

**Minutes of the 8th Meeting of
the Traffic and Transport Committee
of the Kowloon City District Council**

Date: 2 March 2017 (Thursday)
Time: 2:30 p.m.
Venue: Conference Room, Kowloon City District
Office

Present:

Chairman: Mr LUK King-kwong
Vice-chairman: Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming
Members: The Hon LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP (Arrived at 3:15 p.m.)
Mr SIU Leong-sing (Left at 6:45 p.m.)
Mr LAM Tak-shing (Left at 7:20 p.m.)
Dr KWONG Po-yin
Mr YUE Chee-wing, Admond (Left at 5:45 p.m.)
Mr NG Po-keung (Arrived at 2:40 p.m.)
Mr LAI Kwong-wai (Left at 7:04 p.m.)
Ir CHEUNG Yan-hong, MH (Left at 7:00 p.m.)
Mr KWAN Ho-yeung, Roger
Mr LO Chiu-kit (Arrived at 2:44 p.m.)
(Left at 4:40 p.m.)
Mr YEUNG Chun-yu, Ronald (Left at 5:39 p.m.)
Mr HO Hin-ming, MH
Mr CHO Wui-hung (Left at 4:34 p.m.)
Dr the Hon LEUNG Mei-fun, Priscilla, (Left at 3:23 p.m.)
SBS, JP
Mr NG Fan-kam, Tony
Mr PUN Kwok-wah
Mr SIU Tin-hung, Terence (Left at 7:25 p.m.)
Mr LAM Pok, Jimmy (Arrived at 2:40 p.m.)
(Left at 6:42 p.m.)
Mr YANG Wing-kit (Arrived at 3:25 p.m.)
Mr HE Huahan
Miss LEUNG Yuen-ting
Mr TING Kin-wa (Left at 6:42 p.m.)

<u>Secretary:</u>	Miss YUEN Man-ki, Vicki	Executive Officer (District Council) 1, Kowloon City District Office
<u>In Attendance:</u>	Miss CHONG Tan-na, Tanna	Assistant District Officer (Kowloon City), Kowloon City District Office
	Ms HSU Leung-fan, Amanda	Senior Transport Officer/Kowloon City, Transport Department (Acting)
	Mr CHEUNG Chi-wa	Engineer/Kowloon City, Transport Department
	Ms LEE Wing-chee, Joyce	Engineer/Hung Hom, Transport Department
	Mr SUEN Wa-hing	District Operations Officer (Kowloon City District), Hong Kong Police Force
	Mr PO Yiu-wa	Office-in-charge, Traffic Team (Kowloon City District), Hong Kong Police Force
	Mr HO Chi-kin	Office-in-charge, Traffic Team (Sau Mau Ping District), Hong Kong Police Force
	Mr TAM Ho-chuen	District Engineer/Hung Hom, Highways Department
	Mr CHUNG Siu-man	District Engineer/ Kowloon City & Kowloon Bay, Highways Department
<u>Attendance by Invitation:</u>		
Item 2 - 3	Miss LAI Suet-yan, Janice	Senior Transport Officer/Bus/Kowloon, Transport Department
	Miss SIN Kai-wai, Marie	Senior Transport Officer/Bus and Railway/Special Duties, Transport Department

	Mr CHEUNG Tin, Larry	Transport Officer/Bus/Kowloon, Transport Department
Item 2 - 3 and Item 9	Ms Penny CHUNG	Senior Public Affairs Officer, Citybus Limited/New World First Bus Services Limited
Item 2 - 5	Ms Peggy WONG	Assistant Manager (Planning and Development), The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
	Mr Calvin WONG	Senior Planning Officer, Citybus Limited/New World First Bus Services Limited
Item 2 - 9	Mr LEUNG Wang-cheong	Principal Operations Officer (Lai Chi Kok Depot), The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
Item 4 - 5	Mr NG Hon-lai, Patrick	Chief Transport Officer/Bus and Railway 5, Transport Department
	Mr KWOK Yue-fung, Samuel	Transport Officer/Railway 5, Transport Department
	Mr Dennis LEE	Manager (Planning and Development), The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
Item 6 -7	Miss SZE Suk-wai, Muriel	Senior Transport Officer/Bus Restructuring and Projects, Transport Department
Item 10	Mr CHAN Ching-yeung, Philip	Senior Estate Surveyor/Wong Tai Sin, Lands Department
	Ms LEE Shuk-fun, Veronica	Estate Surveyor/Kowloon Tong, Lands Department
	Mr CHENG Chi-wai, Raymond	Engineer/Kowloon/ Land Supply 1, Transport Department

	Mr LEUNG Cho-ming	Senior District Engineer/General(2), Highways Department
	Mr SO Hung-tak, Charles	Executive Director, Transport (Transport Planning), AECOM Asia Company Limited
	Mr K.H. LAU	Chief Engineer, Transport (Transport Planning), AECOM Asia Company Limited
Item 11 - 12	Mr NG Wai-keung	Chief Engineer, Major Works Office, Highways Department
Item 11	Ms. O Fong-wa, Julie	Senior Engineer, Major Works Office, Highways Department
	Mr SHIU Wing-kwok	Engineer, Major Works Office, Highways Department
	Mr Johnny CHUNG	Associate, Parsons Brinckerhoff (Asia) Ltd.
Item 12	Mr LAM Man-san	Senior Engineer, Major Works Office, Highways Department
Item 13	Mr CHING Yiu-yuen	Chief School Development Officer (Kowloon City)
Item 18- 19	Ms Lilian YEUNG	Public Relations Manager – External Affairs, MTR Corporation Limited
	Mr TONG Chai-ming, Ronnie	Operations Manager – Kwun Tong & Tsuen Wan Line, MTR Corporation Limited

* * *

The Chairman of the Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) welcomed Members, representatives of government departments and organisations to the meeting. **The Chairman** reminded Members to declare interests in accordance with

the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) Standing Orders. He also said that when the number of Members present at the meeting was less than 12, he would adjourn the meeting according to Order 36(2) of the Standing Orders. Lastly, he reminded the attendees to turn off the ringers on their mobile phones or to switch them to vibration mode, and to remain silent during the meeting.

2. **The Chairman** said that **Mr SZETO Chi-wah, Deacons** had retired and hence **Ms Amanda HSU** attended the meeting on his behalf for the moment.

Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting

3. The minutes of the 7th Meeting were unanimously confirmed by **the Committee** without amendments.

New Items

Bus Route Planning Programme 2017-2018 of Kowloon City District, Urge for Implementation of Rerouting of Bus No.224X to the Kai Tak Development Area (Paper No. 01/17 and No. 02/17)

4. **The Chairman** pointed out that as both item 2 and item 3 were related to the Bus Route Planning Programme of Kowloon City District, they should be discussed together to make the meeting go smooth. Members present at the meeting agreed to the combined discussion of the two items. The Secretariat had delivered the written replies of the Transport Department (TD) and the Kowloon Motor Bus Co. (1933) Ltd., i.e. Paper No.1-2 tabled, to Members for perusal.

5. **Miss Janice LAI, Senior Transport Officer/Bus/Kowloon of the TD** introduced Paper No. 01/17 and briefly introduced the proposals for the Bus Route Planning Programme 2017-2018 of Kowloon City District (Bus Route Planning Programme 2017-2018). She said that, to tie in with the population growth in the Kai Tak Development Area (KTDA) and the development of Hong Kong Children's Hospital and Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (KTCT), the TD proposed the introduction of three new bus routes in the Bus Route Planning Programme 2017-2018, including one bus route plying between Muk Ning Street in Kai Tak and Island Harbourview in Tai Kok Tsui, one between KTCT and Festival Walk in Kowloon Tong, and one from Shing Tak Street in Kowloon City to Grand Promenade in Sai Wan Ho.

6. **Mr HE Huahan** introduced Paper No. 02/17 and expressed the following views: (a) it was suggested in the Bus Route Rationalisation Plan 2014 that KMB Route No. 224X should operate in the KTDA, but it had yet to be implemented. In view of the progressive completion of private buildings such as De Novo and One Kai Tak, the TD should arrange KMB Route No. 224X to operate in the KTDA and provide whole-day service as soon as possible; (b) the TD proposed in the Bus Route Planning Programme 2017-2018 the provision of an additional departure of KMB Route No. 224X during morning peak hours. Nevertheless, this was not enough to address the needs of residents in the KTDA. Thus, he proposed to extend the route alignment of KMB Route No. 5A and move its last stop from Ma Tau Wai Estate to the KTDA; (c) he thanked the TD for increasing the frequency of KMB Route No. 641 and hoped that the Department would finalise the whole-day service of the route as early as possible; (d) he proposed deploying more buses to serve the route between Shing Tak Street in Kowloon City and Grand Promenade in Sai Wan Ho; and (e) many school children and parents had moved from Sham Shui Po and Cheung Sha Wan to the KTDA, so he suggested relocating the terminus of the bus plying between KTCT and Festival Walk in Kowloon Tong from Kowloon City to Sham Shui Po or Cheung Sha Wan in a bid to address the current lack of bus service between the KTDA and Sham Shui Po and Cheung Sha Wan.

7. **Miss LEUNG Yuen-ting** enquired of the TD about the actual service hours of the special departure of KMB Route No. 224X and the service details of the new bus route.

8. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** said that the new Airport Bus Route No. NA20 departed from the airport at 1:10 a.m., but the last flight at the airport at present landed at 12:45 a.m. Therefore, in case of flight or baggage delays, passengers might not be able to catch the bus. She thus proposed deferring departure time to 1:30 a.m. and reviewing whether the existing service schedules of buses plying between the airport and the urban area could match flight schedules.

9. **Mr Roger KWAN** expressed disappointment over the Bus Route Planning Programme 2017-2018 as it did not advance the introduction of a bus route between To Kwa Wan and Tsuen Wan. He pointed out that paragraph 16 of Paper No. 01/17 set out the nine considerations of bus route planning. He held that the proposed bus route between To Kwa Wan and Tsuen Wan fulfilled most of the considerations except for item 6 “the impacts of the project on operators”.

10. **Mr Ronald YEUNG** enquired of the bus companies about their source of resources for increasing the number of bus routes and their frequency.

11. **Miss Janice LAI of the TD** gave a consolidated response as follows:

(a) in view of the ever-growing population in the KTDA, all the three bus routes proposed this year would be routed via the KTDA. In addition, the Department had suggested in the past two years that KMB Route No. 224X should travel through the KTDA, but this proposal could not be implemented due to the diverse views of District Councils during the consultation process. The TD understood the concerns of **Mr HE** and thus proposed the addition of bus resources and introduction of a special trip of KMB Route No. 224X in the Bus Route Planning Programme 2017-2018, with a view to facilitating residents in the district to go to Tsim Sha Tsui and Yau Ma Tei areas;

(b) in the Bus Route Planning Programme 2017-2018, the Department proposed the introduction of a special trip of KMB Route No. 224X during morning peak hours;

(c) regarding the three proposed new bus routes for the KTDA, the Department was currently consulting the relevant District Councils and would study whether modification of the proposal was required after collecting and consolidating relevant views. The Department would also invite bus companies to submit proposals on the operation of the bus routes concerned, followed by a screening process. The Department initially reckoned that if the screening work was smooth, the three new bus routes would be in service in 2018 to cope with the population growth in the district; and

(d) the bus route running between KTCT and Festival Walk in Kowloon Tong did not only cater to the new population of the KTDA, but also meet the demand of service upon the commissioning of Kai Tak South Children's Hospital. As the Children's Hospital served residents in the whole territory, the Department suggested developing the bus route to connect East Rail stations so that members of the public could access the Children's Hospital from different districts. As regards the bus route between Shing Tak Street in Kowloon City and Grand Promenade in Sai Wan Ho, the Department proposed arranging two bus trips to Hong Kong Island during peak hours so as to address the demand of passengers going to work at morning rush hours.

