

(Translation)

**Minutes of the 3rd Meeting of
Food, Environmental Hygiene and District Facilities Management Committee,
the 6th Term Kwun Tong District Council**

Date: 11 November 2021 (Thursday)

Time: 9:32 a.m. - 11:11 a.m.

Venue: Conference Room, Kwun Tong District Office,
Unit 05-07, 20/F, Millennium City 6, 392 Kwun Tong Road,
Kwun Tong, Kowloon

<u>Present</u>	<u>Arrival Time</u>	<u>Leaving Time</u>
Mr CHAN Yiu-hung Jimmy, MH (Chairman)	9:32 a.m.	11:11 a.m.
Mr PANG Chi-sang (Vice-chairman)	9:32 a.m.	11:11 a.m.
Mr CHEUNG Pui-kong	9:32 a.m.	11:11 a.m.
Ms FU Pik-chun, MH	9:34 a.m.	11:11 a.m.
Mr HSU Yau-wai	9:32 a.m.	11:11 a.m.
Mr KAN Ming-tung, MH	10:16 a.m.	11:11 a.m.
Mr LAM Wai	9:49 a.m.	11:11 a.m.
Mr LEUNG Tang-fung	9:32 a.m.	11:11 a.m.
Mr LUI Tung-hai, MH	9:34 a.m.	11:11 a.m.
Mr NGAN Man-yu	9:44 a.m.	10:28 a.m.
Mr OR Chong-shing Wilson, MH	9:49 a.m.	11:11 a.m.
Mrs POON YAM Wai-chun Winnie, BBS, MH	9:32 a.m.	11:11 a.m.
Mr SO Koon-chung Kevin	9:32 a.m.	11:11 a.m.
Mr TAM Siu-cheuk	9:32 a.m.	11:11 a.m.
Ms TSE Suk-chun	9:46 a.m.	11:11 a.m.

In Attendance

Miss SUM Sze-wing, Cherry	Assistant District Officer (Kwun Tong)2, Kwun Tong District Office
Mr CHOW Lap-kan, Douglas	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Kwun Tong District Office
Mr CHAN Hoi-ming, Peter	Senior Liaison Officer (3), Kwun Tong District Office
Ms WONG Man-ling, Christine	Acting Liaison Officer-in-charge (District Facilities), Kwun Tong District Office

Miss CHOW Tak-sum, Amy	Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Kwun Tong District Office
Mr CHENG Ngat, Cyrus	Executive Officer I (District Management), Kwun Tong District Office
Mr WONG Tsz-ming, Wilson	Executive Officer II (District Management), Kwun Tong District Office
Mr PAU Chung-on	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Kwun Tong), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr SO Yeung-fung	Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing and Pest Control) Kwun Tong 2, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr NG Kai-ming, Alfred	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional East)3, Environmental Protection Department
Ms NG Lai-chu, Gloria	Housing Manager/Kowloon East 4, Housing Department
Mr KWAN Yee-lap	Engineer/Kowloon (Distribution 4), Water Supplies Department
Ms TANG Wing-sze, Maria	District Leisure Manager (Kwun Tong), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms SIU Sau-king, Michelle	Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Kwun Tong, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms WONG Sze-wan	Senior Librarian (Kwun Tong), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms CHAN Lai-ching, Connie	Senior Executive Officer (Planning)31, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr CHENG Chi-wing	Inspector of Works (Kowloon)2, Home Affairs Department
Mr HO Kwan-wan	Assistant Inspector of Works (Kwun Tong), Home Affairs Department
Mr LEE Chun-hung, Roy	Architect (Works)2, Home Affairs Department

Attendance by Invitation

Mr WAN Nam-fung	Senior Engineer/Drainage Project 2, Drainage Services Department
Ms KWONG Siu-ting	Engineer/Drainage Project 15, Drainage Services Department
Mr LEE Shung-tim	Technical Director, AECOM Asia Company Limited

Item IV

Mr LAI Ka-po	Senior Engineer, AECOM Asia Company Limited
Mr YEUNG Tsz-man	Project Engineer, AECOM Asia Company Limited
Mr TAI Moon-kwong, Daniel	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Assessment and Noise)6, Environmental Protection Department
Mr KWOK Kwun-ting, Chris	Environmental Protection Officer (Assessment and Noise)62, Environmental Protection Department
Mr CHAN Chi-ming	Senior Engineer 2/Noise Mitigation, Highways Department
Mr LEE Ho-yin, Lobo	Project Coordinator 2/Noise Mitigation, Highways Department
Mr NG Pak-hung, Simon	Project Manager, Mannings (Asia) Consultants Limited
Mr TUNG Chung-yin, Gary	Deputy Project Manager, Mannings (Asia) Consultants Limited

Item V

Secretary

Ms WONG Yuk-man, Mandy	Executive Officer (District Council)(5), Kwun Tong District Office
------------------------	---

Absent

Ms LAI Po-kwai

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed all the Members of the Food, Environmental Hygiene and District Facilities Management Committee (“FEHDFMC”) and government representatives to the 3rd meeting of FEHDFMC under the 6th Term Kwun Tong District Council (“KTDC”). He welcomed Ms SIU Sau-king, Michelle, who had succeeded as Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Kwun Tong of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”), for attending the meeting of FEHDFMC for the first time.

2. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had received no notice of absence from Members before the meeting.

I. Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting

3. Members had no further comments and the minutes of the last meeting were confirmed.

**II. Rodent Infestation Problems in Kwun Tong District
(KTDC FEHDFMC Paper No. 11/2021)**

4. The Secretary presented the paper.

5. Members noted the paper.

**III. Environmental Hygiene Problems in Kwun Tong District
(KTDC FEHDFMC Paper No. 12/2021)**

6. The Secretary presented the paper.

7. Members noted the paper.

8. The Chairman said the Secretariat had written to Members on 11 October 2021 to collect their views on the environmental hygiene problems of local vacant lands. As the Secretariat had not received any reply, the Chairman suggested that the Secretariat write again to Members after the present meeting to collect their views on the above problems for follow-up actions in the next meeting.

(Post-meeting note: the Secretariat wrote to Members again on 30 November 2021 to collect their views on the environmental hygiene problems of local vacant lands.)

**IV. Sau Nga Road Stormwater Storage Scheme
(KTDC FEHDFMC Paper No. 13/2021)**

9. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Drainage Services Department (“DSD”) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (“AECOM”) to the meeting.

10. The representatives of DSD presented the paper.

11. Members raised views and enquiries as follows:

11.1 Mr Kevin SO said the construction concerned would affect residents in his constituency to a relatively great extent. He said it was widely known that Hip Wo Street was one of the very busy and congested streets in Kwun Tong. He expressed his grave concern towards DSD’s commencement of road opening works by the open cut method at Hip Wo Street immediately after obtaining funding approval. He noticed in the diagrams provided by DSD that a connection chamber would be built in the middle of the road outside Cheung Wo Court. He anticipated that an upstream traffic lane and a downstream one would be respectively closed during the above works. As regards the construction of an inlet at the road outside the stormwater storage pond of Lower Sau Nga Road Playground, he anticipated that the construction site would be enclosed with hoardings during the daytime, but it would still be unavoidable to affect the traffic. He stressed that Hip Wo Street was always congested and therefore it was incomprehensible to him how DSD’s traffic impact assessment had arrived at the conclusion that the relevant construction would only mildly affect the traffic nearby. Also, he noticed that due to the construction of the stormwater storage pond at Lower Sau Nga Road Playground, DSD had designated a temporary works area at Upper Sau Nga Road Playground. He guessed that the area would be used to store relevant tools and supplies. He pointed out that the works area at Lower Sau Nga Road Playground was spacious, opining that DSD could place the relevant tools and supplies in the works area at Lower Sau Nga Road Playground. He noticed that the temporary works area would cover the means of access of Upper Sau Nga Road Playground, and said that improvement works had been conducted at that means of access after discussion with United Christian Hospital (“UCH”) earlier. The improvement works had made it possible for ambulances to go to Hip Wo Street via that means of access when Sau Nga Road was obstructed. He said that to ensure that ambulances could have smooth passage under urgent situations, that means of access had been converted into a slope. He opined that DSD had not considered during DSD’s planning of the temporary works area the arrangements for passage of

ambulances under urgent situations, and hence he hoped DSD could discuss with LCSD the relevant traffic arrangements to minimise the impacts of the works on Upper Sau Nga Road Playground. Moreover, he enquired on the reason for the involvement of the bus stop and the footpath at Hip Wo Street in the temporary works area.

12. DSD responded to Members' views and enquiries as follows:

- 12.1 Regarding traffic impacts on areas around Hip Wo Street: DSD understood Mr Kevin SO's worries. DSD also understood that the traffic situation at Hip Wo Street was tense, and even a minor traffic accident could seriously affect the traffic situation there. Hence, DSD had all along been carefully studying the temporary traffic management measures with the Transport Department ("TD") and the Police. A traffic management liaison group ("TMLG") would also be established after the commencement of the works. Members of the TMLG would not only include representatives of TD and the Police, but also those of UCH. DSD knew that UCH was an important stakeholder of the present project, and thus UCH would be invited to discuss the relevant traffic arrangements together to prevent the works from affecting the operation of UCH. DSD would adopt the trenchless method to carry out the relevant works as far as possible. However, during the works for connecting with the existing drainage systems, it would be unavoidable to adopt the open cut method. It would be necessary to implement the temporary traffic management measures by that time. DSD would partially enclose the roads in phases to conduct the works in a progressive manner to minimise the impacts on traffic.
- 12.2 Temporary works area at Upper Sau Nga Road Playground: DSD clarified that the proposed temporary works area at Upper Sau Nga Road Playground would not be used for storing supplies, but for creating a new traffic lane to maintain the existing number of traffic lanes during the works at the junction of Hip Wo Street and Sau Nga Road to minimise the impacts on traffic. Also, DSD said that only part of Upper Sau Nga Road Playground would be used to create the new traffic lane and therefore the public's use of facilities in Upper Sau Nga Road Playground would not be affected by that time.
- 12.3 Regarding the arrangements for the emergency vehicular access for ambulances and the footpath at Upper Sau Nga Road Playground: DSD said that it had discussed with LCSD the arrangements for that emergency vehicular access. DSD stressed that the operation of that emergency vehicular access would be maintained during the works,

hoping to dispel Members' worries. Regarding the involvement of the existing footpath at Hip Wo Street in the temporary works area as shown in the diagram, DSD said the footpath would be maintained for public use during the implementation of the temporary traffic management measures.

13. Members raised other views as follows:

13.1 Mrs Winnie POON noticed that DSD had added relevant information in the paper in response to Members' concerns raised in the pre-meeting. She indicated her support for the plan of the construction of the stormwater storage pond, opining that it was a rare opportunity to have funding for construction of the stormwater storage pond concerned. Although the works would take five years, she believed the relevant works would be conducive to solving the long-existing flooding problem at Kwun Tong Road and local low-lying areas. She believed that DSD understood Members' concern over the traffic issues and would invite affected stakeholders, including UCH and residents of Lok Wah Estate, to establish a liaison group to solve the traffic problems. Also, she remarked that even if the relevant works could solve the flooding problem near Sau Nga Road, the situation that the underpass under Kwun Tong MTR Station was often flooded was yet to be handled. She hoped that DSD could work with the Highways Department ("HyD") to improve the drainage facility at the said area to alleviate the overall flooding problem in Kwun Tong.

