai Sin District, HD should more actively review the relaxation of GFA for such estates so as to facilitate the provision of covered facilities that better suited the residents' needs.

88. Mr. WU Chi-kin requested HD to expeditiously provide the figures on the GFA of all the housing estates concerned. Recalling that he had suggested to HD the provision of covered pedestrian facilities in Choi Hung Estate but been refused by the Department at that time on the pretext that the estate's GFA had already been used up, he found the written replies of the government departments reflected that there were ways for HD to increase the GFA. He opined that since HD had a mechanism in place to process the applications for relaxation of GFA, the Department should actively consider providing facilities that could suit the needs of the residents, especially those residing in the aged estates in the district.

89. Mr. TANG Wai-keung enquired with LandsD and HD whether the covered pedestrian facilities in estates held under vesting order could be exempted from the GFA calculation. Noting that there was a housing estate having its GFA cap relaxed earlier for the provision of mobile base station in the estate, he therefore also asked the Department about the exemption factors in the calculation of GFA.

90. Miss LAU Ka-man, Carmen expressed that she had previously discussed with the property management company of Wang Tau Hom Estate on the provision of covered pedestrian facilities. She said the Government representatives only explained during the site inspection that provision of the facilities concerned would not be possible as the estate's maximum allowable GFA had already been used up. In her view, if the land use of the Diamond Hill Comprehensive Development Area could be changed, the suggestion of the provision of covered facilities within the estate area should even have been endorsed and accepted. She pointed out that this issue had already been discussed for years but HD never faced up to it properly, causing its failure in implementation of many people-based initiatives. She urged the representatives of HD to relay Members' views to their Headquarters and actively review HD's handling of the issue.

91. The Chairman called upon HD to respond to Members' enquiries concerning whether housing estates held under vesting orders were not subject to the requirement of maximum allowable GFA, and whether housing estates held in form of

land leases could apply to LandsD for exemption when the maximum allowable GFA had been used up.

92. Mrs. TANG FUNG Shuk-yin of HD responded that the Department would add new facilities for PRH estates every year, including covered pedestrian facilities. Whether the maximum allowable GFA of an estate held in form of land leases had been used up was merely one of the factors considered by the Department in the provision of covered facilities. For estates held under vesting order instead of land leases, although there was no maximum allowable GFA set on them, the GFA still had to comply with related regulations such as the Town Planning Ordinance and the Buildings Ordinance. HD also had to take into consideration the feasibility of the provision of the facilities concerned and the views of other property owners.

93. The Chairman, while understanding that HD had to consider other factors as well apart from the maximum allowable GFA, said Members had stated that the Department often rejected their suggestions of provision of covered facilities on the pretext that the maximum allowable GFA had been used up. He enquired again whether the housing estates held under vesting order were not subject to the requirement of maximum allowable GFA, and whether the housing estates held in form of land leases could apply to LandsD for exemption when the maximum allowable GFA had been used up.

94. Mrs. TANG FUNG Shuk-yin of HD responded that if provision of covered pedestrian facilities in PRH estates or Home Ownership Scheme (“HOS”) estates held in form of land leases was needed, HD would, depending on the circumstances, apply to LandsD for exemption. The time for vetting and approval might vary, depending on the situation of each case. As for the PRH estates held under vesting order instead of land leases, although there was no maximum allowable GFA set on them, the GFA still had to comply with related regulations such as the Town Planning Ordinance and the Buildings Ordinance. HD was currently conducting preliminary studies on individual estates mentioned by Members.

95. The Chairman enquired with LandsD about the factors considered when processing the applications for relaxation of maximum allowable GFA for housing estates, and the application processing procedures as well.

96. Ms. NG Chun-wei, Angel of LandsD responded that the Department had made available the related practice notes on its website and that some covered

pedestrian facilities could be exempted from the GFA calculation. Generally speaking, if the Independent Checking Unit exempted the covered pedestrian facilities from the GFA calculation, LandsD would follow the decision of the Independent Checking Unit when processing the applications and vet HD's application based on the terms of land leases of individual estates, such as the GFA and terms of exemption specified therein.

97. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy expressed that after consolidating the replies of HD and LandsD, he found HD was stalling the suggestion simply on the pretext that the GFA had been used up. He was glad to note that HD would study on the provision of covered pedestrian facilities for the estates mentioned in the Paper.

98. Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy was surprised at the claim of HD that various factors would be considered when deciding whether covered pedestrian facilities would be provided. She recalled that during her previous interaction with HD, the Department refused the provision of a cover for the kindergarten in the Lung Poon Court Commercial Centre on the pretext that the maximum allowable GFA had been reached already, at which she expressed her dissatisfaction.

99. Mrs. TANG FUNG Shuk-yin of HD responded that the Department had all long been following up on Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy's suggestion. However, the case mentioned was located in the HOS estate area and views of other owners were also involved. Therefore, the Department would explain to her in details after the meeting why her suggestion was not accepted. While saying that HD would review each cases mentioned by Members and give out a detailed explanation for non-acceptance, she reiterated that the cap of GFA was merely one of the factors for consideration. Besides, since it took time to conduct feasibility study, the Department might not be able to give a response immediately.

100. The Chairman aspired that Members' views would be dealt with by the Policy Section of the Department. He called upon HD to provide Members with the figures on the unused GFA of the housing estates mentioned in the Paper.

101. Mrs. TANG FUNG Shuk-yin of HD responded that it would take time to calculate the figures since some of the estates involved other owners and had their GFA increased.

102. The Chairman asked HD when the figures concerned could be available.

103. Mrs. TANG FUNG Shuk-yin of HD responded that HD targetted to provide the figures concerned before the next DC meeting.

104. Mr. CHAN Lee-shing expressed the hope that HD could update the meeting on the progress and would earnestly follow up on Members' suggestions in the future.

105. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy expressed that the discussion had clearly shown that HD's saying that the maximum allowable GFA had been reached was merely a pretext to stall Members' suggestions. He continued that the issue would be followed up on by the Housing Committee under WTSDC, if necessary. In his view, as the issue was not a matter of concern unique to Wong Tai Sin District, he hoped HD would follow up on the issue.

106. The Chairman reminded Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy that this discussion targetted only at the PRH estates in Wong Tai Sin District. He once again called upon HD to promptly finish the compilation of the GFA figures of the housing estates concerned and provide them to DC.

