

**Minutes of the 14th Meeting of  
the Focus Group on MTR South Island Line Scheme,  
Southern District Council (2008-2011)**

---

**Date : 25 May 2011**  
**Time : 10:00 a.m.**  
**Venue : SDC Conference Room**

**Present:**

Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP (Chairman)  
Ms MAR Yuet-har, BBS, MH (Chairlady of SDC)  
Mr AU Lap-sing  
Mr CHAI Man-hon  
Mr CHAN Fu-ming  
Ir CHAN Lee-shing William, JP  
Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying  
Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung  
Mr FUNG Wai-kwong  
Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH  
Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH  
Mr MAK Chi-yan  
Mrs MAK TSE How-ling, Ada  
Mr TSUI Yuen-wa  
Mr WONG Che-ngai  
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN  
Mr CHEUNG Hon-fan  
Dr MUI Heung-fu, Dennis  
Mr PANG Siu-kei  
Mr PUK Kwan-kin  
Dr TANG Chi-wai, Sydney

**Absent with Apologies:**

Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung  
Mr FUNG Se-goun, Fergus  
Mr LEUNG Ho-kwan, MH  
Mr WONG Ling-sun, Vincent  
Dr YANG Mo, PhD  
Mr CHOW Seung-man

**Secretary:**

Mr CHUNG Yik-lun, Alan                      Executive Assistant (District Council)1,  
Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department

**In Attendance:**

Mr WONG Yin-fun, Alex, JP                      District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department  
Miss LEUNG Tsz-ying, Almaz                      Assistant District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department  
Miss LIN Ming                                      Senior Executive Officer (District Council),  
Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department  
Mr LAW Siu-chung, Paul                      Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 7C,  
Transport and Housing Bureau  
Mr NG Tak-wing                                      Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-1,  
Highways Department  
Mr WAT Wai-ching                                      Senior Engineer/South Island Line 1, Highways Department  
Mr CHAN Gin-wing, David                      Senior Engineer/Priority Railway, Transport Department  
Mr Siu Kam-hang                                      Projects Communications Manager, MTR Corporation Limited  
Mr Bernard WONG                                      Senior Liaison Engineer, MTR Corporation Limited  
Mr Ken WONG                                      Construction Manager - South Island Line Civil, MTR  
Corporation Limited

**Opening Remarks**

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives of the following government departments and MTR Corporation Limited to the meeting:

- (a) Mr LAW Siu-chung, Paul, Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport), Transport and Housing Bureau;
- (b) Mr NG Tak-wing, Chief Engineer/Railway Development, Highways Department;
- (c) Mr WAT Wai-ching, Senior Engineer/South Island Line, Highways Department;
- (d) Mr CHAN Gin-wing, Senior Engineer/Priority Railway, Transport Department;
- (e) Mr SIU Kam-hang, Projects Communications Manager, MTR Corporation Limited;

- (f) Mr Bernard WONG, Senior Liaison Engineer, MTR Corporation Limited;  
and
- (g) Mr Ken WONG, Construction Manager, MTR Corporation Limited.

2. The Chairman advised Members to note that prior to the meeting, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, Mr FUNG Se-goun, Dr YANG Mo and Mr CHOW Seung-man had applied for their absence because of other engagement.

(Post-meeting Note: Mr LEUNG Ho-kwan, MH and Mr WONG Ling-sun were absent from the meeting but no application had been submitted beforehand.)

(Mr CHAN Fu-ming and Mr TSUI Yuen-wa joined the meeting at 10:17 a.m. and 10:20 a.m. respectively.)

**Agenda Item 1: Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 13<sup>th</sup> SIL Focus Group Meeting held on 10 March 2011**

---

3. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN proposed the following amendment on paragraph 48(a) of the minutes:

~~“After project completion, MTR should present the condition and layout plans of the public facilities (e.g. the barging point) after restoration to the public, and a report should be made to the Focus Group. Subject to the support of the Focus Group, MTR should submit the proposal of restoration to the departments concerned for approval.”~~

4. The Chairman said that he would ask the Secretary to listen to the audio record of the meeting again before deciding whether to accept the amendment.

5. The Focus Group confirmed the minutes of the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting in principle.

[Post-meeting note: After listening to the audio record of the meeting again, the Secretary found the proposed amendment was closer to what was discussed at that time. The minutes of 13<sup>th</sup> meeting were amended accordingly as agreed by the Chairman.]

**Agenda Item 2: Latest Development of the South Island Line (East) Scheme**  
**(Focus Group Paper No. 2/2011)**

---

6. Mr LAW Siu-chung stated that the statutory procedures, authorisation procedures, funding application procedures and financial arrangements related to the South Island Line (East) (“SIL (E)”) Scheme have been completed on 18 May 2011. As the independent consultant assessment result indicated that the SIL(E) would not be financially viable based on fare and non-fare revenue alone. The Government granted the MTRCL the property development rights of the ex-Wong Chuk Hang Estate so as to bridge the funding gap of the project. The Government also considered that the site to the north of the Ocean Park Station, which had been reserved for the same purpose previously, would be more suitable for other purposes. Therefore, the above-station property development of the SIL(E) would only concentrate at the ex-Wong Chuk Hang Estate site. The construction works of different sections of the SIL(E) have commenced progressively. The SIL(E) is anticipated to commission by 2015.

7. The Chairman asked whether the District Council (“DC”) would be consulted later regarding the above-station property development in Wong Chuk Hang.

8. In response, Mr LAW Siu-chung said the MTRCL would be responsible for the planning of the Wong Chuk Hang Site, and DC would be informed of the progress in due course.

9. Five Members, namely Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr FUNG Wai-kwong, Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, spoke on the item. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) A Member said that, in general, property developments above railway stations required about four to five years for completion, while the above-station property in Wong Chuk Hang was anticipated to be completed in 2023 to 2024. He enquired whether it was the fastest schedule.
- (b) Intermittent closures of the Aberdeen Tunnel and increasingly rapid development at various parts of the Southern District would increase traffic and congestion in the District and areas near the Aberdeen Tunnel.

Therefore, it was hoped that the development of the above-station property in Wong Chuk Hang could be slowed down and reduced in scale, and Wong Chuk Hang could be further developed after the traffic congestion problem of the Aberdeen Tunnel had been eased.

- (c) Noting that MTR had to withdraw the environmental impact assessment (“EIA”) reports on the Shatin to Central Link project, a Member enquired whether the above-station property development project in Wong Chuk Hang had to pass the same EIA before commencement.
- (d) It was worried that, if members of the public applied for judicial review regarding the legality of the EIA reports of the SIL (E) Scheme and the above-station property development in Wong Chuk Hang, the completion time of the projects concerned would be delayed.
- (e) A Member asked how much area in the large above-station shopping mall would be reserved for social enterprises.
- (f) A Member enquired about the progress of the research on arrangement of feeder services in the Southern District in connection with the commissioning of new railway lines.

10. The Chairman said that, matters related to the research on arrangement of feeder services in the Southern District in connection with the commissioning of new railway lines would be discussed under Agenda Item 3.

11. Mr LAW Siu-chung replied as follows:

- (a) The purpose of granting the property development right at railway station and depot sites along the new railway is to bridge the funding gap of the project. Separating the above-station property development from the railway project would affect the integrity of the whole planning. Constructing the above-station property after commissioning of the new railway line might also obstruct the operation of the station and the depot.
- (b) The Transport Demand Assessment had already taken into account factors that would affect the passenger volume, such as the residential and

working populations, as well as the above-station property development and other developments in the district.