13.2 Mr Kevin SO noted that DSD had communicated with stakeholders on the works concerned. However, DSD had not provided sufficient information for the stakeholders' consideration. For example, the stakeholders had not been informed in the paper of the traffic impacts of the works and the use of the temporary works area in Upper Sau Nga Road Playground. He said that he had not attended the earlier pre-meeting and hoped DSD would confirm the details based on the discussion content in the present meeting. He referred to DSD's remark that the temporary works area in Upper Sau Nga Road Playground would be used to create a new traffic lane to ensure that the traffic of areas around Hip Wo Street would normally operate during the works, but DSD had also said that it had discussed with LCSD reserving the road section at the junction of Hip Wo Street and Sau Nga Road to serve as emergency vehicular access for ambulances to UCH. He enquired how DSD could create a new traffic lane while reserving the emergency vehicular access for ambulances at the same time. Also, considering the difference in the elevations between Hip Wo Street and Upper Sau Nga Road Playground, he believed that if it was feasible to provide an additional traffic lane at that location, HyD would have carried out the relevant works

long ago to ease the traffic congestion problem at areas around Hip Wo Street instead of not providing an additional traffic lane there until DSD conducted works there. He suggested DSD refer the relevant plan to HyD first for the latter to complete the works for provision of the additional traffic lane to improve the traffic of areas around Hip Wo Street before implementing the present scheme. He hoped that DSD could communicate more with him and other stakeholders when preparing the detailed design of the works to learn about the actual situation of the district and the impacts of the works on the surrounding environment. He opined that the flooding problem in Kwun Tong District had to be solved, and hence he said that he did not object to DSD's implementation of the works concerned. However, he hoped DSD would reconsider various works arrangements. Although DSD said that a TMLG would be established for the works, he pointed out that according to the past experience, many TMLGs for works had not planned any solutions until problems had emerged and therefore the problems could not be solved promptly. Moreover, he said that although DSD had said that the footpath outside Upper Sau Nga Road Playground would remain open, the paper only mentioned the relocation arrangements for the bus stop at Hiu Kwong Street without mentioning how other bus stops affected by the temporary works area. He hoped DSD would explain the arrangements concerning the bus stop at Hip Wo Street.

- 13.3 Mr Wilson OR expressed his worries about the information provided in the present paper. He hoped that DSD could provide more information on the relevant works for Members' reference. According to DSD's traffic impact assessment report, he thought that DSD was unable to explain how traffic at busy roads such as Hip Wo Street and Sau Nga Road could be effectively managed during the works. He enquired of DSD on: (i) the specific arrangements for implementation of the temporary traffic management measures in phases as mentioned in para. 12 in the paper, including the number of phases and the specific arrangements of each phase; and (ii) the membership of the TMLG and its meeting arrangements. He pointed out that Members and the public had expressed worries about the traffic arrangements for the relevant works, and there had always been many criticisms from members of the public and the media on the poor traffic management of Kwun Tong District. He opined that the information provided in the paper was limited, and could not dispel doubts of the public. He hoped that DSD could provide more details concerning the works. Moreover, he hoped DSD could communicate more with different stakeholders regarding the works concerned. He said that he was the Chairman of KTDC, as well as a member of the UCH Hospital Governing Committee. Considering the unique geographical location of UCH and that Sau Nga Road was the

only access to UCH, the management and patient groups of UCH were highly concerned about the relevant works. He opined that it was unsatisfactory for DSD to disclose information of the works bit by bit. The UCH Hospital Governing Committee shared the same concern too. He hoped DSD could lay its cards on the table when communicating with the management and frontline officers of UCH while adopting a more open-minded attitude and publicising information of the relevant works. Also, he remarked that quite a number of district organisations, including owners' corporations and relevant community organisations, had reflected that DSD did not have sufficient communication with them. Despite his understanding of the necessity of the works, he still hoped that DSD could collect more views from stakeholders. He considered that the establishment of a TMLG alone would not be able to tackle other problems arising from the works, which would last for five years. Hence, he suggested that DSD should establish a liaison group for the entire works to respond to all problems regarding the works in a holistic manner. In addition, he expressed his concern about the details of the project timeframe mentioned in para. 16 in the paper. It was stated that detailed design work had commenced. He enquired if DSD would provide more relevant information. Moreover, he enquired about the time of DSD's submission of the funding application to the Legislative Council ("LegCo"). He remarked that the estimated commencement date was not mentioned in the paper and hoped that DSD would provide supplementary information. Lastly, he restated that he understood the necessity of the works, but Members still had many queries regarding the works. He hoped DSD could answer them one by one. He stressed that even if the relevant project was endorsed by FEHDFMC, DSD should also explain to the public various details of the works concerned.

- 13.4 Mr LUI Tung-hai hoped that DSD would pay attention to the flooding problem at Lei Yue Mun. He said Lei Yue Mun was a low-lying area, and the tidal back flow problem, which was particularly serious during typhoons, occurred once or twice a year. The situation had stayed the same for long without any improvement. He believed that DSD should be held responsible for providing long-term plans to alleviate the tidal back flow and flooding problems in low-lying areas. He also suggested that DSD provide additional drainage facilities to prevent the tidal water from flowing back. He hoped DSD would follow up on the problems concerned and study solutions to minimise the negative impacts of flooding on residents.