(iii) Follow-up on the Works of Wong Tai Sin Public Transport Terminus and the Temporary Traffic Management Measures at Shatin Pass Road
(WTSDC Paper No. 21/2021)

107. The Chairman welcomed the following attendees to the meeting for this agenda item, namely, Mr. CHU Kwok-ching, Timothy, Senior Engineer/Railway Schemes (11) and Mr. WONG Sik-ming, Sunny, Project Coordinator/Shatin to Central Link ("SCL")(2) of the Highways Department ("HyD"); Ms. LEUNG Man-ling, Karen, Senior Transport Officer/Wong Tai Sin and Mr. LAU Yan-heng, Henry, Engineer/Wong Tai Sin of TD; Ms. NG Chun-wei, Angel, Senior Estate Surveyor/Wong Tai Sin (District Lands Office, Kowloon East) of LandsD; as well as Mr. FUNG Wai-chung, Senior Liaison Engineer, Mr. NG Lap-kei, Senior Construction Engineer - Civil and Mr. LEUNG Man-tik, Public Relations Manager - Projects & Properties of the MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL").

108. The Chairman, saying he learnt that MTRCL did not provide the Secretariat with the PowerPoint slides until on the morning of the meeting day, hoped

the Corporation could supply the relevant information for Members' reference as early as possible in the future.

109. Mr. LEUNG Man-tik of MTRCL presented the Paper (Annex III) and said that Members had already been briefed on the PowerPoint slides concerned at the 2nd meeting of the Working Group on Government and Public Utilities Works Projects ("WGGPUWP") under WTSDC.

110. Mr. FUNG Wai-chung of MTRCL said that upon receiving Members' suggestion on reducing the traffic diversion for minibuses at the second stage of the temporary traffic management measures ("the traffic management measures") at Shatin Pass Road, MTRCL had accepted such suggestion with the alignment sequence of the minibuses under the second stage of the traffic management measures being the same as that under the first stage. As for the suggestion of prohibiting vehicles other than minibuses and taxis from entering the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road during the first stage of the traffic management measures, the consultancy considered that the suggestion would not have too much impact on the works. MTRCL therefore kept an open attitude to the suggestion and was also ready to listen to the views of Members.

111. Mr. CHEUNG Mau-ching presented the Paper.

112. The Chairman enquired whether MTRCL could dovetail with the suggestion if Members considered it necessary to prohibit vehicles other than minibuses and taxis from entering the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road during the works period.

113. Mr. FUNG Wai-chung of MTRCL said the Corporation would tie in with the views of government departments on the traffic management measures, if any.

114. The Chairman enquired whether the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road would be permanently closed for future development purposes after the commissioning of the lower level of the Wong Tai Sin Public Transport Terminus ("WTSPPT").

115. Mr. CHU Kwok-ching, Timothy of HyD pointed out that according to the current works design, the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road would remain open upon works completion. He understood Members' concerns that

the current design might lead to minibuses continuing to pick up or drop off passengers at the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road and cause disputes between minibus drivers and members of the public. In this connection, he said the carriageway in question was currently painted with double yellow lines and yellow hatched markings and it was planned that the section concerned would be designated as a 24-hour prohibited zone (i.e. double yellow line zone) in the future (excluding the direct ingress/egress of the lower level of WTSPTT). HyD would discuss with TD the feasibility of prohibiting minibuses from entering the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road and from picking up or dropping off passengers there. He believed that with the implementation of the relevant traffic measures and the Police's enforcement actions, no minibuses would pick up or drop off passengers at the carriageway section concerned after works completion.

116. Mr. WU Chi-kin opined that it would be difficult to ensure the minibuses not to drive into, pick up or drop off passengers at the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road by painting double yellow lines thereon. He was of the view that HyD should close the road section concerned and could install emergency vehicular gate there to allow the access of emergency vehicles.

117. The Chairman was of the view that after the works, the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road should be closed and only the access of emergency vehicles should be allowed.

118. Mr. LEUNG Ming-hong, Steve enquired with TD about the procedures for closing the carriageway section at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road and for installing emergency vehicular gate there.

119. Mr. TANG Wai-keung enquired whether the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road would fall under the purview of HAD or HyD in the future.

120. Mr. HUNG Kin-lok, Thomas of WTSDO learnt that the District Planning Officer of PlanD had already taken note of Members' views raised on the future development of the site of Chuk Yuen United Village at the previous WTSDC meeting. Up to then, he had not received any information about the handover of the management of the site to WTSDO.

121. The Chairman, reiterating that the last term of WTSDC had already called on TD or HyD to close the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road and to only allow access of emergency vehicles after the works completion, enquired about the government departments' responses to these requests.

122. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy enquired with TD and MTRCL whether there would still be sufficient space for minibus parking after the commissioning of the lower level of WTSPTT and closure of the carriageway section at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road.

123. Mr. FUNG Wai-chung of MTRCL pointed out that the lower level of WTSPTT could accommodate the parking of 26 green minibuses upon commissioning.

124. Mr. CHU Kwok-ching, Timothy of HyD pointed out that since there was no development plan for the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road for the time being, the Department suggested retaining the road section for the use of emergency vehicles or relief of the pressure on WTSPTT by providing additional spaces for picking up/setting down passengers or loading/unloading goods. The closure could be carried out by the works departments concerned upon confirmation of the development plan for the carriageway section at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road in the future. He said since WTSPTT could operate normally without closing the existing carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road, HyD had no justification for the closure. Besides, as the permanent closure of the road section concerned was beyond the project scope of the works of SCL, it was very difficult for the Department to take forward the suggestion on closure. He continued that HyD would, as promised, provide the traffic flow information to TD for its review on the necessity of retaining the road section concerned.

125. Ms. LEUNG Man-ling, Karen of TD said MTRCL and the government departments concerned had been communicating with the minibus operators for years. In 2017, MTRCL had conducted a site inspection to the construction site of WTSPTT with the minibus operators concerned and the latter also learnt the detailed arrangements for the minibus routes at WTSPTT. According to MTRCL's information, the minibus operators at that time expressed no comment on the relevant arrangements but had some views on the walkway connecting to the minibus stops at WTSPTT. The Department was still maintaining contact with them.

126. The Chairman enquired about TD's procedure for and responses regarding the closure of the carriageway section at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road.