- (c) The EIA report and environmental permit of the SIL (E) Scheme were valid and effective.
- (d) An area of about 1 500 sq. m. in the above-station property in Wong Chuk Hang would be reserved for the social enterprises.

12. Mr CHAI Man-hon and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN spoke on the item. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) MTR had been requested to submit the TIA report, yet no report was received so far.
- (b) During the construction of the West Rail, locations of piles were reserved at some stations for property developments. A Member enquired whether similar arrangement would be adopted for Wong Chuk Hang Station with a view to speeding up the construction of property developments and access so that, after commissioning of SIL, residents did not need to travel between the station and the Shum Wan Road area via temporary passageways.
- (c) It would be too slow to progressively put social welfare facilities in place almost 10 years after commissioning of the railway line.
- (d) A Member enquired about the allocation and planning of the space reserved for social welfare facilities.

13. The responses of Mr LAW Siu-chung were summarised as follows:

- (a) In the territory-wide transport demand assessment, planning information such as distribution of population and employment in different districts was employed and a computer model was used to assess the traffic and passenger flows in the new project.
- (b) Information contained in the transport demand assessment report was very extensive and involved long-term planning of the community, and part of

the contents might be relatively sensitive. Therefore, the Administration considered it inappropriate to publicise the whole report, but the relevant assessment result could be provided to the Focus Group for reference.

- (c) At the present stage, developers were only requested to reserve space for social enterprises at the above-station developments at Wong Chuk Hang. Further consultation on its planning and details of allocation would be conducted at the design stage.

14. Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN spoke on the item. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) It was noted that papers of the meeting did not include minutes of the Community Liaison Groups (“CLGs”) and did not reflect the matters discussed by the Telegraph Bay CLG. The DC should be concerned about the opinions of the CLGs and, thus, papers of the meeting should include minutes of every CLG.
- (b) A Member said that some affected local representatives were not invited to attend a previous meeting of the Ocean Park and Chung Hom Shan CLG and were only invited to attend the meeting held the day before. Those affected persons were worried about the operation of the magazine. Therefore, the Member would like to present a petition to MTR together with a group of residents who were concerned about the temporary magazine at Chung Hom Shan.

15. The Chairman responded as follows:

- (a) The Standing Orders did not provide that the Chairman could receive petitions during meetings.
- (b) He had requested MTR to distribute past minutes of the CLGs to all Members of the Focus Group but was yet to receive the documents concerned. He hoped that MTR could submit the minutes as soon as possible after the meeting.

16. Mr SIU Kam-hang responded as follows:

- (a) Two rounds of meetings had been held for each CLG and the minutes of first meetings had been uploaded to the SIL (E) website.
- (b) MTR would discuss with the Secretariat about the way to distribute the minutes to Members.
- (c) The drafts of minutes concerned could only be officially issued after being confirmed by members at the next meeting. Therefore, matters discussed during the second meetings would first be reported verbally later.

17. Mr SIU Kam-hang played a promotional video of SIL (E) and said that Chinese and English versions of the video would be uploaded to the SIL (E) website for public access.

18. Mr SIU Kam-hang and Mr Bernard WONG said that the project had been launched in late May 2011 and briefed Members on the advance works with powerpoint presentation (Reference Paper). The briefing was summarised as follows:

**Open Blasting at Wong Chuk Hang Estate Site**

- (a) Trees at Wong Chuk Hang Estate site would first be removed for blasting, site formation and slope stabilisation. A temporary footbridge had been constructed across the nullah to facilitate transport of materials and spoil to the site via Heung Yip Road.
- (b) MTR was consulting SDC Member(s) of the constituency concerned and schools nearby regarding the works. Blasting from west to east of the site was tentatively scheduled between 3 p.m. and 4 p.m. each day, starting from August this year. Roads in the vicinity would be temporarily closed for around 10 minutes each time.
- (c) No blasting would be carried out in area within 10 m. from the site and 40 m. from the nullah.
- (d) To reduce flying dust, the spot of blasting would be enclosed by a blasting cage surrounded with mat made of thick tyres, which would be encircled by a high-rise wire fence (a vertical screen) covered by wet cloth.

- (e) To ensure safety, the contractor would monitor the works with seismograph and air-overpressure monitoring device, and fine tune the blasting arrangement based on data collected when necessary.
- (f) A series of noise mitigation measures would be implemented, such as installation of mobile noise barriers and use of noise insulating fabric near the source of noise, as well as installation of silencers on machines.
- (g) There would be regular water spraying, covering of stockpiling areas and wheel washing of trucks before leaving the site to reduce flying dust.

### **Temporary Traffic Management Schemes (“TTMS”) Expected to be Implemented**

MTR reported the proposed TTMS to the Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) and the CLG on 14 February 2011, and site inspection would be arranged before the TTMS was finalised. The police would arrange the date for implementing the TTMS only after the proposals had been confirmed by the Site Liaison Group. During the construction period, the measures would be appropriately fine-tuned having regard to the actual circumstances, so that the impacts of the works on traffic in the district could be minimised as far as practicable.

### **Progress of Condition Survey**

Written notification had been sent to all buildings in which condition survey had to be carried out. Except the fact that an industrial building could not be entered, condition survey on public area of many affected buildings had basically been completed. Among the 1 800 units responded to the notification (18% of the total number of notifications sent), condition survey had been completed on 1 500 units. MTR would distribute survey reports to the owners concerned in June to July 2011.

### **CLGs**

CLGs of the five sections held their second meetings in April to May 2011.

### **Operation Arrangements of the Barging Points for the SIL (E)**

- (a) The SIL (E) Scheme would produce about 1.1 million cubic metres of spoil, which would mainly come from the works in Nam Fung Tunnel, the Wong Chuk Hang Estate site and Ap Lei Chau Tunnel. After a long period of discussion, it was finalised that the spoil would be delivered to the barging points at Lee Nam Road and Telegraph Bay, and removed by ship.
  
- (b) Telegraph Bay Barging Point:
  - (i) The barging point was currently managed by the Drainage Services Department (“DSD”) to facilitate implementation of the Hong Kong West Drainage Tunnel project. Only after completion of the drainage project could the barging point be used to handle the spoil from Nam Fung Tunnel.
  
  - (ii) The barging point was expected to start operation in 2012, for a period of two years, handling 150 trucks of spoil at maximum from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. each day.
  
- (c) Lee Nam Road Barging Point:
  - (i) The pier facing Lee Nam Road would be temporarily closed to serve as a barging point, which was expected to be in service from mid 2011 to mid 2014, operating on Monday to Saturday. It would handle spoil from the South Horizons site from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.; the spoil of the ex-Habour Mission School site from 9:30 a.m. to 7 p.m. to avoid the morning traffic peak hours in the Ap Lei Chau area; and the spoil of the Wong Chuk Hang Estate site from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. to avoid the traffic peak hours in the morning and the evening.
  
  - (ii) The barging point could accommodate 400 trucks of spoil per day at maximum, but MTR would only handle 380 trucks per day at maximum, and it was estimated that in the first year, the project would require the handling of about 250 trucks of spoil per day on average. Since the formation work in the Wong Chuk Hang

Estate site was expected to be completed in the first year, the amount of spoil to be handled by Lee Nam Road barging point would reduce largely to 120 trucks per day on average in the second year, and 240 trucks at most.