14. DSD responded to other views and enquiries as follows:

- 14.1 Temporary works area at Upper Sau Nga Road Playground: DSD added that the part

of the temporary works area of Upper Sau Nga Road Playground facing Hip Wo Street would be used to create a new traffic lane during the works whereas that facing Sau Nga Road would be used as emergency vehicular access for ambulances. Hence, DSD clarified that the needs of both the traffic and the operation of the emergency vehicular access for ambulances could be satisfied.

14.2 Communication with different stakeholders: DSD understood Members' view that DSD should strengthen its communication with the public and local communities regarding projects of the department. DSD said that it had communicated with housing estates nearby regarding the works and undertook to maintain close liaison with the public. DSD noted opinions on the establishment of a district liaison group regarding the works concerned and said that they would review the composition of the liaison group in a timely manner with a view to maintaining close communication with different stakeholders.

14.3 Works timetable: DSD said that works were still at the design stage at present. The department would submit the relevant funding application to LegCo as soon as possible and provide Members with the latest information in a timely manner.

14.4 Communication with UCH: DSD said that they had started communicating with UCH regarding the relevant works. UCH knew the plan for the works and DSD also understood the considerations of UCH. DSD said the department would maintain communication with UCH to minimise impacts of the works on the public.

15. AECOM responded to traffic arrangements as follows:

15.1 Temporary works area at Upper Sau Nga Road Playground: AECOM indicated that it was aware that there was a certain difference in the elevations between Hip Wo Street and Upper Sau Nga Road Playground as mentioned by Mr Kevin SO. Hence, elevated structures would be used to support the said new temporary traffic lane when DSD created the lane. Also, AECOM said that DSD would maintain the emergency vehicular access to and from UCH at Upper Sau Nga Road Playground during the works and ensure that ambulances could still use that emergency access.

15.2 Regarding the arrangement for the bus stop at Hip Wo Street: the bus stop at Hip Wo Street would also need to be temporarily relocated and would remain in normal operation during the works.

16. Mr Kevin SO hoped DSD would provide contact person information of the works concerned after the present meeting. He said that it was stated in the paper that the bus stop at Hiu Kwong Street would be permanently relocated and the proposed location of the relocated bus stop was also shown in the diagram. However, there was not any information either in the paper or the diagrams about the bus stop at Hip Wo Street, which would also need to be relocated and would remain in normal operation, as mentioned by AECOM. He pointed out that the paper did not show the elevated structures mentioned by AECOM either. If DSD was unable to publicise the related information at present, he hoped to gain a better understanding of the relevant design from DSD after the present meeting. He doubted that only widening the road section of Hip Wo Street outside Upper Sau Nga Road Playground instead of the whole Hip Wo Street might not be able to effectively relieve the traffic pressure at the said location. He said that the proposed dividing chamber would be located outside Lower Sau Nga Road Playground, opining that widening the road outside Upper Sau Nga Road Playground would not help improve the traffic situation near Lower Sau Nga Road Playground. Hence, he hoped that DSD could provide Members with contact person information regarding the works via the Secretariat for Members to enquire on the specific details of the works. He said that while Members had raised a number of opinions regarding the works in the present meeting, he only hoped DSD could strengthen communication with different stakeholders if DSD still insisted on proceeding with the works. He reflected that the arrangement of conducting works on a busy road was also beyond the imagination of the public and opined that the plan proposed by DSD was just wild imagination. He said that the widening of Hip Wo Street had long been an issue of concern of Members. Nevertheless, other departments had not been able to provide solutions over the years. He hoped to gain a better understanding of the plan of widening Hip Wo Street regarding the present scheme. He also reiterated that he hoped that DSD would strengthen its communication with different parties and provide contact person information of the relevant works after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: the Secretariat forwarded to Members on 24 November 2021 the contact person information of the relevant works provided by DSD.)

17. The Chairman concluded that Members supported the Sau Nga Road Stormwater Storage Scheme and hoped that the scheme could alleviate the flooding problem at the downstream areas in Kwun Tong District. However, it was unavoidable that the works would pose traffic impacts to areas around Hip Wo Street and Sau Nga Road. He hoped that DSD would consider Members' opinions and properly arrange the traffic management plan as far as possible. The Chairman said that pre-meetings provided a channel for Members to deliver their views to DSD and therefore he opined that it was necessary to hold pre-meetings. On the other hand, formal meetings allowed DSD to further appraise Members' views so that Members could urge DSD to squarely face the issues that Members raised. The Chairman remarked that DSD should continue enhancing

communication with different stakeholders in the future. Just as what Mr Wilson OR always said, “the more gatherings we have, the less misunderstanding there are; the more communication we have, the more chances to succeed there are”, many Members also suggested DSD consult different stakeholders more. It was particularly necessary for DSD to enhance communication with district councilors of the constituencies in the vicinity of the works area. He hoped DSD would consider Members’ opinions.

18. Members noted the paper.

V. **Public Works Programme No. 6812TH – Retrofitting of Noise Barriers on New Clear Water Bay Road**
(KTDC FEHDFMC Paper No. 14/2021)

19. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Environmental Protection Department (“EPD”), HyD and Mannings (Asia) Consultants Limited (“Mannings”) to the meeting.

