

(Translation)

**Minutes of the 12th Meeting of
Traffic Development and Transport Committee,
the 6th Term Kwun Tong District Council**

Date: 26 September 2023 (Tuesday)

Time: 9:32 a.m. - 10:37 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>
Dr NGAN Man-yu (Chairman)	9:32 a.m.	10:37 a.m.
Mr LAM Wai (Vice-chairman)	9:32 a.m.	10:37 a.m.
Mr CHEUNG Pui-kong	9:46 a.m.	10:37 a.m.
Ms FU Pik-chun, MH	9:32 a.m.	10:37 a.m.
Mr HSU Yau-wai	9:32 a.m.	10:37 a.m.
Mr KAN Ming-tung, MH	9:43 a.m.	10:37 a.m.
Mr LEUNG Tang-fung	9:32 a.m.	9:56 a.m.
Mr OR Chong-shing Wilson, MH	9:32 a.m.	9:42 a.m.
Mr PANG Chi-sang	9:32 a.m.	10:37 a.m.
Mr SO Koon-chung Kevin	9:32 a.m.	10:37 a.m.
Mr TAM Siu-cheuk	9:32 a.m.	9:50 a.m.
Ms TSE Suk-chun	9:32 a.m.	10:37 a.m.

In Attendance

Ms CHAN Wai-chun, Regina	Assistant District Officer (Kwun Tong)1
Mr CHOW Lap-kan, Douglas	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Kwun Tong District Office
Mr LEUNG Pak-fung, Kazaf	Senior Transport Officer/Kwun Tong 1, Transport Department
Mr CHU Cheuk-king	Senior Transport Officer/Kwun Tong 2, Transport Department
Mr FUNG Wai-yan, Ryan	Senior Engineer/Kowloon District East (South), Transport Department
Mr LAM Yat-fung, Melvin	Engineer/Kwun Tong 3, Transport Department

Mr CHAN Chin-yeung, Edwin	Engineer/Kwun Tong 4, Transport Department
Mr YIP Yuk-tsang, Steven	District Engineer/Kwun Tong, Highways Department
Ms KEUNG Pei-ying	Acting District Operations Officer, Kwun Tong District, Hong Kong Police Force
Mr HO Chi-kin	Officer-in-charge, District Traffic Team (Kwun Tong), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr CHAN Yuen-hong	Officer-in-charge, District Traffic Team (Sau Mau Ping), Hong Kong Police Force

Secretary

Miss SUEN Hoi-ping, Heidi	Executive Officer (District Council)(4), Kwun Tong District Office
---------------------------	---

Absent

Mr CHAN Yiu-hung Jimmy, MH
 Ms LAI Po-kwai
 Mr LUI Tung-hai, MH

Representatives Present to Assist with Discussion of Agenda Items

Agenda Item IV

Progress Report on Road Projects in Kwun Tong District

Mr MA Kin-ye	Senior Engineer 4/Universal Accessibility, Highways Department
Mr TAM Ka-kiu, Adolph	Engineer 8/Universal Accessibility, Highways Department
Ms LAI Shuk-lui	Engineer 1/Universal Accessibility, Highways Department
Mr HO Bun, Ben	Engineer 3/Universal Accessibility, Highways Department
Mr LI Dick-kei, Dicky	Engineer 14/Universal Accessibility, Highways Department
Mr WONG Fai-ho, Dexter	Engineer 15/Universal Accessibility, Highways Department

Mr LI Ka-wang, Calvin

Engineer/11(East)

Civil Engineering and Development Department

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed all the attendees to the 12th meeting of the Traffic Development and Transport Committee (“TDTC”) under the 6th Term Kwun Tong District Council (“KTDC”).