- (iii) Mitigation measures would be imposed at the barging point to minimise the impact of noise and dust.

### **Station Design**

- (a) There would be three entrances at Ocean Park Station. Entrance B would connect to the entrance plaza of Ocean Park via a footbridge. A Park and Ride facility would also be provided at the station.
- (b) There would be two entrances at Wong Chuk Hang Station and a public transport interchange would be available beneath it. Heung Yip Road would be widened as a two-lane carriageway for east-west traffic, and public transport drop-off/pick-up areas would be provided. To ease the traffic of the district, traffic facilities at Police School Road and Nam Long Shan Road would be enhanced. The overall traffic planning would merge with property developments as far as practicable to facilitate residents' use of the station.
- (c) Lei Tung Station would be an underground station with two entrances. The entrance at Ap Lei Chau Main Street would be linked up with the station by a subway, while the entrance at Lei Tung bus terminus would be connected with the station concourse by four high-speed lifts. Besides, in the unpaid area of the station, there would be access leading to Lei Tung Estate and Ap Lei Chau Main Street.
- (d) South Horizons Station would have three entrances, locating outside Precious Blood Primary School, Block 18 of South Horizons and South Horizons bus terminus respectively. Escalators and high-speed lifts connecting the entrances with the station concourse would be available. Plant buildings would be located at the end of the station near Yuk Kwai Shan. To match with the view and community nearby, an environmental-friendly design in green colour would be adopted for the station entrances.

19. The Chairman suggested that Members should make comments and enquiries by section-based CLG.

(Ir CHAN Lee-shing William joined the meeting at 11:36 a.m.)

### **Telegraph Bay CLG**

20. Nine Members, namely Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung, Mr FUNG Wai-kwong, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH, Mr MAK Chi-yan, Mr WONG Che-ngai, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN and Dr MUI Heung-fu, spoke on the item. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) The Telegraph Bay CLG considered that the critical items included the provision of noise barrier of the barging point, dump truck movements in the barging point area, as well as road widening works at the junction of Victoria Road and Sha Wan Drive.
- (b) If the Transport Department (TD) only widened the road at the southern end (down line) of the junction of Sha Wan Drive and Victoria Road (i.e. to cut the slope at the south), this might lead to speeding of vehicles going to Cyberport along the down line. Moreover, the community generally hoped that northern end (up line) of the carriageway could be widened to solve the problem that dump trucks encroaching upon the adjacent lane when passing the junction. The community also hoped that the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and MTR could agree to the proposal shortly and allocate resources as soon as possible, so that amendment to the slope cutting works at the northern end and the road widening works could be completed in summer.
- (c) It was glad to know that the site of the barging point would be reinstated upon completion of the works. However, revision to the reinstatement plan was still needed.
- (d) It was hoped that MTR could build a link between Cyberport and Sha Wan Drive in the future, although investigation into the maintenance problem was needed.

- (e) The handling of 380 trucks of spoil at Lee Nam Road barging point would cause nuisance to nearby residents as well as affecting the daily operation of the driving school and the traffic of the entire Ap Lei Chau area in the morning and in the evening.
- (f) The Lei Tung CLG did not mention the fact that Lee Nam Road barging point would become a single barging point.
- (g) Following the recovery of the ex-Harbour Mission School site adjacent to Lei Tung Estate for the works as well as the progressive intake of residents for the Larvotto development project, there would be an increase in traffic flow. Dump trucks passing through the barging point would definitely further burden the traffic at Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road. The traffic of the entire Ap Lei Chai would be seriously affected in case of accident.
- (h) MTR was requested to explain the reason for the substantial increase in the number of daily truck trips at Lee Nam Road barging point from 240 to 380.
- (i) MTR had clearly noted that South Horizons residents would definitely not accept Lee Nam Road barging point to be a single barging point. It was requested that the barging points at Lee Nam Road and Telegraph Bay should come into operation simultaneously for distribution of traffic.
- (j) A Member asked about the number of South Horizons residents to be covered by indirect mitigation measures and compensated due to noise exceedance during the construction of the plant building.
- (k) MTR was requested to discuss with DSD on whether the latter could hand over the site at Telegraph Bay as soon as possible to relieve the pressure on Lee Nam Road barging point.
- (l) If the Telegraph Bay barging point could not start operation at the same time as the commencement of the works, other barging points in Hong Kong could be utilised to relieve the pressure on Lee Nam Road barging point.

- (m) A Member asked about the operating hours and arrangements of the Telegraph Bay barging point on Sundays and general holidays.
- (n) To avoid affecting the traffic, the Telegraph Bay barging point should not be used until the problem of Sha Wan Drive was completely solved.
- (o) A Member hoped that the Government could explain the reason for the delay in the handover of the Telegraph Bay site by DSD and enquired how the Government would improve or avoid similar problems from happening again.
- (p) The public would be very dissatisfied should there be any insufficiency, delay or concealment in the provision of information on MTR's projects.
- (q) The Telegraph Bay barging point should be used to handle the spoil from Wong Chuk Hang site, so that the pressure on Lee Nam Road barging point and the traffic of Ap Lei Chau could be relieved.

21. Mr Ken WONG replied as follows:

**Telegraph Bay and Lee Nam Road Barging Points**

- (a) He reinstated the fact that there would be two barging points instead of one at Lee Nam Road only.
- (b) It was originally planned that a barging point would be provided at Kellett Bay to handle the spoil from Wong Chuk Hang sites, and Lee Nam Road barging point would handle the spoil from Ap Lei Chau sites (240 trucks per day). In response to the objection raised by residents, Kellett Bay barging point was replaced by the Telegraph Bay barging point. Due to a lapse in operation period of the barging point, truck loads handled by Lee Nam Road barging point were more than initially estimated.
- (c) MTR had discussed the proposal of co-using the Telegraph Bay site with DSD. However, the Telegraph Bay site would not be available until construction of the DSD tunnel outfall was completed. Thus the Telegraph Bay barging point could only start operation in early 2012.

- (d) Having regard to the TIA result, delivery of spoil using Ap Lei Chau Bridge during morning and evening peak hours would be avoided as far as possible, in order to lessen the impact on traffic at Ap Lei Chau Bridge.
- (e) The existing traffic arrangements at Ap Lei Chau Drive would remain unchanged. TTMS would be implemented and adjusted according to the actual situation after the full-scale works at the ex-Harbour Mission School site had been commenced in 2012.
- (f) During the first year of the project, the major task would be transporting the spoil from Wong Chuk Hang sites to Lee Nam Road barging point, and the amount of spoil would gradually decrease in the following year. The works at Ap Lei Chau would approach to its peak in the second year, and Lee Nam Road barging point would mainly handle the spoil from Ap Lei Chau.
- (g) Dump trucks would avoid going via Aberdeen Tunnel as far as possible to minimise the impact on tunnel traffic.