20. Senior Engineer 2/Noise Mitigation of HyD and the representative of Mannings presented the paper.

21. Members raised views and enquiries as follows:

21.1 Ms FU Pik-chun said HyD had earlier repeatedly discussed the details of the relevant works with her. She said that she had all along been expressing her worries about the possibility that the works might lead to traffic congestion at New Clear Water Bay Road. She said that due to the high traffic flow of New Clear Water Bay Road, residents in the vicinity had been suffering noise pollution. Although it would be desirable if noise from the traffic could be reduced by the works, she pointed out that the traffic congestion at the said area was also very serious. She understood that HyD had conducted a traffic impact assessment for the works, and would implement traffic management measures such as installation of road signs. However, she doubted that the traffic management measures would be insufficient as the works would take four years to complete. She said that a bus stop at New Clear Water Bay Road had commenced its service since 1 September 2021. However, over the past three months, traffic congestion at the said location had been serious every day without any alleviation. Also, it was mentioned in para. 6 of the paper that the operation of the existing traffic lanes would be maintained in the daytime as far as possible during the implementation of the works. She enquired if HyD could ensure

that the existing traffic lanes would not be affected in the daytime. She remarked that residents of Sze Shun had been worried after knowing the plans of the relevant project and had been repeatedly making enquiries to her. She said despite the fact that HyD had indicated that no impacts would be brought to the traffic when implementing other works projects in the past, it had turned out that that had not been the case. For example, the Development at Anderson Road had brought a serious burden to the traffic. The temporary traffic management measures had been unsatisfactory as well. Merely widening junctions and providing additional road signs in fact could not solve the problems. As for HyD's remark that the operation of the three existing traffic lanes of New Clear Water Bay Road would be maintained in the daytime as far as possible during the works, she opined that it was unconvincing. She also expressed regret over HyD's having not established any TMLG for the works concerned.

21.2 Mr TAM Siu-cheuk said that HyD had neglected the noise impacts that would be brought by the relevant works to Kwun Tong District in the previous report. Neither had HyD consulted schools in the vicinity and residents of Choi Hing Court. After discussion with Members over the past few months, he praised HyD for supplementing the paper with the arrangements for mitigating the traffic noise at Choi Hing Court and nearby schools. He agreed to the opinion of Ms FU Pik-chun, saying that Members understood that the noise problem could be solved by conducting the relevant works, but HyD should also consider the traffic situation in Kwun Tong District. He remarked that if HyD could not implement proper temporary traffic management measures, the relevant works might worsen the traffic congestion at the said location. He considered that HyD needed to provide solutions.

21.3 Mrs Winnie POON said that Members were worried that the relevant works would worsen the traffic congestion at New Clear Water Bay Road. She said the traffic problem of Kwun Tong District had long been castigated and residents had been tortured by traffic congestion and noise problems. However, the Government had all along adopted a make-do-and-mend approach to handle the problems without any long-term solutions. She opined that it was good for the Government to allocate resources to solve perpetual problems, but she did not want to see residents being annoyed by the noise problem while the traffic problem still remained unsolved. She said that the works would have far-reaching impacts on Kwun Tong District and even on Kowloon East. She said that HyD should consider not only the impacts of the works on Kwun Tong District, but also on the overall development of Hong Kong. She indicated that she had no choice but to support the project concerned since she believed that the project could solve the long-existing problems. However, it was

also unavoidable that the works would bring negative impacts to the district. She was worried that residents would have to endure various sufferings during the five years when the works were conducted. She said that Members had expressed their concerns over the works in detail, and residents of her respective constituency would be especially susceptible to the problems. She pointed out that traffic problems existed at many locations in the district and hoped that HyD could tackle the overall traffic problem at root instead of only implementing traffic management measures such as junction improvement works. She hoped HyD could try its best to complete the relevant works as soon as possible to solve the perpetual nuisances faced by residents.

21.4 Mr LAM Wai said he had noticed that to relieve the pressure on traffic of Hip Wo Street, the Sau Nga Road Stormwater Storage Scheme under item IV might divert some of the traffic onto New Clear Water Bay Road. He said that Members highly welcomed government departments' construction of infrastructure that improved people's livelihood, such as noise barriers or stormwater storage ponds. However, departments often lacked comprehensive plans. He said that traffic congestion at Anderson Road was serious while more housing estates would be progressively completed in areas around Anderson. He noticed the paper said that the funding application for the project under the present agenda item would be submitted to LegCo in 2023 while that for the Sau Nga Road Stormwater Storage Scheme had not been submitted to LegCo. He was worried about how the traffic at areas around Anderson should be handled if both works projects commenced concurrently after they had been granted with the funding. He suggested that government departments should conduct coordination and exchange information with one another. He also hoped that HyD could provide specific plans to ensure that residents could enter and exit areas around Anderson. He said that hundreds of thousands of residents resided in areas around Anderson, where there were no MTR stations in the vicinity. To go out for work for a living, residents had to withstand the daily congestion of around half an hour to one hour or even walk down the hill. He hoped that HyD would understand residents' sufferings. He indicated no objection towards the works, but he hoped that HyD could improve traffic arrangements of the said area. He hoped HyD would negotiate and discuss with relevant departments and opined that diversion of traffic to other areas for accommodating the works would not help improve the traffic conditions.