2. The Chairman reported that the Secretariat had not received any notice of absence from Members.

I. Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting

3. Members raised no other comments. The minutes of the 11th meeting were confirmed.

II. Traffic Conditions at Eastern Harbour Crossing after Implementation of “633” Fixed Toll Plan and HKeToll **(KTDC TDTC Paper No. 26/2023)**

4. Members noted the paper.

III. Members and Area Committees’ Views on Public Transport Services and Road Works Projects in Kwun Tong District **(KTDC TDTC Paper No. 27/2023)**

5. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised views and enquiries as follows:

5.1 The Vice-chairman expressed disappointment at the Transport Department (“TD”)’s response to route no. 213D in the paper. He said the problem with the route was longstanding, adding that he had been reiterating the issue for four years and did not understand why the same route had different fares and service quality levels. For instance, the headway of route no. 27 was about five minutes, while that of route no. 213D was 30 minutes. In his view, TD disregarded public interests and favoured the bus company. He pointed out that TD had been conducting reviews for four years but to no avail, and believed that there were

problems with the system. He added that other routes had the same problem, but route no. 213D was a typical example. He considered the relevant arrangements unreasonable. He enquired what improvement measures TD had taken over the years to actually help residents in relation to the route.

5.2 Ms TSE Suk-chun (i) said she had suggested in writing the extension of route no. A26 to pass through the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (“HZMB”) Hong Kong Port, and thanked TD for revising the route. As for the extension of service hours, route nos. A26 and E22P offered morning departures only but members of the public did not just go out in the morning. Therefore, she recommended that route nos. A26 and E22P be extended to run all day; and (ii) regarding bus interchange services, she had suggested extending New Territories bus routes to Yau Tong. TD had earlier responded that residents could take route no.14B to the town centre and then interchange with New Territories bus routes. However, the route concerned had a low frequency. Even though the bus company specified that the headway of the route was 20 to 30 minutes, residents reported that they actually had waited for more than 30 minutes but still no bus came. Hence, it was believed that the above arrangement failed to tie in with the interchange services. She suggested that the frequency of route no. 14B be increased to every five to ten minutes.

5.3 The Chairman followed up on TD’s plan to amalgamate route nos. A26 and A26P. He said TD had mentioned that the whole-day bus services between Yau Tong and the airport would be provided for passengers and the relevant arrangements would be implemented in a timely manner. He enquired why the above arrangements had not yet been implemented and whether a deadline had been set for Citybus Limited (“Citybus”) to implement the above arrangements.

6. The highlights of the response given by the representative of TD were as follows:

6.1 In terms of the service level of route no. 213D, bus services and frequency depended on service demand, patronage and occupancy rate, among other factors. According to the available statistics from TD, the highest occupancy rate of route no. 213D during peak hours and in heavy traffic areas was about 80 percent. TD noted public concern over the passenger waiting time and would continue to monitor the operation of the route with the bus company so as to make effective use of resources. TD was also aware that the service level and occupancy rate of route no. 213D would be close to high levels, and would work with the bus company to identify room for service enhancement.

- 6.2 Regarding the service of route no. A26, in order to facilitate residents of Kwun Tong District, Wong Tai Sin District, Sham Shui Po District and Islands District to travel to and from the HZMB Hong Kong Port, the route (both bounds) was diverted on 23 September 2023 to run via the port. To cope with the above change, Citybus had extended the service hours of the route accordingly.
- 6.3 As for the amalgamation of route nos. A26 and A26P, TD had earlier communicated with the bus company and expected to implement the relevant arrangements in the fourth quarter of this year. TD would closely discuss the implementation details with the bus company.
- 6.4 With regard to the service of route no. 14B, TD had been encouraging the bus company to provide more interchange concessions where feasible. In addition to route no. 14B, residents of Yau Tong could also take route no. 14 to the Kwun Tong area to interchange with other bus routes. TD would continue to monitor the operation of the route and discuss service improvement arrangements with the bus company in a timely manner.
- 6.5 In terms of the frequency of route no. E22P, TD cited the results of a recent field survey, which showed that route no. E22P still had spare capacity. Meanwhile, TD would closely monitor the operation of the route and route no. E22X and the changes in passenger demand in the district. When necessary, TD would make appropriate service adjustments with the bus company in the hope of providing comprehensive services for passengers.

7. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised follow-up views and enquiries as follows:

- 7.1 The Chairman asked whether Citybus had agreed to implement the proposed amalgamation of route nos. A26 and A26P in the fourth quarter of this year.
- 7.2 Mr HSU Yau-wai enquired about the issue of the cover for the Oi Tat House bus stop. He said TD had earlier stated that the cover could not be erected due to a subway underneath and the queuing arrangements would be changed. However, TD had now stated that it was re-applying to the Highways Department (“HyD”) for an excavation permit, and the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited (“KMB”) would expeditiously start the project, subject to the approval progress. Therefore, he asked whether the cover could indeed be built at that location and

when the project was expected to commence.

- 7.3 Ms FU Pik-chun expressed dissatisfaction with TD's response to route no. 213D. She pointed out that the fare of route no. 213D was \$8.6 and that of route no. 27 was \$5.2, with a difference of \$3.4 between them. Meanwhile, the headway of route no. 213D was 15 to 20 minutes, while that of route no. 27 was six minutes. Therefore, the grassroots of On Tat Estate and On Tai Estate would rather wait in long queues for the lifts or even walk more than ten flights of stairs every day to Sze Shun Area to catch a bus. She pointed out that residents of On Tat Estate and On Tai Estate would rather go a long way to take route no. 27 due to the low frequency and high fare of route no. 213D. As a result, the occupancy rate of route no. 213D was only 80 percent. She added that while TD claimed resources should not be wasted, from a planning perspective, the ancillary transport facilities in On Tat Estate and On Tai Estate should meet the needs of residents in the areas, instead of having the residents in the two areas share limited transport resources and go elsewhere to take the bus. She pointed out that after years of review on the transport arrangements, TD was still unable to improve the transport planning for On Tat and On Tai, and only said resources should not be wasted. She rebuked TD's remark as absurd and outrageous.

8. The highlights of the response given by the representative of TD were as follows:

- 8.1 TD advised that it had reached consensus with Citybus on the amalgamation of route nos. A26 and A26P in the fourth quarter of this year.
- 8.2 Regarding route nos. 213D and 27, TD understood that there were significant fare differences between the two routes. Since the fare level depended on journey distance, and route no. 213D had to travel through New Clear Water Bay Road before reaching the On Tat and On Tai areas, its journey distance was evidently longer than that of route no. 27 and was reasonably reflected in its fare level. The current headway of route no. 213D was 10 minutes during peak hours, while that of route no. 27 was six to nine minutes, reflecting the patronage and demand of the two routes. It was pointed out that as there were differences among the On Tat, On Tai, Sze Shun, and Choi Wan Estate areas in terms of demand and patronage structure, it was inadvisable to make direct comparisons. TD would monitor the patronage and demand of the routes with the bus company so as to adjust their service frequencies, and would strive for more resources from the bus company to strengthen its services.

8.3 Concerning the cover for the Oi Tat House bus stop, TD thanked Members for their views and appreciated the Kwun Tong District Office (“KTDO”)’s assistance in providing additional information on its project of a covered walkway at On Sau Road for reference. Although KTDO’s project was still in the feasibility study stage, TD, after reviewing the information, had extracted useful technical information and passed it on to KMB for study. KMB had also re-examined the plan to build the cover in-situ and was currently applying to HyD for an excavation permit. The project would commence as soon as possible, subject to the approval progress.

9. The Chairman enquired whether TD had any new design drawing for the proposed cover for the Oi Tat House bus stop.

10. The representative of TD responded that there was no change to the design for the Oi Tat House bus stop cover, which would be built in-situ, i.e. there was no need to adjust the queuing location.

11. The Chairman stated that before receiving the information from KTDO, KMB said it was unable to erect the cover. However, after studying the information, it turned out to be able to build the cover according to the previous plan. Therefore, he enquired how the reference information from KTDO affected the plan.