#### **The Junction of Victoria Road and Sha Wan Drive**

- (h) The design of the junction of Victoria Road and Sha Wan Drive conformed with the standard set by TD, but it could be enhanced to further smoothen the operation on the road.
- (i) A Member's view that widening the road at the southern end of the junction would cause the driving speed of the down line to increase was noted, and further studies would be conducted.
- (j) Widening the road at the northern end of the junction and providing an additional lane would involve extending the area of slope cutting works, thus the number of trees to be cut would also increase. Moreover, the area involved in the enhancement proposal exceeded the area of the SIL (E) Scheme specified in the Gazette, so it was more difficult for MTR to accept the proposal.
- (k) The Telegraph Bay barging point would only operate on Monday to Saturday, and would suspend operation on Sundays and general holidays.

22. Four Members, namely Ir CHAN, Lee-shing, JP, Mr FUNG Wai-kwong, Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, spoke on the item. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

**The Junction of Victoria Road and Sha Wan Drive**

- (a) Coaches turning into Sha Wan Drive often encroach upon the opposite lane; and residents also concerned about the speeding problem of heavy vehicles turning into Sha Wan Drive from Victoria Road.
- (b) Long vehicles had to reduce the speed to 10 km per hour or to encroach partially upon the opposite lane before turning into Sha Wan Drive from Victoria Road. When encountering a bus on the opposite lane, either the long vehicle or the bus must stop to give way. The slope at southern end of the junction should be cut to provide space for road widening.
- (c) The junction might need to close if road widening works were conducted at its southern and northern ends simultaneously. Residents of Cyber Port and its vicinity might thus be affected.
- (d) Funding would be involved if a retaining wall had to be built (for slope stabilisation purpose) after widening of Sha Wan Drive. In this regard, it was hoped that an agreement could be reached between the Authority and MTR as soon as possible.
- (e) In studying how to improve the junction, TD only focused its discussion on ways of road widening at the southern end of the junction to address the problem of truck and bus access, without analysing the condition of the entire road section or considering the need of road widening at the northern end of the junction for long-term traffic improvement of the entire Pok Fu Lam area.
- (f) A Member was worried that road widened at the northern end of the junction might attract more people working or living at Cyber Port to use the junction, which might generate traffic problems and arouse discontent from residents in the vicinity of Sha Wan Drive. It was suggested that decision should be made after gauging the views of residents.

- (g) A Member reinstated the fact that residents nearby and CLG members had also suggested road widening at the northern end of the junction.

#### **Telegraph Bay and Lee Nam Road Barging Points**

- (a) MTR often notified the DC, the CLG and the communities on matters arising at the very last moment, and such manner of communication needed improvement.
- (b) A Member was dissatisfied that MTR had not responded directly on the reason for using Lee Nam Road barging point as the only barging point in the first year, neither had it responded to the opposing views of the South Horizons residents.
- (c) MTR had initially said 500 truck trips per day would be required during the works period, among which 2/3 would be handled at Telegraph Bay, and the remaining 1/3 (i.e. about 150 trucks trips) be handled at Lee Nam Road.
- (d) If the number of dump trucks running in the Ap Lei Chau area increased, the traffic of Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road would definitely be affected.
- (e) Heavy vehicles would cause serious noise nuisance to the residents in the vicinity of Lee Nam Road, and MTR was urged to account to the residents and consider implementing mitigation or compensation measures.
- (f) The starting time for delivering spoil from Wong Chuk Hang Estate site should be deferred to 10 a.m., in order to further reduce the impact on the traffic of Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road.

23. Mr Ken WONG responded as follows:

#### **The Junction of Victoria Road and Sha Wan Drive**

- (a) The proposed route for the dump trucks would only go through the southern end of the junction (i.e. turning left from Victoria Road into the

down line of Sha Wan Drive), so the proposal of widening the road at the northern end was not related to the SIL (E) Scheme.

- (b) Constructing a retaining wall at the bend of Sha Wan Drive near Victoria Road would require a larger space, and might block the sight and increase the time required for the widening works. In that case, the time for the Telegraph Bay barging point to start operation had to be delayed.

#### **Telegraph Bay and Lee Nam Road Barging Points**

- (c) Dump trucks from Wong Chuk Hang Estate site would only go through Ap Lei Chau Bridge to Lee Nam Road barging point directly.
- (d) There should be a balance for the traffic arrangements between the two barging points during the construction period.
- (e) MTR had reached an agreement with DSD for the co-use of the latter's works site at Telegraph Bay. However, DSD could only spare the space for setting up a barging point for the SIL (E) projects upon completion of a particular stage of its construction works.
- (f) According to the TIA report, the traffic of the Southern District was generally normal after the peak hours of 9:30 a.m.
- (g) Dump trucks would only leave Wong Chuk Hang Estate site after 9:30 a.m. and their route would be in opposite direction to the queue heading for the Aberdeen Tunnel. In addition, it was anticipated that the time for dump trucks to return to Wong Chuk Hang Estate site along the route heading the Aberdeen Tunnel direction after dumping would take about further 30 minutes. Therefore, the proposed arrangement should not cause severe impact on the traffic during the peak hours in the morning. Also, transport of spoil would stop at about 3:30 p.m., taking into account the off-school hours of schools in the vicinity of Nam Long Shan Road in Wong Chuk Hang.

24. Mr CHAN Gin-wing replied as follows:

- (a) At a resident meeting, it was pointed out that trucks often encroached upon another lane when taking a turn at the junction. As such, TD agreed to improve the bend where vehicles turned from Victoria Road into Sha Wan Drive. However, there was view nowadays that widening the road would increase the speed of vehicles driving into Sha Wan Drive, thus affecting road safety.
- (b) To his understanding, some residents considered road widening at the northern end (up line) of the junction of Sha Wan Drive and Victoria Road would help relieve traffic queues during the peak hours in the morning. However, MTR's TTMS proposal of improving the junction was not incidental to solving the problem.
- (c) In the study of widening the southern end of the junction, TD would together with MTR try to decrease the scope of the slope cutting works, and ensure that there would be enough space for vehicles to make a turn.
- (d) TD would continue to study the feasibility of changing the junction of Sha Wan Drive and Victoria Road from two-lane traffic to three-lane traffic. However, widening the road at the northern end was not part of the traffic management measures of the SIL (E) project.

25. Two Members, namely Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN spoke on the item. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) It was hoped that the Focus Group, the CLG and residents could share consistent views as far as possible.
- (b) The problem of the junction at Sha Wan Drive had existed for a long time. It was quite often for coaches entering and leaving Cyberport to encroach upon another lane and this posed danger to pedestrians who crossed the road there. In principle, residents completely objected to the use of the Telegraph Bay as a barging point. It was not right that TD focused only on the study of widening the southern end of the junction. This could not help to solve the traffic problem but was only a waste of time.

- (c) Formation works for the slope in the southern end of Sha Wan Drive would be substantive in scale, thus TD should conduct feasibility study for widening the road in the northern and southern ends as appropriate.
- (d) It was very clear that residents and the CLG objected to the slope works and hoped that the persistent problem in Sha Wan Drive could be solved together.
- (e) If it was only to solve the problem of dump trucks accessing Victoria Road through Sha Wan Drive, there would be alternative solutions in addition to widening the road, such as implementing traffic management measures or installing traffic light(s) to control the flow of coaches and dump trucks on opposite lanes.
- (f) A Member said that the movement of dump trucks would affect residents of the South Horizons Phases III and IV near the hillside of Lee Nam Road. So he asked if MTR had considered diverging the traffic and implementing other mitigation measures to lessen the impact on residents nearby.