21.5 Mr Wilson OR was worried about the traffic impacts of the works on New Clear Water Bay Road. He said that New Clear Water Bay Road was one of the main routes that allowed passage to Wong Tai Sin or other locations from Kwun Tong District. While

there was already congestion at New Clear Water Bay Road at present, many vehicles from Tseung Kwan O would also drive onto the road, worsening the traffic congestion problem there. He hoped that HyD would study solutions to the traffic problems. Also, he remarked that it was regretful that representatives from the Transport Department (“TD”) were not present at the meeting for discussion of the works because Members could not gain an understanding of TD’s views on the works from the transport perspective. He believed that HyD would firstly need to dispel Members’ doubts whether the retrofitting of noise barriers would bring negative impacts to the traffic in Kwun Tong District. Although the retrofitting of noise barriers could mitigate the traffic noise at areas around Choi Wan Estate, other acoustic measures in Kwun Tong District were still backward. Effectiveness of resurfacing of individual road sections with acoustic materials was limited. He mentioned the housing estates along the two sides of Pik Wan Road, Lam Tin, saying that he had previously enquired with EPD on the reason for not retrofitting Pik Wan Road with noise barriers. He pointed out that the case of Pik Wan Road was only the tip of an iceberg and there were still many similar situations in the district. Hence, he enquired with EPD whether long-term solutions had been formulated to mitigate the overall noise problem in the district. He opined that retrofitting of noise barriers was only one of the noise mitigation measures. He did not hope that the works would worsen the traffic congestion at New Clear Water Bay Road, and hoped HyD would study solutions in detail and report them to residents in the district.

22. HyD responded to Members’ enquiries as follows:

- 22.1 Traffic arrangements during the works: HyD said that the operation of the existing traffic lanes at New Clear Water Bay Road would be maintained in the daytime during the construction period. HyD understood that the traffic congestion problem at New Clear Water Bay Road was serious, which began at the Choi Hung Interchange during peak periods. Hence, HyD would not reduce the number of traffic lanes during peak periods in the daytime, and would use the central dividing strip at New Clear Water Bay Road as temporary space to provide sufficient works space and ensure that the operation of the three existing upstream traffic lanes and the two existing downstream traffic lanes of New Clear Water Bay Road would be maintained in the daytime. On the other hand, HyD said that it would discuss with TD improvement to be made to the traffic conditions of New Clear Water Bay Road or alleviating the traffic congestion there. If TD offered feasible plans, HyD would implement the plans of relevant traffic improvement measures in the works area. However, HyD still had to discuss with TD for the time being.

- 22.2 Regarding seeking advice from schools: HyD said it was documented that school premises near New Clear Water Bay Road had been built according to the latest guidelines. Windows of most of the classrooms of the relevant school premises were facing inner streets, and the classrooms were installed with air conditioners. The related design had theoretically prevented the school premises from suffering the noise problem of New Clear Water Bay Road. HyD had invited principals of the schools located along the two sides of New Clear Water Bay Road to provide views over the relevant works and the traffic noise problem, but the schools had voiced no objections against the works.
- 22.3 Mitigating the noise problem at Choi Hing Court: HyD had conducted a site visit at Choi Hing Court and reexamined the noise problem in the area. HyD said that the road section of New Clear Water Bay Road outside Choi Hing Court would be resurfaced with low noise surfacing materials at the same time when the works were conducted, hoping that it would enhance the existing noise mitigation measures at Choi Hing Court.
- 22.4 Establishment of a TMLG: HyD said that it had learnt about other works projects in the vicinity of the present project beforehand, and that a TMLG would be set up after the works commenced. HyD also added that the establishment of a TMLG was an established arrangement for works requiring implementation of temporary traffic management measures. HyD would maintain close liaison with DSD or departments responsible for the works at Anderson Road regarding the traffic arrangements during the works. TD would also be responsible for coordinating the traffic management arrangements for various works projects. Also, HyD would take the initiative to contact departments responsible for other related works to avoid worsening of the traffic congestion in the district as far as possible. HyD said it would actively make coordination.

23. EPD responded that according the present policies, EPD would consider implementing traffic noise mitigation measures when the road noise level exceeded 70 decibel (“dB”) (A), including retrofitting of noise barriers or laying of low noise surfacing materials. EPD would implement the works concerned if circumstances allowed. Regarding Members’ concern over other locations where noise mitigation measures were yet to be implemented, EPD explained that the main reason was that it was technically unfeasible. Taking the case of Pik Wan Road, Lam Tin as brought up by Mr Wilson OR as an example, retrofitting Pik Wan Road with noise barriers was unfeasible due to the limited space along the two sides of the road. EPD had resurfaced suitable areas of Pik Wan Road with low noise surfacing materials, which could effectively lower the noise level by two to three dB.

Despite the fact that the result had not been as significant as noise barriers, the effect of laying of low noise surfacing materials was equivalent to reducing the traffic volume of that road by 40% to 50%. Regarding Members' concern over traffic noise in Kwun Tong District, EPD stressed that the aspirations of reducing traffic noise of residents of Kwun Tong District had not been neglected. For example, plans for reducing traffic noise impacts had already been formulated according to relevant guidelines during the formulation of the planning of Choi Hing Court, including considering building orientation in the design and installing acoustic windows. EPD noted that some residents of Choi Hing Court had reflected the traffic noise problem to Members. Hence, EPD undertook to resurface the road section outside Choi Hing Court with low noise surfacing materials when retrofitting New Clear Water Bay Road with noise barriers. In addition, EPD would test on the effect of resurfacing roads with thin low noise surfacing material in various districts of the territory, including in Kwun Tong District. EPD had started the test on the laying of the said low noise surfacing material at Pik Wan Road and would make Hiu Kwong Street, Lei Yue Mun Road and Sau Mau Ping Road pilot points for the test in Kwun Tong District. Results of the pilot scheme would be available around one year later. By that time, EPD would examine according to the results which road sections in Kwun Tong District were suitable for being resurfaced with that low noise surfacing material. Also, EPD said that two works projects of retrofitting of noise barriers had been completed in the district. The locations had been the road section on Kwun Tong Bypass near Laguna City and that on Tseung Kwan O Road near Tsui Ping (South) Estate. Yet, there had not been any noise barrier works in Wong Tai Sin District yet. The present work was the only noise barrier retrofitting works project in Wong Tai Sin District. EPD hoped that Members would support the relevant works so that the Government could tackle the noise problems at Choi Wan Estate and Choi Hing Court all together.