12. **Mr Calvin WONG, Senior Planning Officer of Citybus Limited/New World First Bus Services Limited** was aware of the delay of inbound flights in late evening and hence, the inadequacy of bus service to meet passenger demand in the daytime. In light of this, he proposed the introduction of Airport Bus Route No. NA20 to serve the passengers of flights arriving in Hong Kong late at night. The departure time of the two existing NA routes, namely Airport Bus Route No. NA11 to North Point and No. NA29 to Tseung Kwan O, was 1:10 a.m., and these two bus routes could in general satisfy the demand of passengers. The Citybus Limited would also closely monitor the patronage of these bus routes. The departure time of Airport Bus Route No. NA20 was tentatively scheduled at 1:10 a.m. The frequency of bus would be reviewed in accordance with the passenger demand and bus resources in the future. Apart from this, passengers could choose to take Citybus Route No. N23 to travel between the urban area and the airport at midnight.

13. **Mr HO Hin-ming** pointed out that at present, there were rather few bus routes accessing the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU). Thus, he proposed that the bus route between KTCT and Festival Walk in Kowloon Tong be rerouted to travel via Renfrew Road and Chuk Yuen Road instead of Waterloo Road so as to accord facilities to HKBU students.

14. **Ir CHEUNG Yan-hong** said that the Bus Route Planning Programme 2017-2018 proposed to arrange KMB Route No. 93K to ply through Kowloon Bay Business Area (KBBA). He was of the view that this might only lengthen the route but contribute nothing to the passenger volume. Moreover, he opined that the insufficient patronage of KMB Route No. 93K was due to the excessively high bus fare. If passengers took KMB Route No. 93K in the vicinity of Ulferts Furniture in Hung Hom, the fare was higher than that of KMB Route No. 14, Cross-Harbour Tunnel Route No. 101 and Airport Route No. A22. The difference in fares significantly undermined the attractiveness of KMB Route No. 93K. Thus, he recommended a fare adjustment of KMB Route No. 93K. Regarding buses travelling from Kwun Tong to Mong Kok East Railway Station, there was competition between KMB Route No. 93K and KMB Routes No. 14 and 15. Therefore, he suggested the KMB lower the fare of Route No. 93K in order to boost passenger volume.

15. **Mr Terence SIU** did not oppose to the re-routing of KMB Route No. 93K plying through KBBA. He said that in the past year, the TD proposed cancelling KMB Route No. 93K or reducing the number of trips. The Department now put

forward the re-routing proposal to replace the previous proposals, which was a wise decision. As regards the bus route serving between To Kwa Wan and Tsuen Wan, he said that KMB Route No. 40 once plied between Kowloon City and Tsuen Wan but its routing was altered afterwards. Subsequently, residents needed to take minibus to Tsuen Wan at Tam Kung Road paying a fare of \$15, which was extremely costly. Therefore, he hoped that the TD would introduce a bus route plying between Kowloon City and Tsuen Wan and set an optimal fare.

16. **Mr HE Huahan** doubted the effectiveness of introducing a special trip of KMB Route No. 224X in the morning. He said that if the proposal of re-routing KMB Route No. 224X via the KTDA was put on hold merely because of the opposition from a particular District Council or District Council Member, the TD should also respect Members' opposition to the cancellation of a particular bus route or reduction of its frequency. Regarding the introduction of a bus route plying from Shing Tak Street in Kowloon City to Grand Promenade in Sai Wan Ho, he did not understand why only two bus trips were arranged during morning peak hours. He hoped that two bus trips to Kowloon City after working hours would also be provided to meet the needs of passengers.

17. **Mr LAM Tak-shing** said that residents had repeatedly complained about the problem of frequent lost trips of Cross-Harbour Tunnel Bus Route No. 106. Although an additional bus trip was proposed at present, he still feared that passenger demand could not be fully satisfied. He also hoped that the TD could consider further adjusting bus service arrangements and departure frequency. In addition, he urged the Department to consider re-routing the airport buses via Wuhu Street and Walker Road areas.

18. **Miss Janice LAI of the TD** gave a consolidated response as follows:

(a) regarding the bus route plying between KTCT and Festival Walk in Kowloon Tong, the Department would consider the views of **Mr HO** and review the feasibility of re-routing;

(b) the current patronage of KMB Route No. 93K was unsatisfactory. The Department hoped that the extension of bus route into the KBBA could attract more passengers who worked there and lived in Kowloon City or Tseung Kwan O, thereby improving the patronage;

- (c) **Ir CHEUNG** raised the issue of bus fare adjustment and this would be considered by bus companies;
- (d) she noted Members' views on the introduction of a bus route connecting To Kwa Wan and Tsuen Wan;
- (e) regarding the issues of whether the bus route plying from Shing Tak Street in Kowloon City to Grand Promenade in Sai Wan Ho could provide service in the afternoon and whether the terminus of the route operating between KTCT and Festival Walk in Kowloon Tong could be shifted from Kowloon City to Sham Shui Po or Cheung Sha Wan, the Department said that it was consulting different District Councils on the above proposed routes. The Department would, after collection of views, study whether adjustment on the proposals was necessary, and invite bus companies to apply for operation of new routes after consolidating relevant views;
- (f) she noted **Mr HE's** proposal of arranging Cross-Harbour Tunnel Bus Route No. 641 to provide whole-day service. Nevertheless, as new railway lines were commissioned progressively in recent years, the Department had reservation at current stage over the proposal for the reason of preventing duplication in the use of public transport resources and aggravation of traffic congestion on busy roads;
- (g) the Department would urge bus companies to pay attention to the present service situation of Cross-Harbour Tunnel Route No. 106; and
- (h) in order to better utilise bus resources, the Department proposed the introduction of a special trip of KMB Route No. 224X. The departure time of the special trip should be in line with the working hours of residents as far as possible. The Department noted **Mr HE's** views on the special trip of KMB Route No. 224X. It would make appropriate adjustments with the bus company based on passenger needs.

19. **Mr Calvin WONG of Citybus Limited/New World First Bus Services Limited** said that passengers could make a five-minute walk from Walker Road to the bus stop at Chatham Road North near Ping Chi Street to take Airport Bus Route No. A22, or take Airport Bus Route No. E23 at Wuhu Street. The bus company noted Members' aspirations for re-routing the airport buses via Wuhu Street and Walker Road areas.

20. **Mr Peggy WONG, Assistant Manager (Planning and Development) of the Kowloon Motor Bus Co. (1933) Ltd.** supplemented that regarding the proposal of re-routing KMB Route No. 93K via KBAA, most of the passengers affected could take KMB Route Nos. 14 and 15 at a lower fare. As office buildings in KBAA would be completed successively, it was believed that the above re-routing proposal could boost the patronage of KMB Route No. 93K.

21. **Mr Ronald YEUNG** agreed to the re-routing proposal of KMB Route No. 93K and hoped that it could enhance the passenger volume so that the route could be retained. He also said that the re-routing proposal of KMB Route No. 93K was on a trial basis. Even when the patronage decreased after re-routing, the KMB should not use it as an excuse to reduce the service frequency or go further to cancel the route.

22. The views of **Mr LAI Kwong-wai** were summarised below: (a) the TD suggested the re-routing of KMB Route No. 93K via KBAA and expected an increased patronage. However, he was anxious that a lengthened route would reduce its frequency and possibly lead to a drop in quality of service. In addition, the TD was planning for a reduction of frequency due to the commissioning of MTR Kwun Tong Line Extension (KTE). Given these two factors, whether the patronage of KMB Route No. 93K would increase or not remained uncertain. He pointed out that low frequency and a drop in passenger volume formed a vicious cycle. Thus, he urged the TD to maintain the existing frequency after lengthening the route; (b) he agreed to the introduction of a bus route between To Kwa Wan and Tsuen Wan; (c) at present, Airport Bus Routes No. A22 and E23 did not pass through To Kwa Wan (Lower Section), i.e. the vicinity of Grand Waterfront, Wyler Gardens and To Kwa Wan Road. Hence, he requested for re-routing at least one airport bus via To Kwa Wan (Lower Section) to facilitate residents there to take the bus.

23. **The Hon Starry LEE** said that the KCDC had strived for a bus route operating between To Kwa Wan and Tsuen Wan for years and she hoped that the TD could give a concrete reply.

24. **Miss Janice LAI of the TD** noted Members' views regarding the re-routing of KMB Route No. 93K, introduction of a bus route between To Kwa Wan and Tsuen Wan and re-routing of airport bus routes via To Kwa Wan (Lower Section). She also said that a written reply would be provided after the meeting on the views about introduction of a bus route running between To Kwa Wan and Tsuen Wan.

25. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** said that at present some bus routes shared the same starting point and destination but with different routings. He cited the routing arrangement of KMB Routes No. 290 and 290A as an example and suggested to arrange departures of Airport Bus Route No. E23 to travel via To Kwa Wan (Upper Section) and To Kwa Wan (Lower Section) alternately.

26. **The Chairman** summarised Members' views and asked the TD to take them into serious consideration.

Latest Arrangement of the Public Transport Reorganisation Plan in respect of the KTE, Protest against the Transport Department and the KMB for Unreasonable Cancellation of Bus Routes with Increasing Passenger Volume Request for Immediate Restoration of the Original Frequency (Paper No. 03/17 and No. 04/17)

27. **The Chairman** said that both items 4 and 5 were related to public transport reorganisation plan in respect of the KTE, a combined discussion could make the meeting run smooth. He also referred Members to Paper No. 3 tabled.

28. **Mr Patrick NG, Chief Transport Officer/Bus and Railway 5 of the TD** introduced Paper No. 03/17 and presented the latest arrangement of the public transport reorganisation plan in respect of the KTE (reorganisation plan).

29. **Mr LAI Kwong-wai** introduced Paper No. 04/17. He pointed out that the frequency of most of the bus routes set out in the supplementary information had been reduced. In this connection, he enquired of the TD if the frequency of such bus routes would be reduced further.

30. **Mr Jimmy LAM** enquired of the TD about the method of conducting passenger loading survey for the affected bus routes. He also said that as the bus frequency was reduced, the waiting time of passengers lengthened accordingly and their desire to take the bus diminished. Consequently, the passenger volume would further decrease.

31. The views of **Ir CHEUNG Yan-hong** were summarised below: (a) the TD proposed replacing KMB Route No. 212 with KMB Route No. 30X, but the fare of KMB Route No. 30X was higher than that of KMB Route No. 212 to passengers who could not benefit from the Government Public Transport Fare Concession Scheme

(Concession Scheme) for the Elderly and Eligible Persons with Disabilities. Hence, he propounded two-way section fares for KMB Route No. 30X; (b) passengers going to Queen Elizabeth Hospital from Whampoa by MTR had to interchange at Yau Ma Tei Station to go to Jordan Station and the needs of the elderly and persons with disabilities could not be properly addressed; (c) Members had requested for a review on the reorganisation plan half year after the commissioning of the KTE, but the TD requested to review the reorganisation plan in less than half year after the commissioning; and (d) he agreed not to alter the current routing of KMB Route No. 7B.