127. Mr. LAU Yan-heng, Henry of TD said since HyD and MTRCL were responsible for the construction of WTSPTT and the road works at Shatin Pass Road and WTSDC had earlier on suggested the closure of the carriageway section at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road, TD had been conducting meetings with the relevant government departments on the carriageway closure since 2018, and urging HyD and MTRCL to expeditiously collect the traffic flow data and conduct assessment on the feasibility and the impact on traffic of closure of the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road after the commissioning of the lower level of WTSPTT and relocation of the minibus stops from the roundabout to WTSPTT. Noting that HyD was arranging to collect the traffic flow data, TD also called on HyD to conduct the relevant assessment so as to determine the future arrangement for the road section concerned. He added that in TD's view, Members' suggestion on closure of the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road stemmed from the project of WTSPTT. Therefore, HyD, being the responsible department for the construction of WTSPTT, should furnish the relevant traffic data and assessment results in relation to the feasibility of the suggestion.

128. The Chairman enquired of TD the required procedures for the closure of the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road after the relevant traffic data and assessment results were provided by HyD.

129. Mr. LAU Yan-heng, Henry of TD pointed out that HyD, being the department in charge of the project, should carry out the procedures such as the gazettal arrangement for the closure of the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road.

130. Mr. CHU Kwok-ching, Timothy of HyD expressed that the closure of the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road was beyond the project scope of the works of SCL and that whether or not to close the said carriageway section had no direct relevance to the operation of WTSPTT. Hence, the Department was of the view that the two issues should be handled separately. He reiterated that HyD would provide TD with the traffic flow data. Following the gradual improvement of the COVID-19 epidemic situation, it was expected that the traffic flow could be counted in the middle of this year for submission to TD for assessing the traffic needs for the road

section concerned. Even if it was confirmed that there was no such traffic need, further discussions still had to be conducted among government departments to decide on the leading department of and arrangements for the implementation of the proposal.

131. The Chairman enquired about the time required by TD for the assessment upon submission of the traffic flow data by HyD.

132. Mr. LAU Yan-heng, Henry of TD replied that the Department had earlier on discussed with and requested HyD to collect the traffic flow data and conduct assessment while TD would provide comments on the data collected by and the assessment results. Generally speaking, TD could examine the information within one month after HyD's submission of sufficient data and the assessment results. If HyD confirmed that the closure of the carriageway section at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road would not bring about unacceptable impact on the traffic of the area, the government department responsible for carrying out the project had to undertake the works of road closure.

133. In conclusion, the Chairman requested HyD to provide TD with sufficient traffic flow data with regard to the closure of the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road by the middle of this year, and TD to make a decision based on the information provided within one to two months and report the progress to WTSDC. It was hoped that whether the carriageway concerned had to be closed in the future could be determined by the third quarter of this year. If the assessment result was in the affirmative, he suggested WTSDO coordinate the closure of the carriageway concerned and confirm the leading department for the works.

134. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy hoped DO(WTS) would undertake to coordinate with various government departments on the closure of the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road.

135. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO replied that HyD had carefully listened to the views of Members. Regarding the closure of the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road, the professional government departments would lead the work and handle the issue based on their professional judgements. He understood that this issue had been discussed on different platforms and that Members and the local personalities had made their views clear. Thus, he hoped the professional government departments would expeditiously give an account to Members and carry out the relevant works upon study. Should other problems arise, WTSDO

would be ready to discuss with the government departments concerned to see what assistance it could provide.

136. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy was concerned that passengers might become accustomed to boarding or alighting from minibus at the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road during the second stage of the traffic management measures and find it difficult to adjust themselves to use the new boarding or alighting points at WTSPTT in the third stage of the traffic management measures. In this connection, he had already suggested to HyD that the carriageway section concerned should be enclosed with water-filled barriers during the third stage of the traffic management measures to ensure no vehicles could pick up or drop off passengers there. He enquired about HyD's response to his suggestion.

137. Mr. FUNG Wai-chung of MTRCL pointed out that during the implementation of the traffic management measures, MTRCL could temporarily close the road with temporary water-filled barriers if necessary and the construction site contractor could also remove the water-filled barriers under emergency circumstances to allow passage of emergency vehicles. Moreover, MTRCL would instruct the contractor to deploy ambassadors to guide members of the public to queue up for minibuses during various stages of the works. However, the minibus drivers' behaviour of picking up or dropping off passengers was outside the management scope of MTRCL.

138. Ms. MOK Yee-ha pointed out that as MTRCL had indicated its willingness to close the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road, the key point then was whether the government departments had decided to close the carriageway section concerned. Also, she suggested efforts be made to enable members of the public or drivers to get used to as early as possible the arrangements to be put in place upon the commissioning of the lower level of WTSPTT.

139. Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy pointed out that at the 2nd meeting of WGGPUWP under WTSDC, Members had suggested that the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road should be closed for the fear that minibuses would keep on picking up or dropping off passengers there during the second and third stages of the traffic management measures, which would in turn render WTSPTT a futile development. Taking the longstanding problem of minibus drivers urinating in the Diamond Hill Station Public Transport Interchange as an example, she pointed out that minibus drivers would not take heed of TD's advice and opined that TD should

maintain close communication with the minibus stakeholders. She further pointed out that the Department had failed to respond to the concerns of Members of constituencies in Tsz Wan Shan over the picking up/dropping off of passengers by minibuses at the carriageway section at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road.

140. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy pointed out that HyD had not replied on whether MTRCL would be requested to close the section of the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road with water-filled barriers during the works period and opined that DO(WTS) had the duty to handle the shifting of responsibilities among TD, HyD and MTRCL themselves with regard to the closure of the carriageway section concerned at the meeting. He shared the content of the “Report by the Secretary for Chinese Affairs on the City District Officer Scheme” published in 1969, which read “While there are many merits with a specialised administrative body in terms of technical efficiency, there are also shortcomings on the political level where various experts focus on working on different categories of technical problems by exerting their strengths and forte. Such situation is the result of the over-specialisation of the administrative body and the lack of district political coordination, and the City District Officer should be responsible for addressing the political disconnection between the Government and the people. Specialisation can enhance the technical efficiency in a densely populated city but it also brings about political disconnection. Separately, the system of City District Officer aims at strengthening district political coordination to eliminate political disconnection. Specialisation and the system of City District Officer are complementary to each other and the concurrent adoption of both can achieve maximum technical efficiency and give consideration to the actual situation of people’s livelihood in the governance of the Government, as well as ensure all people regardless of wealth and age receive attention from the governance of the Government.” He hoped DO(WTS) could introspect his role with this quote, pointing out that the coordination by DO(WTS) was paramount to WTSDC in addressing the issue of WTSPTT.