26. The Chairman summarised the above discussion as follows:

- (a) Quite a number of Members were discontented with MTR for the substantial increase of trucks trips using Lee Nam Road barging point without advance notice and the fact that only the barging point at Lee Nam Road was put into operation during the first year of the works period.
- (b) THB, MTR and DSD were urged to negotiate for an earlier return of the site at Telegraph Bay.
- (c) MTR should, at the residents' meeting of the South Horizons Station, explain in details to the residents of the South Horizons and Ap Lei Chau Estate the reasons for sudden increase of truck trips and discuss with them the mitigation measures required.
- (d) Since the slope at the northern end of the junction of Sha Wan Drive and Victoria Road was privately owned, TD was advised to consult the owners before handling the issue and taking follow-up action.

- (e) It was suggested that improvement measures for Sha Wan Drive should be followed up and discussed by the CLG.

### **Ocean Park and Chung Hom Shan CLG**

27. The comments and enquiries raised by Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying were summarised as follows:

- (a) The Concern Group on Chung Hom Shan Temporary Explosives Magazine Site (the Magazine Site) and the local residents strongly objected to delivering explosives at peak hour of 4:00 p.m. She suggested to change the delivery time to non-peak hour, e.g. 1:00 p.m.
- (b) MTR was requested to provide the route and delivery schedule of explosives from North Point Ferry Pier to Stanley, the schedule of building the magazine site and other related information about the blasting works.

28. Mr Ken WONG responded as follows:

- (a) The Mines Division was responsible for delivering explosives to the Magazine Site and the delivery time would depend on the destinations of the explosives delivery by Mines Division on the day. The delivery route was also not fixed and would be adjusted according to the conditions in the area.
- (b) Two blasts per day would be carried out at each of Ap Lei Chau Tunnel and Nam Fung Tunnel, once in the early morning and once in the evening, so explosives would be delivered twice for each tunnel. As the explosives and the detonators had to be delivered separately, four trucks would be needed and the effect on the traffic should be slight.
- (c) Subject to the requirements of the Mines Division, MTR could not store explosives in the construction site, so the explosives had to be loaded and detonated soon after their arrival to the construction site. Hence, the arrival time in the afternoon could not advance to 1:00 p.m. However, MTR would try to ensure that the delivery time would not overlap the after school or work peak hours.
- (d) The construction of the Magazine Site would commence on June 2011, and

expect to finish in the forth quarter in 2011.

- (e) In setting the blasting schedule, MTR would consider the conditions at the blasting spot and the daily life of residents to minimise the nuisances caused, so the earliest blasting time would be at 7:00 a.m. An interval of 12 hours was usually required for each tunnel blasting to provide enough time for clearing the debris from the previous blasting, temporary reinforcement work and drilling holes on the rock before loading explosives.

29. Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying opined that MTR had hidden something when drawing up the scheduled road route and final routing time schedule. As such, she requested MTR to explain the details. She reiterated that the explosives should not be delivered at peak hours from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

30. Mr Ken WONG responded as follows:

- (a) MTR could not provide information on the delivery route because the Mines Division was responsible for the delivery of explosives to the magazine.
- (b) MTR was responsible for delivering the explosives from the Magazine Site to the construction sites and the details had already been reported to CLG.
- (c) MTR had made a quantitative risk assessment on the whole delivery procedure for the explosives, and each step had met the requirements of the environmental permit issued by the Environmental Protection Department. MTR assured Members and residents that the Mines Division would strictly regulate the delivery of explosives according to the related legislation.

31. Two Members, namely Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying and Mrs MAK TSE How-ling spoke on this item. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) A Member opined that MTR should strengthen its communication with various government departments and disclose more information to increase transparency. If Members had a clear understanding of the latest progress of work, they could help explain the situation to the residents.
- (b) A Member said that many bus and minibus routes would be affected during the construction period. MTR should provide proper traffic arrangements

and discuss the station diversion with bus companies to minimise chaos and confusion.

32. The Chairman suggested inviting related government department representatives to attend CLG meeting.

33. Mr Ken WONG replied that if CLG members deemed it necessary, MTR would invite government department representatives to attend CLG meeting on their behalf.

(Mr CHAN Fu-ming, Ir CHAN Lee-sing, JP, Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying, Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH, Mr CHEUNG Hon-fun and Dr MUI Heung-fu left the meeting at 12:33 p.m., 12:25 p.m., 12:35 p.m., 12:38 p.m., 12:07 p.m. and 12:17 p.m. respectively.)

### **Wong Chuk Hang CLG**

34. Four Members, namely Mr AU Lap-sing, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr TSUI Yuen-wa and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN spoke on the related subjects. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) A Member worried that the temporary closure of roads near the Wong Chuk Hang Estate site for about 10 minutes in total during blasting would affect the local traffic seriously and the safety of residents.
- (b) A Member opined that MTR should try to arrange the blasting at the same time every day to reduce intermittent closure of road at different time.
- (c) A Member suggested that MTR should erect notice boards on the roads near the entrances of the construction site to let the public know about the daily blasting schedule so that they could avoid driving on the road sections in the specific time period.
- (d) A Member said that MTR only adopted regular mitigation measures to deal with the noise nuisances and dust emission problem. He stated that as the Wong Chuk Hang Estate site was very close to the local community and its noise and dust emission would affect residents, MTR should provide mitigation measures that were higher than the normal standard to minimise the effects.

- (e) A Member worried that the relocation of the Nam Long Shan Bus Terminus would affect the traffic in the local area.
- (f) A Member requested TD to provide the latest arrangements on various bus routes after the relocation of the Nam Long Shan Bus Terminus.
- (g) A Member requested the related government departments and MTR to provide information concerning the effect of a public transport interchange under the Wong Chuk Hang Station to the local traffic, so that Members could discuss its detailed design as soon as possible.
- (h) A Member said that residents were generally concerned with the designs of the Nam Long Shan Bus Terminus, the Wong Chuk Hang Station, the public transport interchange and the arrangement of feeder services, and so would like to have a better understanding of the plans to give advice. He hoped that MTR could consult SDC before making any final decisions on the designs.
- (i) A Member said that at the previous meeting, he had requested MTR to provide the model of Wong Chuk Hang Station to SDC for discussion. He asked when MTR could provide it.
- (j) A Member hoped that before the commissioning of SIL (E), the Government and MTR could work out a forward-looking planning for connecting Wong Chuk Hang to the neighbouring communities (e.g. Aberdeen Centre and Shek Pai Wan) to facilitate residents using the station.
- (k) It is expected that there would be a long interval between the commissioning of SIL (E) and the completion of Wong Chuk Hang above-station property development. In this connection, a Member asked if MTR had any measures to facilitate residents using the station during such period and also to enable the station to cope with the development of the local community.

35. The Chairman said that the residents in the Southern District were very concerned with the design and development of SIL (E), so he hoped MTR could explain the design and planning on the new stations.

36. Mr Bernard WONG responded as follows:

- (a) The model placed at Wong Chuk Hang office mentioned at the last meeting was only a preliminary design of Wong Chuk Hang Station. MTR was working on the detailed design of the station and would consult the Focus Group again when the latest design was available.
- (b) The planning for the programme to relocate the affected bus stops made by MTR in collaboration with TD was at the final stage. MTR would report to and consult the Focus Group when the relocation timetable for various bus stops and bus routes at different stages of the project period was confirmed.
- (c) Since the impacts of noise nuisances and dust emission on different stakeholders varied, they would be consulted separately so that appropriate mitigation measures could be devised for different cases.
- (d) The explosives used in the blasting works at Wong Chuk Hang Estate site would be delivered by the Mines Division and the arrival time would be 12:00 at noon to 3:00 p.m. on the day of blasting.
- (e) MTR would discuss with the Mines Division on scheduling the blasting works at a fixed time as far as possible.