32. The views and enquiries of **Mr Admond YUE** were summarised below: (a) railway could not provide point-to-point transport services; (b) the TD conducted a review on the reorganisation plan four months after the commissioning and this ran contrary to the saying that a review was to be conducted half year after the commissioning; (c) he strongly opposed to the cancellation of KMB Route No. 212 and questioned whether the TD's reduction of frequency of other bus routes was reversing the cause and effect relationship. The reduced frequency of buses led to a fall in patronage, and the Department in turn used it as a reason to cancel the bus route; (d) he enquired about the actual number of passengers taking buses in the survey. He reckoned that the actual number of passengers had higher reference value than percentage, and he hoped that the TD could collect the patronage figures for two more months for Members' reference; and (e) the frequency of KMB Route No. 8P was insufficient. He did not understand why the TD could still reduce the frequency.

33. The views of **Dr KWONG Po-yin** were summarised below: (a) she understood that the patronage of KMB Route No. 212 decreased since the commissioning of the KTE. If the bus route was cancelled, the TD and the bus company must provide adequate alternate services; (b) the fare of KMB Route No. 30X from Whampoa to Queen Elizabeth Hospital was \$8.9 which was not at a reasonable level. Although passengers benefited from the Concession Scheme were not burdened, the difference in fare was subsidised by the Government using public money and it enabled the bus company to make a profit. Thus, she urged the TD to seriously consider the introduction of two-way section fares for KMB Route No. 30X; and (c) she suggested the TD consider allowing minibus operators or other operators to provide service on the route of KMB Route No. 212 if it was scrapped.

34. The views of **Mr YANG Wing-kit** were summarised below: (a) during Lunar New Year holidays, there were changes in the travel pattern of commuters. Thus, the

survey data collected by the TD might be biased and could not reflect the actual situation. He also opined that the data from January to March 2016 were incomparable with those from January to February 2017. He suggested the TD collect data on ordinary days and compared them with the data collected at the same period; and (b) in view that minibuss operators were willing to take over the operation of KMB Route No. 212, market demand for the route existed. He thus proposed the bus company deploy single-deck buses on KMB Route No. 212 instead of cancelling the route.

35. The views of **Mr CHO Wui-hung** were summarised below: (a) the frequency of KMB Routes No. 7B, 8 and 45 was adjusted to 20 to 25 minutes per trip, hence lengthening the waiting time for buses and causing inconvenience to passengers particularly the elderly and persons with disabilities. So he opposed to the reduction of bus frequency; (b) he requested bus companies to install real-time bus arrival information display panels at bus stops in Ho Man Tin District, including Oi Man Estate, Chun Man Court and Cascades, provide caring seats for waiting passengers, refurbish old-style bus stops, extend shelters at bus stops and provide yellow lines on the ground at bus stops for queuing passengers as soon as possible in a bid to improve environment for passengers waiting for buses and minimise the impact of reduction of bus frequency; and (c) although the patronage of KMB Route No. 212 fell, the route was vital to residents going to Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and so the bus company should conceive another plan.

36. **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** said that after the commissioning of the KTE, Kowloon City residents not living along the railway line tended to rely on bus service. He held doubts over the patronage figures provided by the TD. He cited the example of KMB Route No. 7B and pointed out that the patronage of this route varied at different locations. Therefore, he opined that the TD had to collect patronage data at different locations and in different time periods to ensure a more objective analysis.

37. **Mr TING Kin-wa** remarked that the frequency of KMB Route No. 7B during non-peak hours remained at 25 minutes per trip. He was anxious that the reduction of frequency would lead to a further loss of passengers, and the route would finally be scrapped due to insufficient patronage. He agreed to the deployment of single-deck buses to KMB Route No. 212. In addition, he was of the view that as the KTE had started operation for four months only, the TD could further observe if there were changes in the travel pattern of commuters.

38. **Mr Roger KWAN** pointed out that the current patronage of KMB Route No. 30X was as high as 99.3%, resulting in extremely crowded bus compartments. Moreover, the fare of other public transport on the route was high. Thus, he requested for retaining KMB Route No. 212. He remarked that KMB Route No. 212 was the main transport means for residents in the district to go to Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Yau Tsim Mong District Council and Sham Shui Po District Council had already expressed disapproval of the cancellation of KMB Route No. 212 and he opined that the TD should be amenable to good advice. In addition, he said that as the commissioning of the KTE had nothing to do with some bus routes via To Kwa Wan, such as KMB Route No. 85, it was not justifiable for the TD to use this as a reason to reduce its frequency.

39. The views and enquiries of **The Hon Starry LEE** were summed up below: (a) the paper mentioned that three monitor surveys were conducted and she would like to know the way of advancing the surveys; (b) she was of the view that the average patronage of the busiest half hour could not reflect the actual situation. Thus, she enquired about the actual patronage; and (c) the KCDC and other District Councils understood the need to draw up a reorganisation plan, but she hoped that the TD could respond to Members' request for compensation after the cancellation of KMB Route No. 212, including deployment of single-deck buses to Bus Route No. 212 and implementation of section fares for KMB Route No. 30X.

40. The views and enquiries of **Mr Ronald YEUNG** were summed up below: (a) the TD compared the data from January to March 2016 with those from January to February 2017 including Lunar New Year holidays and such a comparison was unconvincing; (b) the TD only conducted three surveys before implementing the reorganisation plan. This was unacceptable to the public; (c) buses on some routes were converted from double-deck to single-deck, or the other way round, he enquired whether the TD had conducted patronage surveys for the bus routes concerned. He also hoped that the Department could provide relevant data; and (d) he enquired how the resources saved by reducing the frequency of some bus routes would be utilised.

41. **Mr Tony NG** welcomed the TD to retain the original routing of KMB Route No. 7B. He said that the residents' demand for bus service in Ho Man Tin District was still keen after the commissioning of the KTE. Hence, he opposed to the reduction of frequency of a number of bus routes via Oi Man Estate. Moreover, he indicated that members of the public had been complaining the inadequate trips in the past, the reduction of trips at present ran counter to their interests. He hoped that bus

companies would continue to better their services.

42. **Mr HO Hin-ming** said that the traffic between Wuhu Street and Chatham Road was congested. If the traffic congestion was mitigated, he believed that the service quality of KMB Route No. 212 would be greatly improved and it could compete with the MTR. Besides, he pointed out that as if passengers opted to take KMB Route No. 30X which charged a high fare, the Government had to subsidise a greater amount of money under the Concession Scheme. Thus, he urged the TD to implement two-way section fares as soon as possible.

43. **Mr HE Huahan** opposed to the cancellation of KMB Route No. 212. He also believed that as the data were collected by the TD during Lunar New Year holidays, he doubted the reference value of the survey. He said that he had taken KMB Route No. 212 together with district personalities and the bus captain concerned said that the patronage rebounded in late February. He queried if the data collected by the TD could reflect the actual situation.

44. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** raised objection to the cancellation of KMB Route No. 212. Moreover, he suggested the TD and the bus company deploy single-deck buses to KMB Route No. 212 and adjust the frequency. He also said that Members was hopeful that the TD would adjust the reorganisation plan within half year after the commissioning, but the GMB Route No. 7 was cancelled during Lunar New Year holidays. On the other hand, the interval of KMB Route No. 5C, the alternative bus route recommended by the TD, was lengthened from five minutes to seven minutes, which was very inconvenient for the residents. In view of this, he proposed that the TD should study the introduction of new bus/ minibus routes to replace GMB Route No. 7.

45. The views of **Mr LAM Tak-shing** were summarised below: (a) he objected to the cancellation of KMB Route No. 212 and agreed to the deployment of single-deck buses to replace double-deck buses for serving the route; (b) the number of boarding passengers varied at each bus stop and there were lost trips sometimes, so he opined that the survey data collected by the TD was not accurate enough; and (c) he hoped that the TD would retain the current routing of KMB Route No. 7B.

46. The views of **Mr SIU Leong-sing** were summarised below: (a) residents in Whampoa and Hung Hom areas benefitted from the new rail line, but the reorganisation plan affected residents not living along the railway line, such as the

residents in To Kwa Wan District. Hence, he requested for restoring the frequency of bus and suspending the adjustment of bus routes; and (b) upon the commissioning of the KTE, the average patronage of cross harbour bus routes in the busiest half hour recorded a rise, reflecting that the existing railway services could not meet the demand of residents and so they preferred taking buses. The TD should review the adequacy of current cross harbor bus service.

47. The responses of **Mr Patrick NG of the TD** were summarised below:

- (a) in November 2016, the Department collected data on the change in passenger demand of the affected bus routes, and the data was submitted to the TTC on 19 December 2016 for Members' perusal along with the revised reorganisation plan. After listening to Members' views, the Department collected relevant data again in January and February 2017, and was aware that the travel pattern and demand of passengers had stabilised. As the travel pattern of passengers might vary due to Lunar New Year holidays, the Department carried out surveys before and after the holidays (from 10th to 20th January 2017 and 6th February 2017, which were respectively the first working day and school day after Lunar New Year holidays), in a bid to ensure that the data collected were unbiased and objective;
- (b) the Department arranged survey staff to carry out on-site surveys at the peak loading point of each affected bus route in different time slots. Some survey staff recorded the number of boarding and alighting passengers at relevant bus stops while some counted the number of passengers in bus compartments. The Department understood Members' concern over the cancellation of KMB Route No. 212 and hence the survey on this route was meticulously designed. The survey staff recorded the number of passengers boarding and alighting at every bus stop along the route from Whampoa terminus to Cheung Sha Wan terminus. The Department then carefully reviewed whether the passenger demand for KMB Route No. 212 met the benchmark for route cancellation under the existing guidelines on the basis of the data;
- (c) according to the survey results, the average patronage of KMB Route No. 7B in the busiest hour at the peak loading point in Kowloon City District ranged from 56.7% (Lok Fu bound) to 60% (Hung Hom Pier bound). As the passenger demand for this route was higher than the relevant benchmark under existing guidelines, the Department would shelve the proposal of shortening the routing of the bus route;

- (d) according to the survey conducted in mid-February 2017, the average patronage of KMB Route No. 212 in the busiest one hour at the peak loading point was 19.5%. The figure recorded a decline of almost 70% when compared with that before the commissioning. If single-deck buses were deployed to the route, the expected average patronage was estimated to be lower than 40%, which could still meet the benchmark for route cancellation under the existing guidelines (a patronage lower than 50% in the busiest one hour).
- (e) the Department did not receive letters from minibus operators before the meeting indicating their intention to take over the operation of KMB Route No. 212. According to the initial assessment, nine double-deck buses were serving KMB Route No. 212, each with a capacity (including both seats and standing spaces) of about 130 persons. Assuming the capacity of a public light bus was 16 persons, a double-deck bus could carry eight times the passengers of a public light bus. The relevant minibus operators, thus, had to deploy a large fleet of minibuses to meet the demand for KMB Route No. 212 and maintain quality service. In addition, the journey distance of KMB Route No. 212 was 8.1 kilometres, and according to the current minibus fare table, minibus operators could charge a maximum of \$10.2 for a single-trip, which was higher than the fare of KMB Route No. 212 at \$5.1. Members could consider whether minibus was an appropriate and feasible alternative service with reference to this information;
- (f) KMB Route No. 30X was a relatively long route. If the two-way section fares were offered, the route would attract more short haul passengers and the frequency of boarding and alighting at en-route stops would be increased. As a result, stopping time and journey time of the route would be lengthened and service would become unstable. All these would affect the passengers' desire to take the route. In addition, under modern technology, passengers who alighted en-route and wanted to pay section fares had to validate their Octopus Cards again at the Processor at bus front. The practice ensured payment of adequate fare by passengers and avoided abuse. Yet, it would affect the daily operation of the route.
- (g) after the commissioning of the KTE, residents used the feeder service to go to nearby MTR stations. Subsequently, the demand for some bus service dwindled and the frequency of bus routes in the affected areas reduced accordingly. The Department had strived to minimise the impact of relevant arrangements on passengers during peak hours;

- (h) according to the survey, the current patronage of KMB Route No. 30X was high. The Department would urge the bus company to pay attention to the service standard of the route so as to meet passenger demand upon the cancellation of KMB Route No. 212;
- (i) the average patronage of most of the cross harbour bus routes in the busiest half hour at the peak loading point (Cross-Harbour Tunnel bus stops) exceeded 85%, therefore only the frequency of one route (Cross Harbour Tunnel Route No. 115) would be reduced; and
- (j) the Department had been communicating with the KCDC since the commissioning and was hopeful of Members' support for the reorganisation plan. Resources in the current bus network would be allocated to areas requiring development, for instance, enhancing bus service in newly developed areas in the district to tie in with the community development there and installing passenger facilities such as real-time bus arrival information display panels and seats at sheltered bus stops in the district.