12. The representative of TD responded that TD would contact KMB for further information. Since many technical details were involved, TD, when vetting and approving the cover project, would forward technical documents to the works departments for consultation. However, the actual situation was subject to underground utilities and structures, and could be more complex and unforeseeable. TD would examine the relevant technical issues with KMB and expected to expeditiously start and complete the cover works for public use.

13. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised follow-up views and enquiries as follows:

13.1 The Chairman requested that TD submit a written reply to TDTC to explain in detail the technical difficulties in the project. He said KMB had originally claimed that it was unable to build the cover on technical grounds, such as a large number of underground pipelines. However, KMB had now said that it could build the cover according to the original design after the last meeting, at which Mr CHEUNG Pui-kong and Mr HSU Yau-wai questioned why KTDO could build a covered walkway

at On Sau Road, but KMB could not build the bus stop cover. The Chairman doubted whether the earlier underground investigation report was inaccurate or whether it was the feasibility of KTDO's project that made it feasible for KMB to implement the project. The Chairman urged TD to submit a written report to the current-term TDTC to explain the technical issues in implementing and taking forward the measures, so that Members could understand how KMB solved the difficulties encountered in the project after obtaining supplementary information. The report would be passed on to the next-term KTDC chaired by the District Officer for reference.

- 13.2 The Vice-chairman responded to TD's reply on route nos. 213D and 27. He believed that KMB's statistics should be true and therefore suggested that KMB compile statistics on the number of delays in the bus services for the past year. He had received complaints from a member of the public that a particular trip on route no. 213D had been delayed for over 30 minutes for a week straight. He suggested that TD and KMB seriously review the relevant statistics, adding that if the bus services were smooth, residents would not have to walk more than ten flights of stairs to Sze Shun to catch route no. 27 just for the sake of money saving. He pointed out that Hong Kong was an efficient city where time was money. If the bus services were smooth and the fares were the same, the grassroots did not have to take the convoluted walking route to catch a bus downhill. In his view, the above problem stemmed from the unfair allocation of resources. He hoped that TD and KMB would provide journey data. The fare difference between route nos. 213D and 27 was \$3, but the headway of route no. 27 was far more frequent than that of route no. 213D. It was unacceptable for residents who wanted to take route no. 213D to just watch several route no. 27 buses passing by while having to wait for 30 minutes.

14. The representative of TD responded that the department was well aware of Members' views and would provide the statistics to Members for reference after the meeting.

15. Members noted the paper.

IV. Progress Report on Road Projects in Kwun Tong District (KTDC TDTC Paper No. 28/2023)

16. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of HyD and the Civil Engineering and

Development Department (“CEDD”) to the meeting.

17. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised views and enquiries as follows:

17.1 Mr Kevin SO enquired about the lift tower project for the pedestrian subway across Chun Wah Road near Lok Wah South Estate (structure no: KS43). He cited the paper as saying that the project would be completed in the fourth quarter of 2023. However, there had been no progress since the last meeting. He stated that before every meeting, a resident engineer of HyD would call him to report on the progress of the project. He said he had repeatedly expressed dissatisfaction with the resident engineer and asked a HyD engineer to contact him to report on the progress. However, so far, he had not received a call from HyD. He added that he had seen several workers working on the site after TDTC expressed concern over the project at the last meeting. He criticised the current progress report for only stating that HyD had reported on the project progress and falling short of explaining the specific progress. According to the paper, the foundation works for the lift tower was completed long ago, but the construction works on the top of the lift tower had not yet started. He was concerned about how the contractor could complete the construction of the lift tower and the procedures for lift installation and acceptance and open the lift for public use within three months. He said HyD had earlier stated that it would reflect the contractor’s poor performance in its performance report and issue a warning letter. However, he was more interested to know how HyD would follow up on the project. He added that he had received complaints from many residents that the lift tower had not been completed since the start of the current-term KTDC four years ago. He pointed out that the acceptance of the lift took time, and believed that there was no definite time frame for the opening of the lift. He hoped that HyD would give an account of the project progress and the practical problems encountered in the project at the last meeting of TDTC under the current-term KTDC.