24. Ms FU Pik-chun stressed that Members were worried about the traffic impacts of the works at New Clear Water Bay Road. However, there were no representatives of TD attending the present meeting. She opined that the department had not taken residents' aspirations seriously. Also, she hoped that HyD could clearly state whether it could ensure that the operation of the existing traffic lanes of New Clear Water Bay Road could be maintained in the daytime during the works. She said that EPD had mentioned that a traffic impact assessment would be conducted and temporary traffic management measures would be implemented when needed. She enquired under what circumstances the said temporary traffic management measures would be implemented. She expressed her dissatisfaction with HyD's response, thinking that the department had not provided practical solutions to resolve the traffic problems at New Clear Water Bay Road. She pointed out that the traffic congestion problem at New Clear Water Bay Road was so serious that residents had to put up with traffic congestion for 40 to 50 minutes on average every day, causing residents to incessantly complain about their plight. She said that residents were not expecting the works to improve the traffic problems at the said location, but they only hoped that the works would not add extra burden to the traffic at New Clear Water Bay Road. She hoped that HyD could provide details

of the temporary traffic management measures, and clearly state whether the department would maintain the operation of the existing traffic lanes at New Clear Water Bay Road in the daytime during the works only as far as possible or could ensure the operation of the existing traffic lanes at New Clear Water Bay Road would be maintained. She said that residents of course hoped to alleviate the noise problem to raise their quality of life, but the traffic congestion problem at New Clear Water Bay Road remained unresolved for now. She said it was regretful that representatives from TD were not present in the present meeting.

25. EPD responded to other enquiries and views as follows:

25.1 Temporary traffic management measures during the works: EPD would ensure that the operation of the existing three upstream traffic lanes and two downstream ones of New Clear Water Bay Road could be maintained in the daytime during the works. EPD said it would be unavoidable that some road sections would be occupied temporarily for the transport of construction materials. Nonetheless, the material loading and unloading activities would only take about half an hour each time and would not be conducted during daytime peak periods. According to the past experience, the transport of construction materials would not significantly affect the traffic in general. EPD pointed out that the temporary traffic management measures would only be implemented on the approval from the traffic control units of TD and the Police. EPD would implement the temporary traffic management measures and carry out the goods loading and unloading activities according to the relevant instructions. EPD clarified that one of the traffic lanes of New Clear Water Bay Road might be temporarily closed for the loading and unloading of goods during daytime non-peak periods; and on the other hand, EPD would ensure the normal operation of the existing three upstream traffic lanes and two downstream ones of New Clear Water Bay Road during daytime peak periods during the works.

25.2 Temporary traffic diversion facility arrangements: EPD explained that there were no specific plans for the provision of temporary traffic diversion facilities at New Clear Water Bay Road at present yet. Hence, the diagram showed no locations for placing traffic signs and the like. EPD said that it would establish during the works a temporary traffic improvement group that mainly consisted of members from TD, the Police and resident site staff. The group concerned would implement temporary traffic management measures based on the actual situations to ensure that the works would not cause any impacts to the traffic at the area concerned. EPD understood that residents were concerned about the arrangements of road closures, which was also the concern of the temporary traffic improvement group. EPD understood that any traffic congestion

at New Clear Water Bay Road would cause certain impacts to the traffic in the surrounding area. The Police would also not allow incidents affecting the whole traffic network of New Clear Water Bay Road to occur.

26. The Chairman expressed appreciation for HyD since the information it provided in the present meeting was more detailed than that provided in the pre-meeting. Supplementary information had also been included in the paper regarding Members' views. The Chairman said Members did not oppose HyD's implementation of works that enhanced residents' quality of life, but Members were worried about the traffic impacts of the works on New Clear Water Bay Road. He stressed that he did not oppose the department's construction of noise barriers and did not expect that the works could alleviate the traffic congestion problem at the area concerned. He only hoped that the works concerned would not worsen the traffic congestion problem at that area. He hoped that HyD would ensure that no extra burden would be added to the traffic of New Clear Water Bay Road by reviewing the works schedule and method during the works. The Chairman said Ms FU Pik-chun was highly concerned about the traffic situation of New Clear Water Bay Road because New Clear Water Bay Road was a strategic route in the district for connecting Shun Lee Estate and other places such as Ping Shek Estate. However, the traffic congestion problem at that location had remained unresolved for long. He hoped HyD would take the present works as an opportunity to study plans for improving the traffic of areas around Choi Hung Estate and Ping Shek Estate with relevant departments such as TD. He suggested HyD consider not only implementing measures, such as adding road signs, near Sing Yin Secondary School, but also informing motorists and residents nearby of the arrangements of traffic diversions as early as possible. The Chairman reminded HyD not to load and unload goods during peak periods during the works to avoid adding extra burden to the traffic at the said location.

27. Ms FU Pik-chun said as HyD could not dispel worries of residents of areas around Sze Shun over the traffic impacts of the works on New Clear Water Bay Road, she could not support the endorsement of the paper.

28. The Chairman hoped that HyD would listen to the views from Members and ensure that the works concerned would not add extra burden to the traffic at New Clear Water Bay Road.

29. HyD thanked the Chairman for his suggestions and said it would consider the Chairman's opinions. HyD pledged that the operation of New Clear Water Bay Road during peak periods would not be affected by the works and the works would be conducted with the most efficient method to shorten the time required for the works as much as possible. HyD would actively maintain liaison with TD and other departments, and did not hope that the works, though with good intentions, would affect life of residents in the neighbourhood, causing undesirable outcomes. HyD hoped that the

works could benefit residents in the neighbourhood and would not cause them other nuisances.