48. **Mr LEUNG Wang-cheong, Principal Operations Officer (Lai Chi Kok Depot) of the KMB** supplemented that after the implementation of the two-way section fares, passengers had to validate their Octopus Cards at the Processor at the bus front before alighting. A bottleneck would then be created and the time of boarding and alighting lengthened. It would be even more inconvenient if there were wheelchair, elderly or disabled passengers. All these would cause impact on road traffic.

49. **The Hon Starry LEE** expressed deep disappointment with the TD's reply. She understood that the implementation of two-way section fare arrangement was constrained by the current bus design, but she proposed the TD request the bus company to study the way to introduce section fares, say, allowing passengers to pay the section fare when boarding the bus as implemented in foreign cities. In addition, she enquired about the actual number of passengers affected by the reorganisation plan.

50. The views and enquiries of **Dr KWONG Po-yin** were summarised below: (a) KMB Route No. 64K operating in rural areas was implementing two-way section fares. She urged the bus company to seriously consider implementing such arrangement; (b) she enquired about the number of passengers taking KMB Route No.

212 from Whampoa to Queen Elizabeth Hospital; (c) the TD said that the capacity of a double-deck bus was eight times of a public light bus, so she reckoned that the capacity of a public light bus was 12.5% of a bus. At present, the patronage of KMB Route No. 212 was about 19%, which meant that minibus operators could meet passenger demand by deploying two to three minibuses per hour. She asked the TD to meet with the operators for more details and study the feasibility of providing alternative service; and (4) she suggested rerouting KMB Route No. 212 via Sham Mong Road so as to create a new source of passengers.

51. **Mr LO Chiu-kit** said that MTR was highly accessible but it could not provide point-to-point service like what buses did. He urged the TD and bus companies to take public demand into serious consideration instead of finalising the reorganisation plan merely by referring to figures. He suggested the KMB lower the fare of KMB Route No. 212 to \$4 to attract more passengers and enhance its competitiveness.

52. **Mr LAI Kwong-wai** remarked that among the 25 bus routes that would undergo frequency reduction as set out in the supplementary information, the frequency of 17 bus routes had already been reduced. He was dissatisfied with the TD for another reduction of bus frequency within a short period of time. Additionally, he enquired of the TD how the bus resources saved after the reduction of bus frequency were utilised and he also requested the TD to submit the data collected every day. He held that the KMB and the TD should consult and respect the views of Members.

53. **Mr HE Huahan** proposed following the charging mode of the Light Rail by installing Octopus processors at bus stops for the implementation of two-way section fares.

54. **Mr Roger KWAN** said that he only received the paper from the TD several days prior to the meeting. He opined that the TD lacked sincerity to communicate. He reiterated that he did not understand why the TD still adjusted the bus routes in To Kwa Wan District after the commissioning of the new rail.

55. In reply, **Mr Patrick NG of the TD** said:

(a) KMB Route No. 30X operated along busy road sections in urban areas. Based on the current technology level, implementation of two-way section fares would

affect bus operation and cause inconvenience to passengers of the route. The Department would continue to study the feasibility of changing the charging mode with the KMB;

- (b) according to the survey data, less than 100 passengers took KMB Route No. 212 from Whampoa area to Queen Elizabeth Hospital per day. The operation of the route became difficult since the commissioning of the KTE. Hence, it was hard to improve overall bus service if bus resources were not utilised properly;
- (c) regarding the proposal of replacing KMB Route No. 212 by public light bus service, the Department would communicate with the relevant light bus operator to evaluate if its operational resources and fare level could meet passenger demand;
- (d) the fare adjustment of KMB Route No. 212 was purely a commercial decision of the KMB;
- (e) the surveys showed that the travel pattern of residents had changed after the rail line commenced operation. Passengers who preferred punctual and stable service tended to take railway service. Their demand for bus service dropped and thus the downtrend in bus patronage was obvious. In the reorganisation plan, the TD required bus companies to provide alternative services for cancelled routes, with a view to minimising the impact on passengers by bus routes reorganisation; and
- (f) the space inside bus compartments was narrow, so it was hard to compare fare payment via Octopus processors on the bus to those at the ticket gates installed in the concourses of railway stations.

56. **Mr LEUNG Wang-cheong of the KMB** said that according to the experience from implementation of two-way section fares for KMB Route No. 64K, a bottleneck would be created while loading and unloading passengers and the time of passengers boarding and alighting the bus would be lengthened. As KMB Route No. 64K operated in rural areas, its impact on road traffic was insignificant. However, KMB Route No. 30X plied along busy road sections in urban areas, the proposal of two-way section fare arrangement had to be studied carefully. In addition, observations by bus captains were merely subjective views. As shown by the figures of the KMB, patronage of KMB Route No. 212 decreased about 70% compared with

before. He could provide the latest patronage after the meeting.

57. **Mr HO Hin-ming** said that under the Concession Scheme, the Government had to reimburse the bus operators the fare difference. Thus, encouraging the public to take KMB Route No. 30X at a higher fare somehow benefitted the bus operators. Moreover, he opined that the technology of Octopus lagged considerably and suggested the TD draw reference from the practice of requiring passengers to tap their cards both when boarding and alighting in foreign countries. He was confident that other technologies could facilitate two-way section fare payment.

58. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** said that the TD should take overall traffic into consideration and strive to minimise the impact on the public by the adjustment if bus routes were to be cancelled. He hoped that the TD could provide alternatives instead of cancelling bus routes.

59. The responses of **Mr Patrick NG of the TD** were summarised below:

- (a) under the Concession Scheme, the Government reimbursed the participating franchised bus companies the fare revenue foregone by giving fare concession to the eligible elders due to the implementation of the Scheme, that was the difference between \$2 and the half fare;
- (b) the Department would continue to study with the bus company the arrangement for implementing two-way section fares; and
- (c) according to the benchmarks of frequency reduction under the guidelines, the Department would carefully consider and review the KMB's applications for frequency reduction.

60. **Mr Dennis LEE of the KMB** said that, owing to a drastic fall in the patronage of KMB Route No. 212, the KMB tendered an application for cancelling this route. The KMB noted Members' views on two-way section fares and fare reduction and would continue to study the provision of fare concessions.

61. **The Hon Starry LEE** requested to write a letter to the Commissioner for Transport in the name of the TTC to relay Members' views.

62. **The Chairman** concluded Members' views and said that Members

unanimously opposed to the cancellation of KMB Route No. 212 and held that there were insufficient alternative services. He urged the TD and the KMB to study other proposals and submit them to the TTC for consideration. Moreover, he asked the Secretariat to issue a letter to the Commissioner for Transport to relay Members' views.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat issued a letter to the Commissioner for Transport in the name of the TTC on 14 March 2017 as directed by the Chairman.)

Concern over the Running Time and Charging Facilities of Super-capacitor Buses Operating on Bus No. 5M (Paper No. 05/17)

63. **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat had sent the written replies from the TD and the KMB, Paper No. 4 to 5 tabled, to Members for perusal before the meeting.

64. **Mr HE Huahan** introduced Paper No. 05/17, and enquired whether the KMB shelved the project due to the potential danger in the charging facilities of super-capacitor buses. He was disappointed that the TD and the KMB did not provide detailed replies before the meeting.

65. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** requested the KMB to give an account of the safety problem of the charging facilities of super-capacitor buses. He was of the view that although super-capacitor buses were not in service at the moment, the KMB should allocate resources to increase the frequency of KMB Route No. 5M to meet passenger demand.

66. **Miss Muriel SZE, Senior Transport Officer/Bus Restructuring and Projects of the TD** gave a consolidated response as follows: (a) the Department had all along been working with the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department and the KMB to introduce super-capacitor buses and yet the Department was greatly concerned about the safety of such buses; (b) the representatives of the Department and the KMB tried out the super-capacitor bus two weeks ago, the KMB said during the trial that the charging facilities in Tak Long Estate had to be retrieved and improved at the present stage; (c) the TD and the EPD would monitor the progress of the above project. The KMB estimated that staff training would commence after the completion of parts assembly in mid-April. It expected that the test run of super-capacitor buses could commence as early as possible; and (d) after the start of the test run of super-capacitor buses, the

KMB would deploy one additional bus to KMB Route No. 5M and would go further to increase the frequency of KMB Route No. 5M in the light of passenger demand.

67. **Mr LEUNG Wang-cheong, Principal Operations Officer (Lai Chi Kok Depot) of the KMB** said that super-capacitor buses would commence when relevant safety standards were met.

68. **Mr HE Huahan** requested the TD and the KMB to explain the safety problems of super-capacitor buses and their charging facilities, and disclose the concrete details of the improvement works.

69. **Miss LEUNG Yuen-ting** said that the delay of the project for the charging facilities of super-capacitor buses caused inconvenience to members of the public and she was strongly discontented with the Department for not proactively explaining the reasons for the delay. In addition, she urged the Department to give an account of the progress of the project and the timetable of test runs of super-capacitor buses.

70. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** requested the TD and the KMB to ensure that the super-capacitor buses passed safety tests before carrying passengers. Besides, he opined that the current service of KMB Route No. 5M fell short of demand, so he asked for an increase in the frequency of the route. He also pointed out that this request had no relation to the failure to put super-capacitor buses into service at the moment.

71. **Mr LEUNG Wang-cheong of the KMB** emphasised that super-capacitor buses had to undergo an examination and approval process as well as a test for safety standards by the departments concerned before they could start providing services.

72. **Miss Muriel SZE of the TD** said that the Department was carrying out a patronage survey for KMB Route No. 5M and would adjust its frequency according to the results and actual needs of the commuters.

73. **The Chairman** urged the TD and the KMB to respond to the safety problems of super-capacitor buses and progress of deploying super-capacitor buses to KMB Route No. 5M.

74. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** enquired how the KMB would address the problem of super-capacitor buses failing to operate due to running out of battery during traffic

congestion, and how the KMB would ensure that such buses would not explode when charging and travelling.

75. **Miss Muriel SZE of the TD** gave a consolidated response as follows: (a) the journey of KMB Route No. 5M was relatively short and thus, the chance of encountering serious traffic congestion was slim and the battery of super-capacitor buses could cope with the power required for the whole journey. During the test run of super-capacitor buses, the KMB would arrange two conventional single-deckers as back-up, which would be deployed to KMB Route No. 5 during emergencies. The KMB would also deploy rescue vehicles when necessary; (b) during the test run of super-capacitor buses, the TD and the KMB would make timely review and respond to Members' aspirations; and (c) after discussing with the EPD and the KMB, the TD would inform Members of the schedule of runs of super-capacitor buses on KMB Route No. 5M and the progress of implementation.