18. The highlights of the response given by the representative of HyD were as follows:

18.1 Counting from the last progress report, there were a total of 12 projects under the “Universal Accessibility” (“UA”) Programme in Kwun Tong District, six of which had entered the construction stage in July.

18.2 Regarding the progress of KS43, the contractor encountered financial difficulties early this year and its persistent disputes with sub-contractors dragged down the

progress of KS43. The consultant and resident site staff had reflected the poor work attitude of the contractor in the quarterly evaluation report. As of 25 August, HyD had banned the contractor from bidding for any new government road works projects. According to site records, the contractor completed foundation works between February and March this year. Since then, there had been occasional cases of site idling. Even if there were people working, only one to two workers were seen rectifying the site. Since early August, HyD had observed that the contractor's resources had increased, with simple rectification work changed to works related to the project progress, such as steel reinforcement fixing and cast-in-place concrete works, and the number of workers raised from one-to-two to five-to-six. In view of the increased resources, HyD had put pressure again on the contractor, such as holding weekly progress meetings to examine site difficulties and working promptly with the consultant to resolve them. Meanwhile, since the contractor stopped bidding for new projects, its resources devoted to the above project had increased. HyD hoped that the contractor could continue to maintain the current progress and complete the rest of the works as soon as possible.

19. The Chairman enquired when HyD discovered that the contractor had financial difficulties and when it started holding weekly progress meetings.

20. The representative of HyD responded that the department was concerned about the financial position of the contractor after noticing its disputes with other sub-contractors early this year, and the contractor had admitted to its financial problems.

21. The Chairman said it was already September, and HyD made no mention of the contractor's financial difficulties in its progress reports in March, May and July. He suspected that HyD had ignored KTDC or covered up the facts.

22. The highlights of the response given by the representative of HyD were as follows:

22.1 HyD had been trying to communicate with the contractor in the hope of resolving the problem. Although the contractor had financial problems, they were not irretrievable. Therefore, HyD had been putting pressure on the contractor at different stages and had promptly taken relevant actions, including regular meetings with the contractor.

22.2 HyD had also given a rather low score to the contractor under a marking scheme for works contracts to reflect its performance. The department would take actions

to manage the contractor in a step-by-step manner and report on such actions in the next progress report.

23. The Chairman pointed out that (i) the current term of KTDC would soon come to an end. This was the last TDTC meeting of the current term; (ii) Members had enquired about the progress of the project at the meetings in March, May and July this year. However, HyD did not give an account of the project progress to TDTC, residents of Lok Wah and the general public of Hong Kong.

24. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised follow-up views and enquiries as follows:

24.1 The Chairman criticised HyD for only stating that “the consultant of HyD had reported on the latest progress of the project to Mr Kevin SO” in 16 progress reports from 2 July 2019 to 29 June 2023 instead of reporting to TDTC on the project progress and abruptly giving an account of the contractor’s financial problems only at the last meeting.

24.2 Mr Kevin SO stated that the resident engineer did not report to him on the financial problems. He added that for years, Members could see the progress of the project when the contractor carried out works, such as excavation, hoarding installation and backfilling. However, he had not seen any progress on the project in the past year. Therefore, he had repeatedly expressed concern at TDTC meetings over the site’s idling. Nevertheless, the representative of HyD who attended the meeting was not responsible for the project and thus only conveyed the views to the engineer concerned. He said that the contractor had already completed the foundation works early this year and then told him in its last three reports that the lift tower works was in progress. He questioned whether the resident staff had relayed to him the actual situation. He pointed out that HyD assigned the resident engineer to report to Members on the project progress. However, if the resident engineer did not relay to him the actual situation, he would have no way of knowing the actual progress of the lift tower structural works. He suggested that TDTC arrange for a site inspection of the project during its current term. He argued that HyD, which signed the works contract with the contractor, had the responsibility to closely monitor the progress of the project. In his view, HyD was belatedly aware of the contractor’s financial problems only after noticing that no one was working on the site. He also criticised HyD for only putting pressure on the contractor, issuing warnings and reflecting the contractor’s poor performance in its performance report, which did not have sufficient deterrent effect on the underperforming contractor. HyD currently set the target completion date as the