37. Four Members, namely Mr AU Lap-sing, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr FUNG Wai-kwong and Mr TSUI Yuen-wa, spoke on the related subjects. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) A Member said that some residents and bus drivers were concerned about how the buses could be driven into the newly provided Nam Long Shan temporary Bus Terminus. And also, it was enquired if the temporary bus terminus would occupy one of the traffic lanes, thus obstructing the traffic.
- (b) A Member stressed that the Wong Chuk Hang Estate site was located very close to residential premises and urged that more stringent measures should be taken during the blasting.
- (c) A Member said that the design plan for the public traffic interchange submitted earlier only outlined hardware like the locations of parking facilities and escalators with no indication of how residents could reach the station, the interchange arrangement, the fine-tuning for improvement and so on. As the

commissioning of SIL (E) in future would have significant impacts on the local community near Wong Chuk Hang, it was hoped that MTR could provide the proposed design of the public transport interchange to SDC for consultation before the plan was finalised.

- (d) A Member enquired if the nullah and water outlet near Ocean Court would continue to be covered at the later stage of project construction.
- (e) A Member said he understood that blasting was necessary. Nevertheless, he hoped MTR could act as it promised and improve its performance in communication. He pointed out that MTR had given the local community many reasonable expectations and hoped there would not be too many adjustments (e.g. increasing the amount of explosives used in the blasting) eventually.

38. The Chairman asked MTR representatives to note the views of Members and to follow up on the arrangements regarding the temporary bus terminus at Nam Long Shan Road at TTC meeting.

39. Mr Ken WONG responded as follows:

- (a) Monitoring points would be set up in the vicinity of the blasting works at the Wong Chuk Hang Estate site to monitor the effects of blasting on the neighbouring area. Besides, vibration monitoring would be conducted according to the requirements of the Mines Division to ensure the structural safety of other buildings.
- (b) Based on the data and information obtained from the monitoring work in the above, the design of the blasting works and the quantity of explosives to be used would be fine-tuned to ensure that the blasting procedures complied with the prescribed safety standards.
- (c) The quantity of explosives used in blasting would be kept to a minimum according to the strict requirements as set by the Mines Division.
- (d) Close communication would be maintained with the local community during the construction period and leaflets would be distributed to explain the details to residents before blasting works started.

40. In closing, the Chairman said that CLG and SDC were very concerned with the blasting works conducted at the Wong Chuk Hang Estate site and hoped that MTR could cooperate and communicate closely with CLG, and would fine-tune the work arrangements after consulting the residents.

### **Lei Tung CLG**

41. Seven Members, Ms MAR Yuet-har, BBS, MH, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung, Mr MAK Chi-yan, Mrs MAK TSE How-ling, Mr WONG Che-ngai and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, spoke on the related subjects. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) A Member believed that CLG could effectively address the problems at the local community arising from the project construction.
- (b) A Member said that MTR had never mentioned the operation of the barging points at Lee Nam Road and Telegraph Bay during CLG meetings, and so there was no way to know how the two barging points would affect the traffic and residents in the areas.
- (c) A Member said that residents did not objection to resuming the planter (the planter) at the side of Tung Hing House in Lei Tung Estate for the provision of a temporary bus terminus. Since the planter adjoined the adjacent slope, both the slope and the planter were placed under the management of Lei Tung Estate Owners' Corporation (OC) during the allocation of shares of ownership in the past. After resuming the ownership of the planter, all the work sites surrounding the slope would be belonged to the Government. Therefore, it was believed that Lei Tung Estate OC should no longer be burdered with the ownership and the management and maintenance responsibility of the slope. It would be unfair to the owners if the slope required repairs because of the works at the planter.
- (d) A Member pointed out the problems concerning the ownership and the management and maintenance responsibility of the slope were brought about by the SIL (E) project, and if handled not properly, would indefinely cause works delay in the construction of Lei Tung Station, thus affecting the residents in the vicinity of Lei Tung Estate, Yue On Court and Shum Wan

Towers. There were several housing estates in the neighbourhood of Lei Tung Estate and their population amounted to about 20 000. It was anticipated that more people would go to Lei Tung Estate and use its public facilities after the Lei Tung Station came into operation. The OC of Lei Tung Estate had already been responsible for the maintenance and repairs of these public areas and the facilities within, the residents in the estate would definitely find it unacceptable and object to the construction works if the issues of ownership and management responsibility of the slope could not be resolved properly.

- (e) A Member advised that the residents had held a protest on the ownership and management responsibility of the slope. They insisted that the Government should resume the ownership of the slope as well and be responsible for its management and maintenance.
- (f) a Member pointed out that some of the slopes near Lei Tung Estate were under the purview of Highways Department and so the department should be responsibility for the management and maintenance of the slope concerned.
- (g) A Member said that at the meetings with MTR and the Lands Department (LandsD), the residents of Lei Tung Estate and the Member of the constituency concerned had questioned if there would be problems with the resumption of the planter at the side of Tung Hing House, and LandsD kept repeating that the resumption procedure was in order.
- (h) There was a complaint mechanism in place to deal with compensation cases concerning resumption of ground surface for railway projects. A Member asked technically if the owners of Lei Tung Estate could resolve the problem on slope responsibility and claim compensation by making use of this mechanism. Also it was enquired if there were any similar cases in the past for reference.
- (i) A Member said that two Members of the constituencies concerned and the OC of Lei Tung Estate had written to LandsD on 13 May about the Government failing to resume the ownership of the slope adjoining the planter. They were still waiting for LandsD's reply.
- (j) A Member proposed that the Focus Group should write to the Legislative

Council and the Chief Executive's Office to explain the issues on the ownership and the management and maintenance responsibility of the slope so as to seek a solution to the problem.

- (k) A Member said recently MTR revealed that a 3-storey structure would be constructed at the entrance of Lei Tung Station on Main Street, Ap Lei Chau. He wanted to know the actual height and size of the structure.
- (l) A Member requested that the storm water drainage works at the entrance on Main Street, Ap Lei Chau should be fully enclosed as far as possible during implementation.
- (m) A Member said that the ex-Harbour Mission School site would be used as a work site for SIL (E) project and its entrance would be located at Ap Lei Chau Drive. He propend that as such an arrangement would affect the road traffic near Ap Lei Chau Drive, the control of traffic lights there should be operated manually.

42. Mr LAW Siu-chung responded as follows:

- (a) Reviewed by the relevant government departments, it was decided that only the site of the existing planter was required for SIL (E). Therefore, the Government would not resume the ownership of the slope where no construction works would be conducted.
- (b) The Government needed to go through the necessary statutory procedures for resuming the slope ownership from Lei Tung Estate OC, if any.
- (c) THB would study the matter with LandsD.