76. **Mr HE Huahan** requested again the Department and the KMB to give an account of the safety problems of super-capacitor buses and their charging facilities that led to the suspension of the project. He was strongly discontented over the Department's response about the safety problems. Moreover, he suggested to send a letter to the Head of Department in the name of the TTC to ask for an explanation about the safety problems of super-capacitor buses and their charging facilities.

77. **The Chairman** stated that as Paper No. 05/17 did not require the TD and the KMB to respond to the safety problems of super-capacitor buses and their charging facilities, they could not respond to Members' enquiries instantly. Hence, he adopted the proposal of **Mr HE** and instructed the Secretariat to follow up **Mr HE's** suggestion after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat issued a letter to the Director of Environmental Protection in the name of the TTC on 28 March 2017 as directed by the Chairman.)

Proposal on the Provision of Bus Route between Kai Tak and Cheung Sha Wan
(Paper No. 06/17)

78. **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat had sent the written replies from the KMB, Paper No. 6 tabled, to Members for perusal before the meeting. He then invited the **Vice-chairman** to chair the meeting.

79. **Mr HE Huahan** introduced Paper No. 06/17, and suggested changing the

terminus of the route plying between KTCT and Festival Walk in Kowloon Tong from Kowloon City to Sham Shui Po or Cheung Sha Wan.

80. **Miss LEUNG Yuen-ting** said that passengers travelling to Cheung Sha Wan could go to Rhythm Garden on Prince Edward Road East to take New World First Bus/ Citybus Route No. 796C, KMB Route No. 98C or KMB Route No. 296C. However, residents in Kai Ching Estate had to take a 5 to 10-minute walk to that bus stop while those in Tak Long Estate needed to walk 15 to 20 minutes to the bus stop. The residents in the KTDA found it inconvenient to go out.

81. **Miss Muriel SZE of the TD** gave a consolidated reply as follows: (a) regarding the provision of additional bus routes between Kai Tak and Cheung Sha Wan, the Department had replied to relevant Members earlier. Moreover, the Department introduced three new bus routes in the reorganisation plan to enhance associated transport facilities in the KTDA; (b) as regards the extension of the route plying between KTCT and Festival Walk in Kowloon Tong, the Department noted the views of **Mr HE**, and would relay his views to the Bus Development Division; and (c) regarding the fact that residents in the KTDA had to walk for some distance to reach the bus stop, the Department was unable to set up a bus stop at the mid-point or introduce a new bus route meanwhile because of the distance between Kai Ching Estate, Tak Long Estate and Prince Edward Road East. Residents could take KMB Route No. 24 and transfer to KMB Route No. 2A at Prince Edward Road East westbound if they went to Mei Foo and Cheung Sha Wan.

82. **Miss LEUNG Yuen-ting** said that lost trips of KMB Route No. 24 were frequent and interchange of bus was inconvenient to residents with disabilities. She pointed out that Members were requesting not a new bus route, but an extension of the routing of the new bus route.

83. **Miss Muriel SZE of the TD** noted the request of **Miss LEUNG**, and would discuss further with the Bus Section.

Request for Improvement on Infrequent Service of Bus No. 5D

(Paper No. 07/17)

84. **The Vice-chairman** said that the written reply from the Kowloon Motor Bus Co. Ltd. (KMB) (Paper No. 07/17 tabled) was sent to Members for perusal before the meeting.

85. **Ms LEUNG Yuen-ting** introduced Paper No. 07/17 and added that many students in the district had to take KMB bus no. 5D to school.

86. **Mr Admond YUE** said that KMB bus no. 5D was an important means of transport for residents in the district to travel to Telford Gardens. Residents complained that bus no. 5D ran at sparse intervals and they requested for an increase of runs to shorten the waiting time to 20 minutes from 25 to 30 minutes.

87. **Ms Amanda Hsu, Acting Senior Transport Officer / Kowloon City of the TD** replied that KMB bus no. 5D started to offer full-day service on February 6 and the runs during peak hours and off-peak hours were set at every 15 to 25 minutes and 30 minutes respectively. The TD had paid heed to the passenger demand of the route and was planning to conduct field surveys. It would discuss with the KMB further to enhance the service in order to meet the needs of the public when necessary.

88. **Mr LEUNG Wan-cheong of the KMB** said that the bus no. 5D had offered full-day service for nearly a month and the company was now studying the number of passengers in both peak and off-peak hours. It would work closely with the TD to see if there was room for further improvement in light of passenger volume.

89. **Ir CHEUNG Yan-hong** said that when there was traffic congestion during off-peak hours, waiting time for bus no. 5D might turn to 45 minutes instead of 30 minutes, and thus, he opined that a 25 minute interval should at least be maintained during off-peak hours.

90. **Ms Amanda Hsu of the TD** said that the Department would discuss about and review the transport arrangements for bus no. 5D during peak hours with the KMB.

91. **The Vice-chairman** summed up the views of Members and urged the TD to closely monitor the operation of the KMB Company so that the public would be more satisfied with the service of the KMB.

Call for Attention to the Safety Problem of Bus Stop at Kiang His Street in To Kwa Wan

(Paper No. 08/17)

92. **The Vice-chairman** said that the written reply from the KMB (Paper No.

08/17 & 09/17 tabled) was sent to Members for perusal before the meeting.

93. **Mr Jimmy LAM** presented Paper No. 08/17. He said the KMB indicated that the bus stop could be moved about four meters away, but he was anxious that the move would affect the operation of other bus stops or minibus stops. He made two proposals: (a) widening the pavement to enlarge the distance between the columns of old buildings and the bus stop; and (b) erecting a crash barrier. He said that there was a sign reminding drivers to steer buses near the stop cautiously, but the sign was not conspicuous enough.

94. **Mr YANG Wing-kit's** views were summed up as follows: (a) a number of bus stops were installed at that area, and if a number of buses stopped at the same time, moving the bus stops about four meters away could not solve the problem of buses bumping into columns of nearby buildings. For the sake of safety, he supported the proposal of widening the pavement as proposed by **Mr Jimmy LAM**; and (b) the written reply of the KMB suggested about re-organisation of bus stops. He considered that the reorganisation program involved a change of bus routes which would cause a large impact to the community. If widening of the pavement could resolve the problem, it was advisable for the TD and the KMB to opt for the easier solution.

95. **Ms Amanda HSU of the TD's** views were summed up as follows: (a) the TD was concerned about the safety of bus stops and hence conducted a field inspection at the junction between Ma Tau Wai Road and Anhui Street and Kiang Hsi Street. To ensure that KMB bus no. 75X could safely station at the bus stop, the KMB moved the bus stop of bus no. 75X near columns of the old building at Ma Tau Wai Road four meters away towards Anhui Street; and (b) the Department would review the existing arrangements with the bus company and examine whether there were other more feasible ways, including the relocation of bus stops to guarantee the safe operation of buses and to minimise the impacts on passengers currently taking the buses.

96. **Mr LEUNG Wan-cheong of the KMB** remarked that the bus stop of KMB buses no. 75X and 93K on Ma Tau Wai Road would be shifted four meters to the direction of Anhui Street to prevent the buses from hitting against the columns of nearby old buildings. In the long run, he suggested moving some of the bus stops about 60 to 70 meters away.

97. **Ms Penny CHUNG, Senior Public Affairs Officer of Citybus Limited &**

New World First Bus Services Limited said that the company already inspected the bus stops at Ma Tau Wai Road near Kiang Hsi Street as well as the location of stops for Citybus / NWFB bus no. 796X and N23 and their operation. It was confirmed that no risk was found. The company was well aware of the views of Members on the safety of bus stops and would work with relevant government departments to see if there were other feasible options to improve the safety of bus stops.

98. **Ms Joyce LEE, Engineer / Hung Hom of the TD** said that the proposal of widening the pavement and installing a crash barrier would, to a certain extent, affect the traffic flow. The TD would consider the overall traffic and transport situation when making adjustment. The current plan was to move the bus stops a few meters away. The Department would review whether the existing arrangements were appropriate and consider if more viable options were available.

99. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** said the proposal of moving bus stops 60 or 70 meters off would perhaps spark controversy. Moving the bus stops towards Shan Si Street was not ideal as the spot was easily soaked with rain water. He agreed with Ms LEE of the TD that the feasibility of the scheme for the relocation of bus stops should be examined first prior to exploring other solutions, including widening the pavement.

100. **Mr LEUNG Wan-cheong of the KMB** took note of the views of Members and said that relocation of bus stops was a preliminary proposal. The KMB would conduct site inspections before making further arrangements.

Road Improvement Works at Lung Cheung Road and the Construction of Footbridge across Lung Cheung Road and Westbound Lung Cheung Road to the Northbound Slip Road of Lion Rock Tunnel Road
(Paper No. 09/17)

101. **Mr Philip CHAN, Senior Estate Surveyor of the Lands Department (LD)** presented Paper No. 09/17.

102. **Mr LEUNG Cho-ming, Senior Engineer / General Duties (2) of the Highways Department (HD)** added that in view of the study on the impacts on transport completed by the TD earlier on, the Highways Department (HD) conducted a feasibility study on the road project. **Mr SO** of the consultancy would introduce the details of the project.

103. **Mr Charles SO, Executive Director / Traffic and Transport Planning of AECOM Asia Co. Ltd.** briefed Members on the suggestions listed in the Annex of Paper No. 09/17:

- (i) providing a deceleration zone on the eastbound carriageway of Lung Cheung Road and erecting bus stops in the deceleration zone; improving the junction leading to the primary service reservoir No.2 on Lion Rock;
- (ii) adding bus bays and acceleration zones at westbound Lung Cheung Road; and
- (iii) constructing footbridges across Lung Cheung Road and westbound Lung Cheung Road to the northbound slip road of Lion Rock Tunnel Road to connect the land lots, pavements on both sides of Lung Cheung Road and a pedestrian walkway to the northbound slip road connecting Lion Rock Tunnel Road.

104. **Mr HO Hin-ming's** views were summarised below: (a) he thanked the Department for taking the advice of the KCDC to revise the design of the proposed footbridge to connect the park in Lung Cheung Road for the convenience of other residents; (b) the Paper mentioned that the footbridge would be built by the developer and he wished the HD would remind the developer that the impacts of noises at Lung Cheung Road on the residents should be considered when buildings were constructed; (c) he supported the construction of a covered footbridge, but did not recommend a sealed design because the place was a bit remote and the sealed design would generate crimes; and (d) he urged an early completion and opening of the proposed footbridge.

105. **Mr Philip CHAN of the Lands Department** said that developer would have to assess the noise impacts of this development project and then implement the project on the basis of the assessment report. He said that due to the considerable scale and complexity of the development project, the period of construction might take seven to nine years. Upon the completion of the footbridge, the Lands Department (LD) would consult the relevant departments including the TD and the HD when devising the conditions for the sale of land, and would seek advice from the KCDO. It was believed that during the consultation period, all stakeholders would have chance to express their views and the LD would try to meet all the needs.

106. **Mr LEUNG Cho-ming of the HD** said the preliminary design of the

footbridge was a covered one instead of sealed.

107. **The Vice-chairman** questioned if the footbridge was managed by the Government or the management company of a private housing estate. If it was to be managed by the Government, it might attract many street sleepers.