fourth quarter of this year, which was not the actual completion date. It was only HyD's desirable completion date, and the contractor was unable to meet it at all. At present, he had not seen any progress on the project, not even the walls of the lift tower. He questioned HyD's claim that the lift could be put into operation within three months, and did not expect the lift to be put into service even in the first quarter of 2024. He considered it insufficient for HyD to just put pressure on and mildly criticise the contractor, adding that it did not make good use of key performance indicators. He said taking three to four years to build a lift tower had become a laughing stock, and once again expressed dissatisfaction with the progress of the project.

25. The representative of HyD responded that the fourth quarter of this year was indeed the target completion date set by HyD for the contractor. The department would review the completion date and examine how to assist the contractor in speeding up the project progress after the meeting.

26. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised follow-up views and enquiries as follows:

26.1 The Vice-chairman pointed out that (i) the banners hung on the lampposts at On Sau Road had been blown loose in the last typhoon and had yet to be fixed. Therefore, he wanted to know whether it should be HyD or the Lands Department ("LandsD") that was responsible for the issue. He had contacted HyD for the above issue but HyD responded that the road section was not under its purview; (ii) invited HyD to join TDTC in a site inspection of the pedestrian crossing near Kam Tai House, and explain the forthcoming project and how to install safety devices; (iii) pointed out that there was a slope overgrown with weeds near the covered walkway from On Tat to On Tai, and urged the department concerned to contact him as soon as possible for follow-up on the case. He said that the grass-cutting work on the slope was only half completed. The weeds on the side near On Tat had been cleared but with a bee nest left behind, while the weeds on the side near On Tai were not cut at all. He had been asking about the above issue for nearly three weeks but still could not find the responsible department; (iv) appreciated the frontline staff of TD for inviting Members to conduct site inspections when problems arose to review areas that could be improved or projects that required follow-up; and (v) stated that he often could not find the relevant staff responsible for following up on district issues, and hoped that the representatives of various departments would arrange for relevant staff to proactively contact him for follow-up after the meeting. He said he had called the hotline 1823 regarding the above issues and was awaiting a reply. He considered that roads and lifts were the most

commonly used facilities by the public, and hoped that HyD would not only be responsible for the building of facilities but would also strengthen maintenance and management. He found it difficult for Members to contact HyD, and its staff only gave him a perfunctory reply by phone, showing a lack of respect towards the public and KTDC. He hoped that HyD could provide a direct telephone line of the responsible staff so that he could follow up on the above situation.

- 26.2 Mr KAN Ming-tung (i) said that the expected commencement and completion dates of the project of the pedestrian subway across Pik Wan Road connecting Kwong Tin Estate Bus Terminus and Hong Pak Court (structure no.: KT01) were listed in the paper as “to be confirmed”, and the progress report also stated “HyD is currently coordinating with the property owners concerned on the project in order to formulate a project plan and construction timetable”. Therefore, he urged HyD to provide the timetable to him; (ii) pointed out that the display panel already installed for the Kai Tin Estate bus stop at Tak Tin Street (no.: TA32-E-1000-0) only showed “KMB” and had not yet been put into operation. In addition, the display panel for the bus stop across the road turned black, while the display panel at one of the bus stops in nearby Hong Yat Court had yet to return to normal operation despite having been under repair for six months. He expected TD to follow up on the display panels for the bus stops at Hong Yat Court and Kai Wong House, among others, adding that since some display panels were installed by franchised bus companies with government subsidies, he enquired which party was responsible for the supervision and maintenance of these display panels; and (iii) urged HyD to promptly follow up on the road surface undulations on the downhill side of Tak Tin Street near the roundabout and outside Kai Yan House.