43. Mr Ken WONG responded as follows:

- (a) The structure at the entrance of Lei Tung Station on Main Street, Ap Lei Chau was an emergency lift to meet the requirements of the Fire Services Department. The structure was a 3-storey building leading to the road surface of Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road. The emergency lift could allow firemen to reach the entrance on Main Street, Ap Lei Chau and enter Lei Tung Station without driving the fire appliances onto Main Street, Ap Lei Chau

during major rescue operations.

- (b) TTMS would be implemented at the entrance on Main Street, Ap Lei Chau for the drainage works to channel the rainwater collected into the storm water drainage of DSD. The related matter would be discussed at CLG meeting when more detailed planning was available.
- (c) When the residents of Larvotto started to move in, the number of private cars using Ap Lei Chau Drive might be increased. MTR had already taken this factor into account when estimating the traffic volume. Regarding the proposal on adjusting the traffic light manually, MTR would discuss this with TD before making any decisions.

44. Mr NG Tak-wing responded that the railway project had already been gazetted according to the Railways Ordinance, and people who were affected could claim compensation from the Government. Such claims would be handled by LandsD.

45. Four Members, namely Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr CHEUNG Siu-keung, Mr WONG Che-ngai and Mr PANG Siu-kei, spoke on the related subjects. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) A Member pointed out that he had raised the issue concerning the planter and the slope repeatedly, and so he was dissatisfied with THB's response. He stressed that the slope and the planter were adjoined and any works on the planter would definitely affect the slope. Therefore, MTR should be responsible for the slope maintenance and repairs.
- (b) A Member shared the view that THB had neglected its duty in handling the land resumption concerning the planter.
- (c) A Member enquired if the Government had ever resumed the ownership of slope when conducting works underneath private slopes, and also if MTR had ever taken possession of such slopes.
- (d) Noting that all along the residents on Main Street, Ap Lei Chau had wanted an elevator connecting Main Street to Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road, a Member asked whether the fireman's lift at the entrance of Lei Tung Station on Main Street, Ap Lei Chau could be open for public use, and if a staircase could be

built beside the fireman's lift.

46. Mr Ken WONG responded as follows:

- (a) According to the Registry of Slopes , the planter underneath the slope did not include in the area of the registered slope.
- (b) The fireman's lifts on the railway lines were for use of firemen during emergency, so could not be open for public use. After the fireman's lift was built, it would be difficult to install a staircase. Nevertheless, the Government would consider building another lift connecting the Main Street and Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road.

47. Mr NG Tak-wing responded that when drafting a land lease for slope or in the sale of slope, the Government would set up an inter-department committee to decide on matters relating to the ownership and maintenance responsibility of the slope in question. The planter at Lei Tung Estate did not record in the Catalogue of Slopes. In resuming land for railway construction by way of publication in gazette, subject to the Railways Ordinance, the land resumed should be keep to a minimum for the purpose. The Government and MTR did not resume the slope adjoining the planter based on this principle.

48. Mr WONG Che-ngai requested the Focus Group to write to LandsD concerning the ownership of the slope adjoining the planter and at the same time indicating that the owners of Lei Tung Estate were willing to surrender the ownership of the slope.

49. In closing, the Chairman stated that the ownership of the slope and its maintenance responsibility were belonged to Lei Tung Estate OC because the slope adjoined the planter. When the land resumption was gazetted, it only resumed the planter but not the slope because the slope was located outside the works limit, on which the residents of Lei Tung Estate strongly opposed to. Since this was a matter of ownership transfer, the Focus Group suggested that Lei Tung Estate OC should continue to discuss it with LandsD. Meanwhile, the Focus Group would write to the Development Bureau to request for follow up on the matter.

### **South Horizons CLG**

50. Two Members, namely Mr FUNG Wai-kwong and Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH,

spoke on the related subjects. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) A Member enquired if the footbridge connecting Ap Lei Chau Estate and the entrance of South Horizons Station would be constructed by prefabrication or other methods.
- (b) A Member opined that transparent hoardings and fish-eye mirrors should be installed at Marina Square (East Wing) so that the vision of drivers would not be obstructed, thus the safety of pedestrians could be ensured.

51. Mr Ken WONG responded as follows:

- (a) In studying the construction method for the footbridge, the premises was to minimise the inconvenience to the public. MTR would report to the CLG when the latest progress was available.
- (b) Transparent hoardings were adopted in some of the MTR work sites in urban area. However, sometimes only water-filled crowd control barriers would be used on road sections where TTMSs were implemented. MTR would consider the proposal of installing fish-eye mirrors and the details would be discussed at CLG meeting.

52. The Chairman requested MTR to organise resident meetings at South Horizons and Ap Lei Chau Estate respectively for consultation and to adjust the TTMS and works arrangement according to the views of the residents.

### **Re-zoning of the Site Previously Reserved for Route No. 4 as Open Space**

53. Mr Bernard WONG briefly introduced the latest arrangement for the site previously reserved for Route No. 4 (the reserved site) with the aid of PowerPoint presentation (Reference Paper). THB had already written to SCD confirming that the temporary nursery at Kellett Bay would become an open space and MTR would be responsible for its construction, management and maintenance. A consultant company had been hired for the detailed design of the site and SDC would be consulted on the proposal in June this year. Subject to the approval of the design, the works would begin as soon as possible.

54. Three Members, namely Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mrs MAK TSE How-ling and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, spoke on the related subjects. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) A Member supported re-zoning the reserved site as open space permanently.
- (b) A Member said that the open space at Kellett Bay under planning was part of the waterfront from Aberdeen to Kennedy Town. In planning, MTR should consider how to link up the footpaths and walking trails in the north, west and southeast.
- (c) A Member was concerned about the proportion of trees planting to the area of the open space.
- (d) A Member enquired about the tree holding capacity of the site, and if the number of trees needed to be transplanted exceeded the capacity, what arrangement would be made for the remaining trees.
- (e) A Member asked MTR if it would present the detailed planning design at the meeting of SDC or its committees.
- (f) The Planning Department (PlanD) would hold a meeting on 3 June this year to decide the land use of the reserved site. It was enquired if MTR would proceed the planning after the Town Planning Board (TPB) had approved the re-zoning application.
- (g) A Member asked MTR what arrangement would be made to facilitate the linking of walkways at the open space to the outside footpaths to form a promenade along the waterfront.
- (h) A Member enquired if the park constructed on the reserved site would be opened in phases so that residents could use part of the public space as soon as possible.
- (i) A Member enquired if MTR could provide a programme of works in June this year.

55. Mr LAW Siu-chung and Mr Ken WONG responded as follows:

- (a) The reserved site would be converted to an open space. The MTRCL would manage the site for 10 years. PlanD would amend the outline zoning plan and work out the long-term planning for the site.
- (b) MTR had already been working on the detailed design for the open space before TPB considered the application for re-zoning. It was anticipated that the proposal would be submitted to SDC for consultation in late June or July this year. Moreover, after the design had been confirmed, arrangement would be made for early removal of the trees for transplantation so that the affected trees would not have to be moved a second time.
- (c) The proposal put forward by SDC on connecting the open space and the promenade would be explored.
- (d) In the initial stage of construction of the open space, the trees would be removed first before any works would be started. It was expected that the open space could be open for public use before the commissioning of SIL (E).