30. Members endorsed the paper.

**VI. Report on the Utilisation of Public Libraries of LCSD in Kwun Tong
(KTDC FEHDFMC Paper No. 15/2021)**

31. Senior Librarian (Kwun Tong) of LCSD presented the paper.

32. Members noted the paper.

**VII. Report on the Management of LCSD Facilities in Kwun Tong for August to September 2021
(KTDC FEHDFMC Paper No. 16/2021)**

33. Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Kwun Tong of LCSD presented the paper.

34. Members raised views and enquiries as follows:

34.1 Mr HSU Yau-wai noticed that the utilisation rate of the seven-a-side soccer pitch in On Sau Road Park in September had only been 63%. He enquired if LCSD could open the venue for the use of other residents for free when the venue was idle. He pointed out that there were no free soccer pitches at areas around On Tat Estate and On Tai Estate and therefore residents could only play soccer in basketball courts in the housing estates. He opined that as the utilisation rate of the seven-a-side soccer pitch in On Sau Road Park was not high, LCSD should consider opening the venue for free use of other residents.

34.2 Mr PANG Chi-sang expressed his concern over the “Five-year Plan for Upgrading Soccer Pitch Facilities”. He said he had conducted site visits at the venues concerned and opined that there were insufficient ancillary facilities for the seven-a-side soccer pitches in Upper Sau Nga Road Playground and Kowloon Bay Playground. He understood LCSD needed to convert some seven-a-side soccer pitches into five-a-side soccer pitches to cater for the development of five-a-side soccer. However, he hoped that LCSD could enhance ancillary facilities of the relevant venues at the same time. He said that if LCSD could enhance ancillary facilities as well following the

implementation of the above plan, it could be beneficial for the neighbouring schools or local organisations to organise five-a-side soccer games at the relevant venues.

34.3 Mr Kevin SO was also concerned about the Five-year Plan for Upgrading Soccer Pitch Facilities. He said that the relevant works of the Sau Nga Road Stormwater Storage Scheme under item IV would be conducted at Lower Sau Nga Road Playground whereas the Five-year Plan for Upgrading Soccer Pitch Facilities would involve the conversion of the seven-a-side soccer pitches in Upper Sau Nga Road Playground. The construction periods of the two works projects might overlap. He was worried that if the construction periods of the two works projects overlapped, two soccer pitches in Upper Sau Nga Road Playground and one soccer pitch in Lower Sau Nga Road Playground would be closed for several years at the same time. He enquired if LCSD had informed schools in the vicinity of the works arrangements. He said that as works of the Sau Nga Road Stormwater Storage Scheme would take two to three years to complete while it was also estimated that the Five-year Plan for Upgrading Soccer Pitch Facilities would take a long time to complete, he was worried that schools in the vicinity would possibly not be able to use the soccer pitches concerned for a few years. He enquired if LCSD would reschedule the conversion of the seven-a-side soccer pitches in Upper Sau Nga Road Playground according to the utilisation situations of soccer pitches to prevent the construction period of the works at Upper Sau Nga Road Playground from overlapping with that of the works at Lower Sau Nga Road Playground. He said that all the soccer pitches of Sau Nga Road Playground were under the purview of LCSD. He hoped that LCSD could coordinate the construction periods of the two works projects with the relevant departments. He suggested opening at least one soccer pitch of Sau Nga Road Playground for the use of residents when the relevant improvement works or works of other facilities were conducted.

35. LCSD responded to other enquiries as follows:

35.1 LCSD said as maintenance and repair works had been conducted at the seven-a-side soccer pitch in On Sau Road Playground from August to September, the utilisation rates in those two months had slightly dropped.

35.2 LCSD noted the suggestion of simultaneously enhancing ancillary facilities of soccer pitches during the conversion of soccer pitches to five-a-side soccer pitches, and said that the department would consider such a suggestion as well when formulating plans of upgrading facilities of soccer pitches.

35.3 LCSD said that it had discussed and scheduled the construction periods of the works with the works department regarding the works projects at Upper and Lower Sau Nga Road Playgrounds to avoid concurrent implementation of the projects.

36. Members noted the paper and endorsed the proposal in para. 9 of the paper.

**VIII. Report on the Utilisation of Community Halls/Community Centres in Kwun Tong
(KTDC FEHDFMC Paper No. 17/2021)**

37. Acting Liaison Officer-in-charge (District Facilities) of the Kwun Tong District Office (“KTDO”) presented the paper.

38. Members noted the paper.

**IX. Progress Report on Recreational and Cultural Works in Kwun Tong
(KTDC FEHDFMC Paper No. 18/2021)**

39. Senior Executive Officer (Planning)³¹ of LCSD presented the paper.

40. Members noted the paper and works progress.

**X. Progress Report on District Minor Works
(KTDC FEHDFMC Paper No. 19/2021)**

41. Members noted the paper.

XI. Any Other Business

42. Mr Kevin SO enquired on the progress of the former Food, Environment and Hygiene Committee’s plan of reserving \$1,000,000 to purchase cleaning packages.

43. The Secretariat responded that KTDO was considering the funding application concerned and studying the relevant procurement arrangements.

XII. Date of Next Meeting

44. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 9:30 a.m. on 13 January 2022 (Thursday).
45. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:11 a.m.

The minutes of the meeting were confirmed on 12 May 2022.

Kwun Tong District Council Secretariat
May 2022