108. **Mr Philip CHAN of the LD** expressed that the footbridge was primarily built for public use, and therefore, it would be managed by the relevant government department in future. However, part of the footbridge would extend into the private housing estate for the use of the residents there, and thus, the part concerned would possibly be handed over to the private management company for management and the LD would discuss about the details of it with the relevant departments.

The Next Phase of Universal Accessibility Programme **(Paper No. 10/17)**

109. **Mr NG Wai-keung, Chief Engineer of the HD** presented Paper No. 10/17 with a projector.

110. **Mr HO Hin-ming** raised the following opinions and enquiries: (a) the installation of an elevator at the pedestrian walkway straddling Junction Road near Renfrew Road (Structure No. KF25) led to an increase in the number of pedestrians, but as the bridge was of a sealed design, robberies and sex crimes had taken place. It was hoped that the HD would refine the design to reduce the occurrence of crime; (b) as to the pedestrian link (Structure No. KC01) across Junction Road near Renfrew Road, Point B displayed on the slide show was within the jurisdiction of the LCSD. As no trees and flowers were planted at the spot at the moment, it was easier to conduct works; and (c) he proposed the HD discuss about resumption of the land lot indicated by Point A on the slide show with the Hong Kong Baptist University so as to avoid narrowing the road surface of Junction Road during the works.

111. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** made the following comments and enquiries: (a) with the commissioning of the KTE, the intake of Harbour Place and Star by the Harbour, it was estimated that the pedestrian flow of the pedestrian walkway at Shung King Street, Hung Hom South Road and Hung Luen Road near Oi King Street (Structure No. KF107) would increase, and as the access ramp was very long, it remained inconvenient for pedestrians; (b) she queried if it was appropriate to install an elevator there. As many people crossed the road at an inappropriate position, she requested

for the provision of a pedestrian crossing off Hung Hom South Road and a letter regarding the issue had been sent to the TD; and (c) pedestrians using the footbridge could not walk across Hung Luen Road and needed to make their way via Exit A or B of Whampoa MTR Station. If the elevator was built at the front end of the flyover staircase, it would be more accessible to pedestrians, but she was not sure about any difficulties in design; and (d) she reaffirmed that the provision of a pedestrian crossing would facilitate pedestrians most.

112. **Mr NG Po-keung** consolidated his views as follows: (a) there were many elderly people in Kowloon City District, and with the development of the old airport and the commissioning of the Shatin to Central Link, the people using the pedestrian walkway (Structure No. KS8) straddling Prince Edward Road West near Lion Rock Road would increase and hence he backed the construction of an elevator at the location; (b) the initial assessment showed that the works would affect the pedestrian crossing but as the surface of the road leading to Prince Edward Road West and Lion Rock Road was wide enough, there would be little impact on pedestrians; and (c) a small garden under the LCSD would be requisitioned for carrying out the works but the residents would not be greatly affected as the usage rate of the park was low.

113. **Ir CHEUNG Yan-hong's** views were summed up as follows: (a) many elders resided at Hung Hom Estate and Whampoa Estate and they found it very inconvenient to walk up and down 73 stairs or the long ramp when using the pedestrian link spanning Hung Hom Road near Dyer Avenue (Structure No. K64), (b) since the operation of Whampoa MTR Station, more pedestrians used the above-mentioned flyover; and (c) in the previous phase of the Universal Accessibility Programme (UAP), he had proposed to provide a lift at the above-mentioned footbridge, but it was not included in the programme in the end. The TTC Members unanimously agreed to list it as a replacement suggestion. Therefore, he now requested for classing the above-mentioned footbridge as a project to be implemented at this phase.

114. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** raised the following views and enquiries: (a) since the residents had to walk a long distance to reach Lok Man Sun Chuen, the provision of a lift was proposed. However, he was unsure if the staircase / ramps met the conditions of the project plan; (b) he suggested to adopt the usage of the pedestrian walkway and the feasibility of the works as criteria of prioritising the construction items; (c) he agreed to **Mr HO's** views that the pedestrian flow of the walkway across Union Road near Renfrew Road (Structure No. KC01) ranked second among all items

and a slight revision of design would believably help lower the degree of difficulty of the project; (d) he sided with **Mr NG** that the works of the pedestrian walkway spanning Prince Edward Road West near Lion Rock Road (structure number KS8), was feasible; and (e) it might not be proper to finalise the priority of all items in this meeting but he wished that relevant departments would make further assessment after listening to opinions of various parties.

115. **Mr SIU Leong-sing** requested the TD to provide the method of assessing the maximum hourly flow of pedestrians and time of conducting the assessment. He said that the usage of every pedestrian walkway varied, say, the one spanning Boundary Street near Embankment Road (Structure No. KF111) recorded the highest number of pedestrians in the morning when people hurried for school and work.

116. **Mr LAM Tak-shing's** views were summarised as follows: (a) he supported the views of **Ir CHEUNG Yan-hong** about the ramp across Hung Hom Road near Dyer Street (Structure No. K64), which linked up three areas. As the ramp was long and oblique, the provision of a lift could benefit many pedestrians; and (b) the flow of pedestrians was high at the pedestrian walkway across Fat Kwong Street, near Wo Chung Street (Structure No. KS21), because nearby residents would go for a morning walk at the park at Fat Kwong Street. He advised the Department to accord priority to the above two projects.

117. **Mr NG Wai-keung of the HD** made a consolidated reply as follows: (a) the HD had entrusted the TD with the calculation of the pedestrian flow at the three walkways set out in Annex III. Based on the past experience, the TD recorded the flow rate at two particular hours with maximum amount of people at 15-minute intervals and then calculated the maximum flow rate per hour. It was believed that the above estimates could accurately reflect the amount of people at times with maximum pedestrian flow rate; (b) since the pedestrian walkway across Union Road near Renfrew Road (Structure No. KC01) was not maintained and managed by the HD, requisition of land was not required for the construction of a lift. As reflected in the slide show, the proposed lift would be built at a spot close to private land lot. Due to the narrow surface of the pavement, the project might involve the narrowing of the existing carriageway and was technically difficult. If the TTC voted for the project, the HD would engage a consultancy to further study the feasibility of the project. It would also discuss with the Hong Kong Baptist University about the project implementation arrangements. If the project selected was technically infeasible, the HD would report to TTC; and (c) the UAP aimed at providing lifts at

existing footbridges, subways and elevated pedestrian walkways to facilitate the use of road crossing facilities by the public. Members suggested building a lift at staircase / ramp at Lok Man Sun Chuen. However, as the staircase / ramp was situated in the housing estate without extending into the public road managed or maintained by the HD and nor was it a footbridge, subway or elevated pedestrian walkway, it thus fell outside the coverage of the UAP and could not be included into the project list of the next phase of the UAP.

118. **The Chairman** pointed out that Members held different views on various projects and failed to reach a consensus. He urged Members to conclude the priority of the three pedestrian walkways so that departments could make further assessment on the projects and study their feasibility.

119. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** remarked that it was difficult for Members to reach a consensus on the priority of the three pedestrian walkways at the moment and she proposed to deal with this at the next meeting.

120. **The Chairman** said that, to allow departments to speed up the progress of the project, the document would be circulated for Members to express their views and come to a decision on the priority of the walkways.

121. **Mr SIU Leong-sing** proposed to build a lift on the private footbridge at Embankment Road and Prince Edward Road West to connect Mong Kok East MTR Station for the convenience of residents.

122. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** opined that the priority of the three projects hinged on the pedestrian flow and their feasibility, and he agreed to the suggestion of **the Chairman** on collecting views and forging a consensus by circulating the documents.

123. **Dr CHEUNG Yan-hong's** views were summed up as follows: (a) the pedestrian link across Hung Hom Road near Dyer Street (Structure No. K64) was discussed at the last meeting of TTC. He requested for deciding the priorities of projects at the current meeting; (b) he raised no objection to circulate the document for soliciting views in two weeks' time; and (c) amongst the seven items listed in Annex III of Paper No. 10/17, four projects were highly difficult to implement whilst three relatively difficult. If three highly difficult projects were deleted, leaving only four options, Members would find it easier to choose and prioritise three projects.

124. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** pinpointed that if the TD was going to set up a pedestrian crossing off Shung King Street, it would not have to provide a lift at the pedestrian walkway spanning Shung King Street, Hung Hom South Road and Hung Luen Road near Oi King Street (Structure No. KF107). This could then spare resources for the provision of a barrier-free access at pedestrian link with greater need. On the contrary, if no ground-level pedestrian crossing was provided, residents might need a footbridge with a lift for road crossing. She enquired about the feasibility of installing a pedestrian crossing there.

125. **Mr Roger KWAN** said that Members insisted their views at the meeting, and some had raised new proposals and suggested replacement items. In view of this, it was not the right moment to accord priorities to the projects. He therefore agreed with **the Chairman's** opinion of collecting comments from Members by circulating the documents.

126. **Mr HO Hin-ming** expressed his views and raised questions: (a) he concurred with the views of **Mr YANG** that the priority of items hinged on the flow of pedestrians; (b) he objected **Ir CHEUNG's** views and thought that it was the HD's responsibility to solve the difficulties of the project and the public should not suffer inconvenience; and (c) he enquired if any traffic accidents had happened at the road intersection and the pedestrian crossing close to the pedestrian walkway at Junction Road near Renfrew Road (Structure No. KC01). This would contribute to the assessment of the need of the project.

127. **Mr NG Po-keung's** views were: (a) he agreed to **Mr HO's** point of view and pointed out that the HD's preliminary assessment of the various projects were "relatively difficult" or "highly difficult" but in fact, the Department should strive hard to grasp the nettle; and (b) in view that the Shatin to Central Link and community redevelopment were underway in Kowloon City District, he requested the HD to estimate the pedestrian usage upon the completion of the project and to adopt objective criteria when assessing the project.

128. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** enquired about the reasons for prioritising the projects and whether the construction costs of the elevators was one of the assessment factors. He agreed to circulate the documents for collecting views of Members.

129. **Ms Joyce LEE, Engineer / Hung Hom of the TD**, in reply to the request for setting up a pedestrian crossing at Hung Hom South Road, said that after

preliminary field inspections, it was found that many pedestrians did not use the footbridge when crossing the road. Instead, they just walked across Hung Hom South Road where no pedestrian crossing was provided, and the condition was undesirable. The footbridge was constructed with the aim of providing proper and safe pedestrian crossing facilities with no impact on traffic. The Department was now reviewing the traffic management measures of the spot to prevent pedestrians from crossing the road at inappropriate locations. The footbridge would undergo improvement works and would then be connected to a footbridge of a new housing estate and pedestrian use was expected to increase significantly. In view that the provision of another pedestrian crossing at the suggested location might affect the traffic there and a pedestrian crossing not affecting traffic was available in the vicinity, the proposal of installing a new pedestrian crossing was not recommended.

130. **Mr NG Wai-keung of the HD** gave a consolidated reply as follows: (a) the projects were funded through a block allocation and no more than three projects could be chosen for the next phase of the UAP. And the costs of each additional project item could not exceed \$75 million. All the projects proposed for adding elevators set out in Annex III of Paper No. 10/17 for Members' consideration did not cost more than \$75 million; (b) whether the footbridge leading to Mong Kok East MTR Station at Embankment Road across Prince Edward Road West met the requirements of the UAP was to be confirmed by a preliminary study; and (c) Members were advised to reach a consensus as soon as possible and to finalise the priorities of the projects.

131. **The Chairman** decided to collect the views of Members in 14 days by circulating the documents so that the HD could expedite the implementation of the next phase of the UAP.