141. Mr. CHU Kwok-ching, Timothy of HyD said the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road should remain open during the works period in order to tie in with the temporary traffic diversion. Having taken note of Members’ concerns that minibuses would keep on picking up or dropping off passengers at the carriageway concerned after end of the second stage of the temporary management measures, HyD and MTRCL would be ready to explore suitable ways to prevent such happenings and would also confirm the relevant details with the government departments.

142. The Chairman enquired whether HyD would consider temporarily closing the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road with water-filled barriers during the implementation of the traffic management measures.

143. Mr. CHU Kwok-ching, Timothy of HyD pointed out that there were many methods to prevent minibuses from picking up or dropping off passengers at the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road, for instance, to mark the entire road section with double yellow lines. If such method was ineffective, HyD would consider further alternatives with other departments with a view to ensuring no chaotic situation would be caused.

144. The Chairman hoped the government departments would closely communicate with Members about the second and third stages of the traffic management measures to ensure that the professional advice of the departments could be in line with the situation of the community. He also consulted Members whether it was necessary to arrange a site visit with the government departments concerned and minibus operators.

145. The Vice-chairman, concurring with the Chairman's suggestion, expressed that Members would consult the residents on the issue concerned. Also, some minibus operators had conveyed their views to Members. He therefore opined that at this stage, discussions could first be held between Members and the minibus operators.

146. Mr. CHEUNG Mau-ching said four DC Members of Tsz Wan Shan had liaised with the operator of minibus No. 37M and the operator was deeply concerned about the arrangement regarding the walkway connecting WTSPPT and Wong Tai Sin MTR Station during the works period. It was hoped that WTSDO could coordinate with various government departments to expeditiously arrange for a more convenient walkway.

147. The Chairman said communication with various stakeholders on the traffic management measures would continue subject to the situation. He also enquired about LandsD's response with regard to the proposal of retrofitting a walkway at the temporary car park of Wong Tai Sin Road connecting WTSPPT and Wong Tai Sin MTR Station mentioned in the Paper.

148. Ms. NG Chun-wei, Angel of LandsD, saying the issue had been discussed at the 3rd meeting of the Traffic and Transport Committee (“T&TC”) under WTSDC, pointed out that currently the upper half of the site at Wong Tai Sin Road was an open site while the lower half was used as a temporary car park. There was such discussion at the T&TC meeting back then because TD proposed using the entire site at Wong Tai Sin Road as car park whereas some Members at the meeting suggested using part of the site as transitional housing. According to the latest information, the Transport and Housing Bureau (“THB”) and TD were having discussions on the suggestion concerned. As for the proposal of using part of the site at Wong Tai Sin Road to retrofit a walkway connecting WTSPTT and Wong Tai Sin MTR Station, LandsD kept an open attitude. Having said that, LandsD was not a works department and had no resources to provide roads for public use. If any relevant technical department was ready to handle the management and maintenance of such walkway, LandsD would dovetail the works as far as possible.

149. The Chairman enquired whether the site at Wong Tai Sin Road was still under the purview of LandsD and about its leasing status.

150. Ms. NG Chun-wei, Angel of LandsD said the upper half of the site at Wong Tai Sin Road was an open site while the lower half was a temporary car park. LandsD had not received any definite response from THB or TD about the use of the site at Wong Tai Sin Road for the time being. Therefore, at present, the Department had no information as to whether the proposed walkway would be incorporated into the site at Wong Tai Sin Road or not.

Impromptu Motion: “Request for WTSDO’s Coordination among Various Departments on the Use of Part of the Open Site in Wong Tai Sin and Provision of a Covered Walkway Connecting the MTR Exit and WTSPTT”

151. The Chairman expressed that the motion was moved by Mr. CHEUNG Mau-ching and seconded by Mr. WONG Yat-yuk, Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy and Ms. MOK Yee-ha (Annex IV).

152. Mr. CHEUNG Mau-ching presented the Paper.

153. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy expressed that LandsD had already clearly stated that the open site in Wong Tai Sin was available for application for use but no technical

department was willing to take over the works, and that it became an issue of district political coordination, which required DO(WTS) to make coordination efforts to tackle.

154. Ms. TANG Kit-wah, Fanny of WTSDO expressed that WTSDO had repeatedly relayed to HyD during previous DC meetings and other different meetings WTSDC's views and request for the permanent closure of the carriageway at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road upon the full commissioning of the ingress/egress of the lower level of WTSPTT. Regarding the suggestion on provision of a covered walkway connecting the MTR exit and WTSPTT, active discussion had been made during the last-term DC meetings on the use of the funding for district minor works for carrying out the proposal. However, it was found out after study that the underground utilities at the proposed location for the provision of covered walkway at Shatin Pass Road were too dense and thus the proposal was assessed as technically infeasible. Besides, regarding the suggestion on provision of a temporary covered walkway at the temporary carpark located in the lower half of the site of Wong Tai Sin Road connecting the MTR exit and WTSPTT, the proposal could not be implemented using the funding for district minor works as the funding could not be used for provision of temporary facilities.

155. Mr. CHAN Chun-yue, noting from PlanD's documents that the Department had a plan to develop a Folk Culture Area at the roundabout of Shatin Pass Road and space would be reserved within the Area for provision of walkway, enquired whether the plan was still in the pipeline. Separately, he suggested the Department taps into the experience in the construction of Kai Chuen Court in Diamond Hill by providing flower beds to demarcate a walkway for residents to access the Diamond Hill MTR Station during the works period.

156. Mr. WONG Yat-yuk said the situation of the issue mentioned by WTSDO had been discussed since the last-term DC and still remained unsettled. To him, the public aspiration for provision of a covered walkway with direct access to the MTR station had been very clear. However, HyD and LandsD said that there should be a leading department. Thus, he hoped WTSDO could take up the coordinating role in order to meet the needs of the public.

157. The Chairman understood that the departments had difficulties and constraints in the implementation, saying that it might not be easy to conclude the issue at the meeting that day, or else, the issue should have been concluded without straddling two DC terms. Mentioning that the former Chief Executive had once described the

District Officer as the “Chief Executive of the District”, he called upon WTSDO to take up its coordinating role and called for the cooperation of all departments.

158. The Chairman confirmed that no amendment to the motion was proposed by Members present.

159. The Chairman announced the unanimous passage of the motion and asked the Secretariat to relay it to WTSDO and the relevant departments for follow-up actions.