56. Four Members, namely Mr CHAI Man-hon, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Mrs MAK TSE How-ling and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, spoke on the related subjects. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) A Member requested that when designing the footpaths in the open space, consideration should be given to the needs of local community in using the public facilities (e.g. footpaths and waterfront) nearby so as to minimise the effect on people taking a walk in the vicinity of Wah Kwai Estate and Wah Fu Estate.
- (b) A Member opined that the open space should not be opened in phases. Also, the transplantation and planning should be carried out concurrently to minimise the nuisances to residents.
- (c) There was a walkway on the waterfront side of the served site, while the side next to carriageway was planted with trees. With the commencement of the railway construction and more and more trees would be transplanted to the site, a Member suggested that MTR should carry out the construction works for the open space along the waterfront first so that this part could be open for public

enjoyment as soon as possible.

- (d) A Member opined that the procedures for opening the park should be discussed after MTR had submitted the detailed design.
- (e) A Member said that considering the relatively large size of the open space and that the nearest toilet was located at the commercial complex some distance away, MTR should include toilet facilities in the design of the open space.
- (f) A Member opined that MTR should organise consultation meetings at Wah Kwai Estate and Wah Fu Estate to collect the views of residents.

57. Mr Ken WONG responded that basically the open space would be used as a temporary nursery for transplanting the trees affected by the SIL (E) project, and it was very important that the trees should be complementary to the surrounding areas for the benefit of the residents. The design of the open space would be as simple as possible. As the area was in fact a work site, it would be open for public use only after the construction works had been finished.

58. The Chairman proposed that the detailed design of the open space would be fully discussed and voted on at the 23<sup>rd</sup> SDC meeting held on 14 July.

59. Ms MA Yuet-har, BBS, MH proposed that a workshop should be held before SDC meeting to discuss the design proposal for a preliminary consensus. After that, the proposal would be included in the agenda of SDC meeting for discussion and voting.

60. Mr Ken WONG advised that the design proposal could be submitted to SDC in mid-June for preliminary discussion.

### **Design of Hoardings at Work Site**

61. Mr Bernard WONG briefly introduced the design of hoardings at the work site with the aid of PowerPoint presentation (Reference Paper). Details were summarised as follows:

- (a) A design featuring the characteristics of the Southern District would be adopted for the hoardings at the work site of SIL (E).

- (b) The design on the hoardings in locations where people frequent would be more diversified, while those in specific locations would contain signs showing the direction or giving safety advice.
- (c) Some of the hoardings at stations would display signs representing their respective areas.
- (d) MTR welcomed residents to give advice on the above proposals and the designs of hoardings.

62. Two Members, namely Mr WONG Che-ngai and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, spoke on the related subjects. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) A Member welcomed the design of the hoardings and opined that since the area of the construction site outside Lei Tung Commercial Centre was relatively large, it was suitable for displaying the appearance of the future Lei Tung Station and the information on different construction stages to the residents.
- (b) A Member opined that the information provided on the hoardings should include the complaints hotline and other enquiry/contact information.
- (c) A Member thought that the design of hoardings at Ocean Park Station should not put too much emphasis on promoting the Ocean Park. SIL (E) would provide a more convenient and faster way for local residents travelling to and from the Ocean Park and the Central/Tsim Sha Tsui, so the information on hoardings should focus on this point.

63. Mr Bernard WONG responded that the design of hoardings suggested was only preliminarily. The hoardings would contain information such as the enquiry hotline of the project, and consideration would be given to providing the designs of stations as well.

64. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that in the video played by MTR in the beginning of meeting, it claimed that SIL (E) could address the congestion problem in Aberdeen Tunnel. However, he pointed out that according to TD and THB, the congestion problem in the tunnel was attributed to the traffic conditions in the Central and Wan

Chai. He believed that SIL (E) could only offer an alternative for residents in the Southern District and Hong Kong travelling to and from the northern and southern parts of the Hong Kong Island. Therefore, he said that the contents of the video should be amended.

65. The Chairman maintained that it was beyond doubt that the construction of SIL (E) could help relieve the traffic congestion in Aberdeen Tunnel.

**Agenda Item 3: Research on Arrangement of Feeder Services in Southern District in Connection with the Commissioning of New Railway Lines**  
**(Focus Group Paper No. 3/2011)**

---

66. The Chairman briefly introduced the contents of the paper.

67. Three Members, namely Mr AU Lap-sing, Mr TSUI Yuen-wa and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, spoke on this agenda item. Their comments and enquiries were summarised as follows:

- (a) A number of Members supported carrying out a questionnaire survey.
- (b) A Member shared the view that the scope of research should include both the West Island Line and SIL (E).
- (c) A Member said that the questionnaire could include questions about whether residents would use University Station or Wong Chuk Hang Station for interchange to their destinations. He believed that such data would provide useful reference for TD or MTR in designing the transport interchange at Wong Chuk Hang area in future.
- (d) A Member agreed that the questionnaire survey could provide data on feeder service needs in relation to Wong Chuk Hang Station and University Station.
- (e) A Member said that it should find out the preliminary feeder service needs of the public for interchange at SIL (E) from studies already conducted first. Afterward, a survey should be carried out to collect data for demand projection and to find out how many residents would change their travelling

patterns after the commissioning of the new railway line. By using these data, SDC could urge the Government and the transport service providers to design suitable interchange facilities.

- (f) A Member found that the contents of the Annex were very complicated.
- (g) A Member shared the view that the target groups of the questionnaire should include residents in the vicinities of Baguio Villa, the Queen Mary Hospital and Sandy Bay.
- (h) A Member pointed out that the views of people living on the western and eastern sides in the area from Aberdeen to Chi Fu Fa Yuen and Baguio Villa might not be the same. Therefore, the research should be carried out by areas.
- (i) A Member enquired if MTR supported this research by providing expertise advice to make it more professional, which in turn could help MTR obtain local views on the feeder services as soon as possible.

68. Mr Bernard WONG responded as follows:

- (a) MTR would also conduct similar research. Before the commissioning of a new railway line, usually MTR would discuss with TD on restructuring the transport facilities in the district using railways as the backbone of the transport system.
- (b) In the early stage of railway development, MTR usually would not carry out such research since the traffic condition could be drastically different when the railway lines finally came into operation a few years later.
- (c) MTR was open-minded on the research and would be happy to assist in the initial stage of the research.

69. Miss LIN Ming advised that subject to the approval of the Focus Group on the questionnaire survey, the Secretariat would proceed with the tendering and quotation exercise and would revise the terms and conditions in the tender based on the views of Members. The Secretariat would consult Members on the terms of tender via email before issuing the tender invitation.

70. The Focus Group supported the arrangements as stated in above. The Chairman hoped to seek the fund from SDC as soon as possible.

[Post-meeting note: Since there was only one contractor submitted a quotation, and the price far exceeded the reserved fund of SDC, the research was kept on hold for the time being.]

**Agenda Item 4: Other Business** \_\_\_\_\_

71. Ms MAR Yuet-har, BBS, MH said that the residents in Kau Wai of Wong Chuk Hang did not quite understand the works and the closure of access, and hoped MTR could explain the arrangements to them.

72. Mr Bernard WONG responded that they would contact the residents in Kau Wai to follow up on the matter.

73. Mr Bernard WONG invited Members to the ground-breaking ceremony for SIL (E) project held on 22 June 2011.

**Agenda Item 5: Date of Next Meeting** \_\_\_\_\_

74. The Chairman said that the Secretariat would inform Members of the date of next meeting in due course.

75. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:11 p.m.

Secretariat, Southern District Council  
August 2011