(Post-meeting notes: As directed by the Chairman, the Secretariat sent a letter to Members on 16 March 2017 to invite them to submit new proposals for the installation of lifts at the next phase of the UAP and the HD would initiate a preliminary study on these proposals.)

Objection to the Conversion of the Leisure Path at King Wan Street for Temporary Reprovisioning of Public Pier
(Paper No. 11/17)

132. **The Chairman** said that the written reply from the Department (Paper No. 15/17 tabled) was sent to Members for perusal before the meeting.

133. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah**'s views were summed up below: (a) At present, there was a parking lot for tourist coaches at Kowloon City Ferry Pier near where many coaches loaded and unloaded passengers. Earlier on, the Department said that after the completion of the Central Kowloon Route, the car park for tourist coaches would continue to operate. However, Members later learnt that the parking spaces for coaches of the car park near Kowloon City Ferry Pier would be moved to a lot beside Wyler Gardens and the coaches would have to pass by Wyler Gardens when parking in or out; and (b) Ma Tau Kok Public Pier would be demolished and relocated to a leisure trail at King Wan Street. So, if the tourist coaches could not be parked at the existing parking lot near Kowloon City Ferry Pier, they would pick up and drop off passengers at Wyler Gardens, King Wan Street and Kwai Chow Street. At the moment, King Wan Street was very congested and residents were unlikely to accept the new arrangement.

134. **Mr Roger KWAN** expressed his views: (a) at present, space for accommodating coaches and tourists was insufficient at Kowloon City Ferry Pier. According to the plan shown in the document tabled, the area of the temporary ferry pier upon relocation was smaller than the existing Kowloon City Ferry Pier. He was anxious about whether there was enough room to allow a large number of tourist coaches loading and unloading passengers. If the temporary ferry pier could not cope with such a large traffic flow, tourist coaches would drive into the ferry pier at King Wan Street and aggravate the traffic load there; and (b) he understood that the TD had been organising a number of public involvement activities and collecting public views, but the problem of tourist coaches in the area remained unresolved. Thus, Members needed to express their worries about the traffic flow and the overall safety concerns to the Authority.

135. **Mr NG Po-keung** said that as traffic congestion in Hoi Sum area was serious and passengers always flooded the roads, the residents were often forced to walk onto the roadway. The commencement of the Central Kowloon Route project would cause more tourists to flock to Hoi Sum area and so he advised the Department to conduct a public consultation before implementing the plan.

136. **Mr NG Wai-keung of the HD** made a summarised reply as follows: (a) during the public involvement and consultation and gazettal process, no comments on the temporary relocation of ferry pier at King Wan Street were received. As the project was approved by the Chief Executive in Council, the HD had commenced the tendering procedures. Considering the new concerns of Members, the HD would

discuss with other departments the possibility of fine-tuning the plan; (b) the HD had finished the assessment of impacts of the project on the traffic earlier on. When the works were underway, the Department would form a community liaison group and a traffic management coordination group with the contractor to discuss about specific interim traffic arrangements. And before the arrangements were implemented, the HD would also consult Members of the TTC or DC Members concerned if necessary.

137. **Mr LAM Man-san, Senior Engineer, Major Works Project Management Office of the HD** supplemented: (a) regarding Members' worry about the interim traffic measures bringing the coaches into Kwai Chow Street, the HD planned to retain the passenger pick-up and drop-off area next to the Grand Waterfront at San Ma Tau Street and strengthen the pedestrian access system; (b) the ferry pier was scheduled for relocation in the third year after the commissioning of the Central Kowloon Route. Therefore there would be sufficient time for assessing the prevailing traffic and pedestrian flow and considering the temporary traffic diversion measures with Members; (c) as for the adequacy of room for passengers to wait for coaches, the Department would expand the space beside the leisure trail and build a covered passenger link to guarantee the safety of pedestrians; and (d) as to the impacts of tourists at Hoi Sum area on residents, the Department would carry out consultation before the implementation of major temporary traffic arrangements.

138. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** expressed his views as follows: (a) he was anxious that once the project was carried out, it would be difficult to make any further changes, and hence he urged the HD to make amendments before commencement of works; (b) the Department indicated that the area for loading and unloading passengers adjacent to the Grand Waterfront would be retained, but upon the removal of the parking lot for coaches and ferry pier, tourist coaches would no longer use the area; and (c) he wondered if the space around the pier at King Wan Street would be more spacious than the existing passenger pick-up and drop-off area of Kowloon City Ferry Pier upon expansion, and he was worried that the congestion of King Wan Street would worsen upon the change.

139. **Mr NG Wai-keung of the HD** gave the following reply: (a) when the works commenced, representatives of the HD, the Police, the TD and other relevant government departments would set up a traffic management coordination group to assess the proposed interim traffic diversion measures conceived by the contractor and consult Members of the TTC and DC Members concerned if necessary before the implementation of measures; and (b) the project was at the tendering stage, and if a

consensus could be reached in short time, the HD would consider including the revised measures into the terms of the contract. However, if the revised measures could not be stated in the contract before the closure of tender process, the Department would communicate and coordinate with the KCDC and the DC members concerned before implementing the relevant measures in an effort to reduce the impacts of the project on the residents in the district.

140. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** said that even if there was no temporary ferry pier, the vessels would identify the appropriate dock for embankment and so it was not necessary to build a temporary ferry pier at the leisure trail in King Wan Street.

141. **The Chairman** urged the Department to deliberate the views of Members so as to avoid the deterioration of traffic condition upon the implementation of relevant measures.

Concern over Serious Traffic Congestion Caused by Pick-up Vehicles of International Schools at Man Fuk Road

(Paper No. 12/17)

142. **The Chairman** said that the written reply from the Department (Paper No. 10-11/17 tabled) was sent to Members for perusal before the meeting.

143. **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** presented Paper No. 12/17.

144. **Mr CHING Yiu-yuen, Chief School Development Officer (Kowloon City) of the Education Bureau** made a consolidated reply as follows: the Education Bureau (EB) had urged the school concerned to make appropriate arrangements when students attending school. And the school engaged a transport consultancy to conduct a study on the problem. The consultants then suggested that the parents should be requested to let their children travel to school by school bus or public transport and coordination with neighboring schools should be achieved for arranging students to finish school at different times so as to achieve a diversion of traffic.

145. **Mr CHEUNG Chi-wa, Engineer / Kowloon City of the TD** said that the road section off the school was more spacious and allowed passengers to get on and off vehicles without obstructing traffic.

146. **Mr PO Yiu-wa, Officer-in-charge, Traffic Team (Kowloon City District), Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF)** said that since the commencement of

the school on 1 September 2016, a total of 26 complaints about vehicle obstruction were received. The number of complaints was mild when compared with the whole of Kowloon City.

147. **The Chairman** advised that apart from the existing international schools, different housing estates would be ready for intake in near future. So he hoped that the EB, the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) and the TD would closely monitor the traffic condition in the district.

Concern over the Illegal Parking Problem at Cooke Street, Baker Street, Lo Lung Hang Street, Winslow Street, Bulkeley Street and Ming On Street in Hung Hom and Strong Request for Combating Illegal Parking at Broadcast Drive and Kam Shing Street
(Paper No. 13/17, 14/17 and 15/17)

148. **The Chairman** said that agenda items 14-16 were related to the matter of illegal parking in the district. To make the discussion smooth, the items should be deliberated together. And Members agreed to the suggestion.

149. **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** introduced Paper No. 13/17 and suggested issuing a number of tickets to owners who continued to park illegally so as to drive them to use public car parks and hence addressing the growing problem of illegal parking.

150. **Mr LAM Tak-shing** elaborated Paper No. 14/17 and requested the police to report on field inspections.

151. **Mr HO Hin-ming** presented Paper No. 15/17 and requested the police to enforce the law strictly.

152. **Mr HO Chi-kin, Officer-in-charge, Traffic Team (Sau Mau Ping District), Hong Kong Police Force** pointed out that the police had purchased different technology products, such as video systems, speeding detection or automatic license plate recognition systems, to facilitate the implementation of traffic regulations without amending the law. However, the system for booking proposed by **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming** involved the amendment of the Fixed Penalty (Traffic Contraventions) Ordinance (Chapter 237), which covered a number of issues. It was thus inappropriate to launch a discussion at the level of the District Council. In

addition, the system could only identify the license plate of vehicles parking illegally, and this differed from the systems with the ability of identifying the speeding of drivers or automatically recognising license plates.

153. **Mr PO Yiu-wa of the HKPF** said it was found during site inspection that the funeral parlors were busiest between 9:00am and 10:00am. And with a large number of tourist coaches driving into Lo Lung Hang Street and Cheong Wan Road, traffic congestion was serious at Cheong Hang Road and the new development area of Hung Hom. Besides, the two lanes of Winslow Street merged into one, forming a bottleneck area, and thus, it was proposed that the pavement was to be narrowed for the provision of a new lane to speed up traffic flow.

154. **The Hon Starry LEE** pointed out that since the Government was unable to resolve the problem of inadequate parking spaces, after the discussion of the Legislative Council, her political party opposed to the proposal of increasing the amount of fixed penalty at this stage.

155. **Ir Dr CHENG Lee-ming's** views were summed up as follows: (a) he expressed dissatisfaction with the police's response and opined that the existing legislation was out of date and the police should amend the legislation and introduce new technology to tackle the problem of illegal parking and traffic congestion so as to keep abreast with the times; and (b) he disagreed to the view that the main reason for illegal parking was inadequacy of parking spaces. Instead, he believed as the amount of fixed penalty for illegal parking was lower than the fee collected by car parks, the deterrent effect of the fixed penalty ticket became weak.

156. **Mr HO Hin-ming** said that Kowloon Tong provided ample parking spaces but drivers still parked illegally, resulting in traffic congestion at Kam Shing Road. The police should deploy more staff there to enforce the law.

157. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** considered that: (a) the current shortage of parking spaces was unfavorable to drivers, while bus companies cancelled bus routes and it became difficult for the public to take public transport. The whole transport system had inadequacy, which could be in no way resolved at the District Council level; (b) Taking the illegal parking outside the Landmark as an example, the police often chose people relatively elder for issuing fixed penalty tickets, and hence reducing the deterrent effect of the penalty system. To solve the problem of illegal parking and street obstruction at prime locations, she proposed the introduction of new technology

for booking to enhance the effectiveness of law enforcement.

158. **Mr HO Chi-kin of the HKPF** said he would reflect the views of the TTC Members to the Police. In addition, as illegal parking at Causeway Bay was within the jurisdiction of the police on Hong Kong Island, the police in Kowloon District were unable to deal with the problem.

159. **The Chairman** hoped that the police would respect the spirit of law and maintain fairness during enforcement operation to ensure that drivers who parked illegally were bound by law.

Request for Additional White Lines at the Junction between Renfrew Road and Junction Road

(Paper No. 16 /17)

160. **Mr HO Hin-ming** presented Paper No. 16/17 and added that some non-law-abiding drivers went straight on left-turn lanes and he suggested adding road signs for steering left on left-turn lanes plus go-straight signs on the other two lanes.

161. **Mr CHEUNG Chi-wa of the TD** took note of the views of Members and agreed to study the possibility of adding road signs.

Request for Provision of Paid Passageway Validators in MTR Kowloon Tong Station

(Paper No. 17/17)

162. **Mr HO Hin-ming** elaborated Paper No.17/17 and requested for the installation of Paid Passageway Validators (PPV) at Kowloon Tong MTR Station.