160. Mr. CHEUNG Mau-ching expressed that the development of WTSPTT was rather uncertain. Apart from the foreseeable chaotic situations, the situation upon the completion of WTSPTT might also be even worse than the present. Retaining the cul-de-sac design of the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road and allowing public light buses to continue to pick up or set down passengers would turn WTSPTT into nothing but a carpark for public light buses. This would be a waste of public funds. Besides, under the current design, residents would have to walk a longer distance and expose themselves to the sun and rain before reaching WTSPTT, which would go against the original intent for the provision of WTSPTT. He opined that WTSDO had the responsibility to coordinate the cooperation among government departments and ensure an effective use of resources by making WTSPTT a facility that could really bring convenience to the residents.

161. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy further enquired whether WTSDO attached great importance to this project and how it would coordinate the cooperation among various departments.

162. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO expressed that the project of WTSPTT came into being as the result of the SCL works project. HyD would be in charge of the project while MTRCL would be the project manager. The representatives of HyD at the meeting had taken note of Members’ views. Being the representative of WTSDO, he could not rashly make any promise to Members for their requests on behalf of the leading works departments. While WTSDO was willing to provide liaison support for the departments, the design and implementation of the project would be subject to the professional decision of HyD.

163. The Chairman further enquired with WTSDO whether the provision of covered walkway concerned could be made possible.

164. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO responded that the proposed works could not be carried out under the District Minor Works (“DMW”) programme. If it was to be carried out, HyD and MTRCL would have to examine and consider it from their professional perspective.

165. Mr. CHAN Chun-yue further enquired whether funding could be available under DMW programme for the provision of flowerbeds to demarcate a walkway in the temporary carpark site. Taking the example of the Beautification Works to the Former Hsin Kuang Bridge Remains, he stated that there would be new development plans for Chuk Yuen United Village in 2025 and thus believed that the works done would not be permanent. However, funding application under DMW programme for such works could still be put forth and it was just a step away from the funding endorsement last year. He found it puzzling.

166. Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy reminded DO(WTS) that, according to HAD’s website, his duties were to ensure that the advice of DC was properly followed up, to act as a link between DC and government departments, and to act as a co-ordinator in the provision of relief services in emergency situations. She opined that DO(WTS) should make good use of his power to carry out the coordination work.

167. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy cited a passage from the Report by the Secretary for Chinese Affairs on the City District Officer Scheme, which read “Every City District Officer must remember that the cost for the City District Office is paid for by the taxpayers in the city of Hong Kong and none of them owes the City District Officers a living. We must ensure that the City District Office renders service of value considerably in excess of the cost. If this is not so, the money spent on the City District Office could be put to better use in other service such as medical or educational facilities.” He opined that the present performance of DO(WTS) was a far cry from the description in 1969 and called upon DO(WTS) to put public interests above everything.

168. The Chairman reminded Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy to be careful for citing the information of the former Hong Kong Government in 1969.

169. In response to Mr. CHAN Chun-yue’s speaking, Ms. TANG Kit-wah, Fanny said that the bridge deck of the Former Hsin Kuang Bridge Remains was retained in the garden site under the purview of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department. As for the proposed beautification works as DMW, it had already been assessed as

technically infeasible and the District Facilities Management Committee had already endorsed the cancellation.

170. The Chairman reiterated that the purpose of the discussion at the meeting was to make the residents' voices heard. While admitting that the meeting might not be able to conclude the issue, he assured that further efforts would be made for the follow-ups.

171. Mr. CHEUNG Mau-ching expressed that the needs and demands of residents were very clear, and the said open site could also be used to tie in with the provision of covered walkway connecting the MTR exit and WTSPTT. However, the departments were unwilling to take up the role and only kept shifting duty to others. He asked the attending civil servants whom they were serving, and he found it inexplicable and disappointing that the civil servants were neglecting the residents' needs.

172. Mr. CHAN Chun-yue, admitting that he was aware of the cancellation of the Beautification Works to the Former Hsin Kuang Bridge Remains, enquired about the criteria under which the funding application under DMW programme could still be allowed to be made when the site of Chuk Yuen United Village would be resumed by the Government in 2025.

173. The Chairman concluded that there were three issues to tackle regarding the works project of WTSPTT, including: the traffic congestion caused by the partial narrowing down of the carriageway at Shatin Pass Road during the works period, the closure of the cul-de-sac lane at the south roundabout of Shatin Pass Road, and the provision of a direct walkway connecting the MTR exit and WTSPTT. Opining that the residents' demands were very clear, he requested that WTSDO should organise an inter-departmental meeting for the discussion and following-up on this motion and that the departments concerned should also provide solution to the problem for the implementation.

(iv) Follow-up on the Research Projects Endorsed by Wong Tai Sin District Council in 2020-21
(WTSDC Paper No. 22/2021)

174. The Chairman called upon Ms. MOK Ka-han, Rosanda to present Paper No. 22/2021.

175. Ms. MOK Ka-han, Rosanda presented the Paper.

176. In response to the Paper, Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO expressed that the Office had along been playing a role as the bridge of communication between the public and the government departments. It was more suitable and appropriate for the responsible department concerned to follow up on or handle individual cases. For instance, road issues regarding public transport interchanges should be followed up and handled by HyD. As the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road mentioned in the Paper was under the professional purview of the Environment Bureau and the Environmental Protection Department (“EPD”), whether or not the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road was serious should be determined and answered by EPD from its professional perspective. EPD had already made a response on the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road in an earlier meeting of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Committee (“FEHC”). Being the controlling officer of DC funds, WTSDO would determine whether a funding application for project was compliant with the provision stipulated in the Manual on the Use of District Council Funds (“the Manual”). According to paragraph 6.6.3(e) of the Manual, projects that were more appropriately charged to other government or departmental votes would not normally be supported. As mentioned earlier, the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road was under the policy area of EPD and thus it was more suitable for EPD to handle and follow up on it. After careful review on the funding applications concerned, WTSDO had written to inform Ecobus, the applicant organisation, on 14 January 2021 that, under the principle of “prudent use of public money” and according to paragraph 6.6.3(e) of the Manual, WTSDO would not support the implementation of the study projects nor would it reimburse the expenditure incurred from the projects.

177. The Chairman called upon DO(WTS) to supplement an explanation on whether he had consulted or communicated with EPD regarding the study projects concerned, explain why FEHC had been allowed to have discussion on and endorse the funding application for the project which was considered more appropriate to be charged to other government or departmental votes.