163. **Ms Lilian YEUNG, Public Relations Manager - External Affairs of the MTR Corporation** gave a consolidated reply as follows: (a) the MTR Corporation (MTRC) would assess if the flow of passengers would be affected and conceive ways of speeding up the flow before installation of any new facilities at the MTR stations and to consider how to disperse passengers in an emergency situation; and (b) from 18 January onwards, two PPVs would be placed near Exit G of Mei Foo MTR Station with which the passengers might tap their Octopus Card and then be offered a 20-minute free access to different entrances and exits in the station. Meanwhile, the unpaid areas of the two lines were not connected and thus, the MTRC introduced the

PPVs on a trial basis and the machines would be placed at the paid area of the West Rail Line near Exit G. The company would pay attention to the usage of the machines but meanwhile, no further plan to install the facility at other stations was formulated.

164. **Mr HO Hin-ming** asked the MTRC whether it would study the proposal or refuse to consider it.

165. **Ms Lilian YEUNG of the MTRC** said that a review on the trial plan at Mei Foo MTR Station was to be conducted first before further decision on whether or not PPVs should be provided at other stations. Thus, the company had no plan to install the machines at other stations.

166. **The Chairman** asked the MTRC about the time of further planning.

167. **Ms Lilian YEUNG of the MTRC** stated that the new facility was put into operation not long ago on 18 January and it would take more time for the company to observe its utilisation.

168. **Mr TONG Chai-ming, Corporate Affairs Manager (Kwun Tong & Tsuen Wan Line) of the MTRC** added that the scheme involved an automatic payment system, which should be handled with care. So he hoped that Members would understand that the MTRC needed more time to conduct a research and review.

169. **Mr HO Hin-ming** pointed out that setting a time frame for installing PPVs at Kowloon Tong Station was important because the station was an interchange station of the East Rail Line and KTE and there were also bus interchanges and two universities in the vicinity of it. In addition, the pedestrian flow of Waterloo Road was very high and the easy access of Kowloon Tong Station would help relieve the heavy crowdedness. Furthermore, he did not agree to the view that the flow of people would greatly increase if PPVs were installed at Kowloon Tong Railway Station.

170. **The Chairman** urged the MTRC to follow up and liaise with the Members concerned on the issue in future.

171. **Ms Lilian YEUNG of the MTRC** said that when reviewing the utilisation of new facilities, the MTRC would make reference to Members' views.

**Request for Reinforcing the Escape and Safety Guidelines in MTR Train
Compartments and Stations**

(Paper No. 18/17)

172. **The Chairman** said that the written reply from the Department (Paper No. 12/17 tabled) was sent to Members for perusal before the meeting.

173. **Mr Tony NG** presented Paper No. 18/17 and asked the MTRC to strengthen public education and teach passengers how to evacuate from the train when an accident occurred.

174. **Mr TONG Chai-ming** of the MTRC made a consolidated reply as follows: (a) the MTRC was highly concerned about the arson incident and a high-level review committee, led by two directors of the MTRC namely the Operations Director Mr LAU Tin-shing and the Engineering Director Mr Peter Ronald EWEN, was set up to study and review the details on all fronts including the safety procedures of handling railway networks, the design inside the compartments, ventilation system, installation of additional CCTVs and staff training etc.; (b) the committee would also review the staff's communication with passengers and the guidelines of general safety information for the public; (c) the MTRC had appointed two independent expert consultants, namely Professor Ho Siu Lau and Engineer Mr Peter Bressington to provide professional advice to the committee; (d) a report on the review was expected to be submitted to the Government in April; (e) the fire control equipment currently at the stations and in the compartments were in compliance with the fire safety regulations for the design at the time of construction. Each compartment stored two fire extinguishers and bore signs indicating the position of the fire extinguishers, while the platforms of all stations were also installed with fire extinguishers; (f) all staff of the MTRC were required to undergo fire training at the time of entry and to be refreshed with the knowledge every three years. The MTRC also organised no less than 12 fire drill exercises every year with the Fire Services Department and the HKPF; and (g) at present, the customer service center of each station distributed the "Travel Safely Every Day in the MTR" pamphlet for free to educate the public the way to leave the train safely in case of fire incidents.

175. **Ms Lilian YEUNG of the MTRC** said that apart from setting up a high-level review committee, the MTRC had examined the installation of CCTV or ancillary facilities in compartments after the accident. At present, 35% of MTR trains were installed with CCTVs. Upon the replacement of the first generation

trains in urban area by 93 newly purchased ones and the operation of new trains on the Shatin to Central Link, the percentage would be elevated to 85%. All new trains would be installed with CCTVs and the 93 new trains would provide service in urban areas. It was estimated that the proportion of trains equipped with CCTVs would reach 85%.

176. **The Chairman** said that the District Councils were very concerned about the safety of MTR passengers and hoped that the MTRC could provide safe compartment for the public.

Request for Explanation for the Consultation Procedure for fare Increase of GMB Routes No.25M and No.25MS and the Rationale for Approving the Fare Increase Application

177. **The Chairman** remarked that Item 20 and 21 of the agenda were both related to the green minibus service in the district. To facilitate the discussion, the two items would be deliberated together and Members of the TTC agreed to the proposal.

178. **Mr Ho Hin-min** presented Paper No. 19/17 and requested the TD to explain the consultation and approval procedures.

179. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** presented Paper No. 20/17 and requested minibus companies to offer discount to attract passengers.

180. **Mr NG Po-Keung** pointed out that the route of minibuses no. 25M and 25MS were short but the fares charged were high, with the full and section fares set at \$6 and \$5 respectively. He proposed to lower the fare of the two routes.

181. **Ms Amanda HSU of the TD** gave a consolidated reply as follows:

- (a) in approving the fare adjustment of green minibuses, the TD would take into account of various factors, including the financial situation and financial performance of green minibus operators, the standard of service and the plan of improvement, the fare charged and the acceptance of passengers;
- (b) In view of the incessant increase in the operating costs of the green

minibus (GMB) route no. 25M and its ancillary route no. 25MS (in particular the salary of drivers, insurance and rental etc.) and the operating loss, the operator submitted the data of operation and application for fare adjustment in March 2016 in order to maintain the routes and keep improving the service. The TD agreed that fare increase was necessary for the continuous operation of the above routes. After careful consideration of factors and consultation with the operators as well as the consultation with local personalities in May, the fare of route no. 25M and 25MS were adjusted to \$ 5.9 and \$ 4.7 respectively on 14 August 2016. Yet the operators offered one year concessionary rate of \$0.2 for route no. 25MS (until 13 August 2017) and the actual charge amounted to \$4.5. Compared with the previous fare of \$4.3, the amount of increase was only \$0.2, representing about 4.7%;

- (c) the TD understood the concern of the public about the fare adjustment proposed by green minibuses. When approving the adjustment, the TD had made every effort to strike a balance between the operation and finance of the routes and the impacts of the fare adjustment on the passengers. And to ensure that green minibus operators were in good financial condition, maintained sound operation and continued to improve the minibus service, the TD considered that appropriate fare adjustment was inevitable. Compared with the 12% increase in the fare as requested by the operators, the rate of adjustment currently approved by the TD was low;
- (d) the GMB route no. 25MS mainly served the teachers, students and visitors of the Hong Kong Baptist University. The number of passengers was relatively high at school days and the return trip recorded less passengers than the departure trip. As a result, the operator was under heavy financial pressure;
- (e) When the application for fare increase for GMB routes no. 27M, 27MS, 28M was lodged last year, the operators were also suffering a financial loss. The steady rise in drivers' salary generated an increase in the operating cost. To improve the service, the operator had adjusted the salary several times to recruit more drivers in the past year; and
- (f) it was not prescribed in law that seats on minibuses should not be

reserved. This was totally left to the decision of the minibus operators and no notification was required to be given to the TD. However, to meet the demand of passengers en route, the operators needed not notify the TD about the arrangement. The TD would discuss with the minibus operators to increase the number of runs during peak hours in order to achieve an efficient diversion of passengers en route.

182. **Mr YANG Wing-kit's** opinions and enquiries were as follows: (a) he expressed disappointment about the failure of the operating company of GMB routes no. 27M and 27MS to meet their performance pledge; (b) he demanded the minibus company to increase the frequency of runs so that the public needed not wait for over half hour in the morning during peak hours, and (c) the minibus operator should make a risk assessment of the operation instead of committing to run the GMB routes no. 27MS and 28MS in face of a financial loss; (d) the fare for routes no. 27MS and 28MS were high and he thus suggested lowering the fare of the two routes to \$3 or \$2.5 to attract more passengers and hence increase the revenue of minibus companies; and (e) he requested the TD to closely monitor whether the minibus company had hired more drivers and increase the runs for route no. 27M.

183. **Mr HO Hin-ming** said he understood that the cost of operation of minibus companies surged due to the pay rise for drivers. However, with a remarkable fall in the price of petroleum, the pressure of operation was relieved to a certain extent. In addition, the passengers of the GMB route no. 25MS were mainly students. A substantial increase in fare would only lead students to apply for school bus. The operation of the route would become harder in this case. To avoid this, the TD and the minibus company were advised to discuss the reduction of the fare for the route.

184. **Mr HE Huahan** enquired the TD which minibus routes in Hong Kong or Kowloon currently saw a financial surplus, and whether the fare would be lowered in view of the surplus.

185. **Ms Amanda Hsu of the TD**, in response, replied as follows: (a) The TD was concerned about the standard of service of GMB routes no. 27M and 27MS and did closely monitor the service the two routes. Members indicated that the public had to wait longer time for minibuses during peak hours. The TD would continue to discuss about hiring additional drivers and offering more runs at busy times to shorten the waiting time for passengers; (b) in connection with the operation of the GMB route no. 25MS, the TD would closely follow up with the minibus operator and the

Hong Kong Baptist University. The TD had also advised the minibus operators to provide fare concession to attract more passengers; and (c) the TD understood the concerns of the public about the adjustment of fares for green minibuses and when it approved the fare adjustment of the above route, it would try the utmost to balance the operation and financial condition of the routes and the impact of the fare adjustment on passengers.

186. **The Chairman** urged the TD to discharge its supervisory function effectively and balance the interests of all parties.

Concern over the Frequent Malfunction of Footpath Lighting at Ming On Street, Bulkeley Street and Wuhu Street in Hung Hom
(Paper No.21/17)

187. **The Chairman** said the representative of the HD, who was responsible for the item, failed to attend the meeting. The Secretariat had sent a written reply from the Department (Paper No. 13/17) to Members for perusal earlier on.

188. **Mr NG PO-keung** was authorised by **Mr LAM Tak-shing** to elaborate Paper No. 21/17 and he requested the HD to scrutinise and monitor closer the operation of street lights to reduce or prevent accidents.

Request for Repairing the Road Surface of Kai Tak Tunnel As Soon As Possible

189. **The Chairman** said the representative of the HD, who was responsible for the item, failed to attend the meeting. The Secretariat had sent a written reply from the Department (Paper No. 14/17) to Members for perusal earlier on.

190. **Mr Roger KWAN** presented Paper No. 22/17.

191. **Mr TAM Ho-chuen, District Engineer / Hung Hom of the HD** said that the Department expected to complete the tunnel maintenance works in the first quarter of 2018 as stated in the written reply tabled.

Date of Next Meeting

192. **The Vice-chairman** said that the next meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 20 April 2017 (Thursday). There being no other business, **the Vice-chairman**

adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

193. The minutes of this meeting were confirmed on 20 April 2017.

The Chairman

The Secretary

Kowloon City District Council Secretariat
April 2017