178. In reply, Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO said it was noted that EPD had already responded on the issue concerned in a FEHC meeting held earlier, during which EPD told the meeting that it had used its resources to conduct studies on the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road and suggested some mitigating

solutions for improving the traffic noise problem. He said if Members were dissatisfied with the mitigating solutions suggested by EPD, they should further question and follow up with EPD instead of attributing the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road to WTSDO's decision of rejecting the funding applications for the study projects concerned. He pointed out that the study projects were obviously more appropriately charged to other government or departmental votes as stipulated in paragraph 6.6.3(e) of the Manual, and thus, WTSDO considered the funding applications for DC funds for implementation of the study projects concerned not appropriate. These reasons had already been clearly explained in the letter to Ecobus on 14 January 2021. He reiterated that if Members wished to seek for a long-term solution to the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road, they should enquire and follow up with EPD.

179. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy said he had already pointed out in FEHC's earlier meeting that the study projects were not just about the issue of the noise level at Lung Cheung Road but more about the psychological burden posed by the traffic noise on the nearby residents. The representatives of EPD had also stated in the meeting that EPD was a technical department and the issue of psychological burden posed by traffic noise on residents was outside the purview of EPD. One could see from this that the study projects did not only deal with the policy area of EPD. WTSDC was of the view that the study projects could provide relevant study data and support regarding the psychological influence on the residents. However, WTSDO rejected the funding applications for the study projects, and even advised Members to request EPD to implement the project instead. He queried whether DO(WTS) considered that the psychological influence posed by the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road on the nearby residents was under the policy area of EPD, and whether DO(WTS) was making professional judgment on behalf of EPD.

180. Mr. CHAN Chun-yue, citing WTSDO's saying made only after the funding applications for the study projects on the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road and the demand for parking spaces for motorcycles had been discussed and endorsed in the related Committees that the two study projects were under the policy areas of other government departments, thus the funding applications for DC funds for implementation of the study projects concerned were not appropriate, questioned why WTSDO did not raise the issue when the funding applications for these projects were discussed in the related Committees. Besides, he also pointed out that the projects implemented by the Fire Safety Committee, Fight Crime Committee and Youth Programme Committee under WTSDO could all be funded by other corresponding

government departments, and questioned why they could use the DC funds for Community Involvement Projects (“CIPs”) to implement their projects. Saying that WTSDO had never rejected funding applications of these Committees based on paragraph 6.6.3(e) of the Manual all these years, he suspected that WTSDO’s rejection of the funding applications for the study projects endorsed by FEHC and T&TC by invoking the relevant provision of the Manual was an act of political suppression. He opined that WTSDO’s invocation of the relevant provisions of the Manual could not clearly explain the reasons for rejection of the funding applications. To him, if WTSDO considered that the projects were more appropriately charged to other government or departmental votes, it should provide assistance in referring the projects to the related government departments for follow-ups.

181. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO expressed that the so-called political suppression just mentioned by Mr. CHAN Chun-yue was simply conjured out of his own imagination and unfounded. He reiterated that the Director of the Home Affairs (“DHA”) was the controlling officer of DC funds. According to paragraph 6.5.3 of the Manual, upon endorsement by DC, DHA or any officer authorised by DHA would approve the funding of the project if he/she was satisfied that the project fell within the ambit and scope of DC funds, and the applicant would be informed of the outcome accordingly. Therefore, it was a usual practice of DHA or any officer authorised by DHA to vet funding applications endorsed by DC and determine whether they fell within the ambit and scope of DC funds. In view of this, WTSDO was just processing the funding applications according to the normal procedures and the so-called political suppression was unfounded. Moreover, the psychological impact on residents as mentioned by Members earlier stemmed from the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road and noise problem was under the policy area of EPD. EPD had already conducted studies on the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road with the use of its resources and suggested some mitigating solutions to improve the traffic noise problem. EPD should be the department leading the efforts to tackle traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road and work for the solutions. Therefore, after review, it was concluded that the funding applications for the study projects concerned were obviously more appropriately charged to other government or departmental votes according to paragraph 6.6.3(e) of the Manual and that the funding applications for DC funds for implementation of the study projects concerned was not appropriate. The said reasons had already been clearly explained to Ecobus in the letter of 14 January 2021.

182. Mr. CHAN Chun-yue said his earlier comment that WTSDO's rejection of the funding applications for CIPs was an act of political suppression was his sheer speculation. He opined that HAD or WTSDO should give a more detailed explanation for the decision concerned instead of glossing over the issue simply by quoting a provision of the Manual. He was of the view that DO(WTS) should move one step forward for the affairs in the district and that if DO(WTS) considered that the project involved an issue of district concern but was under the policy area of other government departments, he could refer the project to the related government departments and assist the applicant organisation in applying funding from the related government departments for implementation instead of simply rejecting the funding applications. Besides, he did not understand why DO(WTS), by making reference to the same principle, sometimes allowed Members to have discussion and afterwards claimed that the issues discussed were considered as incompatible with the functions of a DC, and at other times did not allow Members to have the discussion and simply left the meeting to express his stance. He hoped that DO(WTS) and the staff of WTSDO would not neglect important district work due to political consideration amidst the current political atmosphere.

183. Mr. CHAN Kai-shun, Gary enquired whether DO(WTS) had consulted the Environment Bureau or EPD for their views on the funding applications for the study project on the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road and about their reply. He also enquired how DO(WTS) determined which government department should be the responsible department for the issue. Taking the issue of the covered pedestrian walkway discussed earlier as an example, he enquired how DO(WTS) determined which government department should the issue be referred to when no government department was willing to take up responsibility.

184. Mr. CHAN Lee-shing expressed that many funding applications for CIPs in this DC term were not much different from those in the previous DC terms, and they were not unrealistic projects. He said that the two funding applications that could not secure the funding approval aimed to conduct study on long-discussed district problems, and that similar studies had been carried out in the previous DC terms. Therefore, he was regretful that WTSDO had declined to grant the funding approval. He found it hard to comprehend the current blurry standards and hoped for clearer and unified standards so that DC could play its part to contribute to the livelihood affairs.

185. Ms. MOK Ka-han, Rosanda expressed that the funding applications for study projects endorsed earlier in FEHC were on the traffic noise problem at Lung

Cheung Road and community health promotion. In her view, DO(WTS)'s response reflected that he was turning a deaf ear to the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road and to Members' views, and was turning his back on the residents who were deeply disturbed by the noises. Having grown up in Wong Tai Sin since childhood, she said that at the beginning she was very glad to be able to serve the Wong Tai Sin District as a grown-up and had been striving for the well-being of residents of the Wong Tai Sin District. However, WTSDO's repeated suppression had made her feel deeply disappointed.

186. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO reiterated that WTSDO had not committed any act of political suppression nor did it agree to such claim. He also reiterated that the decision of rejecting the funding applications for the study projects was made purely according to the processing of funding applications stipulated in the Manual. He continued that traffic noise problem was under the policy area of EPD and EPD had already responded on the issue in a FEHC meeting held earlier. If Members had further comments on the traffic noise problem at Lung Cheung Road, they could raise them to EPD.

187. To conclude, the Chairman expressed that DO(WTS), by invoking paragraph 6.6.3(e) of the Manual, rejected the two applications for funds for CIPs which had been endorsed by the Committees under DC. In response to the explanation of DO(WTS), he suggested the Secretariat pass the two proposed study projects to the government departments concerned for action and request them to provide WTSDC with the study reports for reference upon completion. If the departments concerned refused to do so, WTSDC could then discuss again on whether the funding for CIPs could be used to implement the two projects.

(v) Change in Membership of Committee(s) of Wong Tai Sin District Council
(WTSDC Paper No. 19/2021)

188. The Secretary presented the Paper.

189. Members noted and endorsed the change set out in the Paper.

IV. Progress Report

190. Members noted the following Paper:

- (i) Progress Report of the 6th Meeting of the Housing Committee held on 9 February 2021 (WTSDC Paper No. 20/2021)

Any Other Business

- (i) Matters Concerning the Area Committees of the Wong Tai Sin District

191. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy said while the Area Committees (“ACs”) of Wong Tai Sin District claimed in their reports to FEHC that no issue concerning food and environmental hygiene had been discussed, the departments concerned expressed that they had received comments from ACs. He found it puzzling and enquired whether it was the result of miscommunication or intentional concealment. He opined that the views and suggestions of ACs were also significant and DC should have the knowledge of and follow up on them.

192. The Secretary explained that under the current arrangement, the Secretariat would, in line with the usual practice, send out the standard forms to the Secretaries of all ACs for collecting reports one month before DC Committee meetings, and afterwards consolidate the reports for submission to DC Committees upon receipt. The FEHC meeting held on 9 March 2021 was an example to illustrate that as ACs had not submitted reports on the issues concerned, the Secretariat reported the same truthfully. She said that there was no superior-subordinate relationship between ACs and DC, and that Members could discuss and decide among themselves whether or not to maintain the practice of inclusion of the reports of ACs in the Committee agendas. She also supplemented that the Secretary of FEHC had, as per the instruction of the Chairman of FEHC, sent letters to the AC Chairmen on 26 January 2021 to request for reports in more details and attendance of their representatives to the Committee meetings for giving account on the items discussed in the AC meetings. However, no reply had been received so far.

193. The Chairman, believing that there were some local views on district affairs expressed in the corresponding AC meetings and stating that DC Committees also hoped to know and follow up on the views concerned, enquired what coordinating efforts the Secretariat would make to meet Members’ expectations.

194. Mr. CHAN Chun-yue suggested the practice of including the AC reports in the agenda be maintained and distribution of standard forms to all ACs for their reports be continued. ACs could decide on their own whether or not to continue to submit their reports. In parallel, the DC Secretariat could help get the minutes of AC meetings and put the documents in good order for comparison.

195. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO responded that the minutes of AC meetings were open information for public. Members of the public or DC Members could retrieve the information at the Public Enquiry Service Centre of Wong Tai Sin. Interested DC Members could go there and retrieve the information themselves.

196. Mr. CHAN Lee-shing further enquired whether the Secretariat could act in concert with Mr. CHAN Chun-yue's suggestion.

197. The Chairman enquired whether the Secretariat could help retrieve from the Public Enquiry Service Centre of Wong Tai Sin the latest minutes of AC meetings for Members' reference.

198. Mr. CHONG Ting-wai opined that the Chairman had the power to directly instruct the Secretariat to follow up while the Secretariat had the responsibility to prepare the related documents for DC meetings and place the minutes of AC meetings on Members' table for their reference.

199. Ms. MOK Yee-ha, recapped her own comment made in FEHC and expressed that from another perspective, papers of ACs could reflect local views which were of constructiveness and significance. If DC Members could learn about the items discussed in AC meetings, duplicated requests to government departments for follow-up on the same issues could be avoided and prudent use of resources could be achieved.

200. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy considered the response of DO(WTS) perfunctory. The Secretary had made a clear response and he believed that it had been a standard practice to request ACs to submit the report forms. ACs were also under WTSDO, and DO(WTS) should review whether there were errors in the submission process of ACs' report forms or the procedures were followed in full or not, and advise improvement measures.

201. In response, Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO said that ACs had their own functions and that it was up to ACs to decide on the contents of the reports to be submitted and WTSDO could not give out instructions in this regard. Interested DC Members could retrieve the minutes themselves or attend the AC meetings as observers. They could also liaise with the AC Chairmen direct for enquiries.

202. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy clarified that he was enquiring whether there were errors made by the AC Secretariats in the submission process of report forms. As the staff of AC Secretariats were also the staff of WTSDO, DO(WTS) should have the power to look into the process. He found it unfair that while the minutes and audio records of DC meetings were made fairly transparent as they could be accessed online, it was so difficult to obtain the minutes of AC meetings.

203. Mr. CHAN Chun-yue again suggested that the practice of submission of report documents be retained and another version compiled separately by the DC Secretariat be presented in parallel with the report documents.

204. The Chairman agreed that the current practice of requesting the AC Secretariats to submit the report forms should be retained while the DC Secretariat had to check if there was any omission. He understood that there was no superior-subordinate relationship between ACs and DC and that if ACs continued to not submit their reports, the DC Secretariat would have to make separate efforts to acquire the minutes of AC meetings and have them compiled into another document for submission to DC Committees.

205. Mr. CHONG Ting-wai reiterated that the Chairman had the power to directly order the Secretariat to prepare documents for DC meetings and compile the documents on the minutes of AC meetings for submission to DC. He enquired whether the Secretariat could act in line with the request of the Chairman.

206. The Secretary responded that the Secretariat could follow the established procedures and standing practice to provide assistance for facilitating the proceedings of the meetings, including requesting submission of information that had to be reported in the meetings from the departments concerned. Having said that, she reiterated that the Secretariat could, under its terms of reference, only make the requests to the departments.

207. The Chairman expressed that the Chairmen of DC Committees could direct their Secretaries to request the report forms and meeting minutes from the AC Secretariats for their Members' reference so as to avoid any omission. He enquired whether or not this practice was the duty of the Secretariat.

208. The Secretary responded that apart from preparing the report forms submitted by ACs, the Secretariat could also request the AC Secretaries to submit the meeting minutes. However, it was out of the Secretariat's control whether or not ACs would submit the documents.

209. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy, expressing that if the submission of AC minutes of meetings was beyond the Secretariat's control, considered that the Secretariat could get the minutes of AC meetings at the Public Enquiry Service Centre instead. Even if only the duplicate copies of the minutes could be available, it would still be better than having none. One might find that the Secretary was trying to shirk the responsibility in her reply.

210. The Chairman expressed that it should be the Secretariat's duty to request the report forms and minutes of AC meetings from the AC Secretariats for Members' reference. The Chairmen of DC Committees could remind their Secretaries to follow up in the future.

211. Mr. CHAN Chun-yue concurred with the Chairman's decision. While the minutes of AC meetings could be obtained from the Public Enquiry Service Centre even if the AC Secretariats did not submit them to DC, the staff of AC Secretariats were also under WTSDO and he found it strange that the colleagues of the same department would impede each other's work. Besides, he hoped the public would not misunderstand that Members were picking faults as the situation today was after all the results of the disruption of the existing effective mechanism by ACs which shut DC Members out and refused to submit their reports. And, that was why Members had to find out the reasons behind.

(ii) Matters Concerning the Government's Delineation of "Restricted Areas"

212. Ms. CHEUNG Ka-yi, Kathy followed up on the enquiry made at the 8th DC meeting held on 5 February 2021 regarding the impact of the Government's delineation of "restricted area" on the daily operation of WTSDC. She recalled that when she asked DO(WTS) about the internal guidelines and staff deployment of

WTSDO for the delineation of “restricted area” in Wong Tai Sin District, she was given the reply that the Government did not have internal action guidelines, nor had there been relevant cases in Wong Tai Sin District. However, unfortunately, on the night of 23 February 2021, the Government delineated a “restricted area” on Kam Wing Street in San Po Kong. She enquired whether DO(WTS) had been at the scene at that time, and if he was there, how many WTSDO staff members were deployed to the scene, how many hours they had worked, and when they were notified of the need to be present at the scene for assistance.

213. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO responded that WTSDO had assisted in coordinating a blitz operation in the restricted area for enforcement of a restriction-testing declaration and issue of compulsory testing notice. Sufficient manpower was arranged to cope with the tasks and the daily operation of WTSDO was not affected.

214. The Chairman further enquired about the number of WTSDO staff deployed to the scene for assistance.

215. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO responded that Members might refer to the press release of the Information Services Department at 11:18 a.m. on 24 February 2021. In the operation, about a total of 200 staff members from HAD, WTSDO, HKPF, the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department and Auxiliary Medical Service were mobilised for implementation of the declaration and enforcement against violation of the compulsory testing notice issued earlier.

216. The Chairman called on WTSDO to provide the number of its staff members deployed to the scene for assistance after the meeting.

(iii) Wong Tai Sin District Officer’s Perfunctory Performance of His Duties

217. Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy presented the Paper (Annex V).

218. Mr. WONG Chi-wah, Steve, JP of WTSDO refuted by saying that as soon as WTSDO learned on the morning of 16 February 2021 that due to a confirmed COVID-19 case, compulsory testing was required for Fung Chuen Court in Diamond Hill in accordance with the Prevention and Control of Disease (Compulsory Testing for Certain Persons) Regulation (Cap. 599J), WTSDO contacted the property management office and dispatched staff to the scene for inspection and identification of suitable

venue for setting up a mobile specimen collection station. Afterwards, WTSDO discussed with the testing contractor the feasible location for setting up the mobile specimen collection station, including the badminton court near Fung Chuen Court. According to the contractor's professional opinion, it was most appropriate and safe to set up the mobile specimen collection station in the hall of Fung Tak Estate Community Centre, which was only about 400 metres away and three minutes' walk from Fung Chuen Court. WTSDO then informed the property management office about the setting up of the mobile specimen collection station in Fung Tak Estate Community Centre for specimen collection from the residents and staff of Fung Chuen Court between 17 and 18 February, and told the property management office to notify the residents of the relevant arrangements. Within two days, over 94 percent of the residents in Fung Chuen Court went in person to the Fung Tak Estate Community Centre for testing, which was conducted with good order. In addition to the testing at Fung Tak Estate Community Centre, those who were required to be tested might also go to the designated places to obtain specimen collection packs and return them to the designated clinics after self-collecting specimen. Since the distribution and collection of specimen collection packs were not under WTSDO's purview, WTSDO had reminded the property management office to obtain specimen collection packs from the Centre for Health Protection for residents who could not go out for testing, and encouraged the property management office to consider collecting and returning specimen collection packs for the residents. To WTSDO's knowledge, the property management office had arranged the distribution of specimen collection packs to the residents in need on the afternoon of 17 February. WTSDO had all along maintained close liaison with various sectors of the community. In a meeting on the afternoon of 16 February, he himself received a phone call from Ms. TAM Heung-man, Mandy. A WTSDO staff then immediately returned her call in a polite manner, but it was a pity that she hung up on him. He said WTSDO deeply regretted that Ms. TAM unreasonably accused him and WTSDO staff of perfunctorily performing their duties despite their due diligence in work. Anti-epidemic work relied on the joint efforts and cooperation of all sectors of the society and the Government. WTSDO sincerely thanked the residents in Wong Tai Sin, in particular those of Fung Chuen Court, for cooperating with the Government's anti-epidemic measures. He called on Ms. TAM to actively dovetail with and support the Government's work in a pragmatic manner so as to fight COVID-19 together.

219. Dr. SHAM Yu-hin, Eddy alerted the Chairman that there was not a quorum of members present.

V. Date of Next Meeting

220. The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned and reminded Members that the 10th meeting of the Sixth Term of WTSDC would be held in this Conference Room at 2:30 p.m. on 4 May 2021 (Tuesday).

221. The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Wong Tai Sin District Council Secretariat
April 2021

Ref. No.: HAD WTSDC 13-5/5/53 Pt. 59

Chinese Version Only

(Please refer to:

[https://www.districtcouncils.gov.hk/wts/doc/2020_2023/tc/dc_meetings_minutes/
DC_M9_M.pdf](https://www.districtcouncils.gov.hk/wts/doc/2020_2023/tc/dc_meetings_minutes/DC_M9_M.pdf))