27. The highlights of the response given by the representative of HyD were as follows:

- 27.1 With regard to KT01, housing estate owners had agreed, in principle, to the project. HyD was discussing detailed proposals with them. As regards the construction timetable for the project, HyD would consider the project in conjunction with the implementation of the remaining lift retrofitting projects in other areas so as to enhance the cost-effectiveness of the construction and management of the works contracts.
- 27.2 As for the banners falling from the lampposts at On Sau Road, HyD said banners were generally followed up by the department responsible for hanging them. If there were any fallen banners, staff of the Food and Environmental Hygiene

Department might clear them away as trash. He said HyD's job was to lend lampposts to other departments to hang banners, and would find out which department hung the banners after the meeting.

27.3 Regarding the pedestrian crossing near Kam Tai House, HyD was currently working with an underground utility services provider to carry out the diversion of underground utilities. HyD could conduct an inspection of the site with Members and explain to them the temporary traffic arrangement measures so that they could keep track of the pedestrian diversion situation during the construction period.

27.4 Concerning the issue of the slope overgrown with weeds in On Tat Estate and On Tai Estate, slope management came under the purview of different departments. As for slope sections under its management and maintenance purview, HyD would arrange for a contractor to cut the weeds regularly. HyD would ask Members for the specific location after the meeting. If the weeds were overgrown, HyD would arrange for a contractor to cut them.

(Post-meeting note: on the day of the site inspection, HyD pointed out to Members that the part of the slope, about which they were concerned, was managed by LandsD. LandsD staff also explained the follow-up progress to Members on site.)

27.5 As for the issue of the surface undulations on the footpath of Kai Yan House, HyD would follow up on the case and arrange for a contractor to pave the path when necessary.

28. In regard to the agenda item, Members raised follow-up views and enquiries as follows:

28.1 Mr KAN Ming-tung enquired about Project KT01 and asked when HyD would discuss with property owners.

28.2 The Vice-chairman (i) understood that there was a sophisticated division of labour between and within departments, with dedicated staff to follow up on different issues. However, at every turn, Members had to ask questions at the meeting, while the department concerned might not be able to reply immediately and sometimes did not even respond. He added that Members would relentlessly follow up on unresolved issues. He appreciated the willingness of individual staff members to follow up on issues raised by Members. For instance, he once suggested to the department concerned that the fallen light tube might cause electric

shock, and the department followed up within 24 hours. Meanwhile, some problems had dragged on for a long time without being handled, such as the above-mentioned banners at the lampposts had not been fixed for nearly half a month. He also mentioned the grass-cutting problem, saying that the department concerned was not conscientious enough in performing grass-cutting work, leaving a bee nest behind. The Vice-chairman said that the above problems showed the ineffective monitoring on the part of the department. Since this was the last TDTC meeting under the current term, the Vice-chairman hoped that the department would respond to Members' enquiries in writing within this month, or conduct site inspections with Members, so as to handle the above issues as soon as possible. The department could provide him with the contact information of different responsible officers so that he could clearly know who to contact for follow-up. He did not want to go through the complicated referral procedure of the hotline 1823.

29. The representative of TD responded that regarding the display panels for the bus stops at Kai Wong House of Kai Tin Estate and Hong Yat Court at Tak Tin Street, TD would relay Members' views to KMB to facilitate passengers to obtain travelling information.

30. The highlights of the response given by the representative of HyD were as follows:

30.1 With regard to KT01, one of the lift towers was located in the common area of Kwong Tin Estate. HyD had been in discussion with property owners on management, maintenance and other responsibilities, and received a written no-objection in August from the property owners for the continuation of the project. HyD was drafting a deed of easement, clearly spelling out the management and maintenance responsibilities. The draft deed was expected to be submitted to the relevant department and property owners within the year for a review of its details.

30.2 HyD expressed its willingness to collaborate and communicate closely with Members. For any enquiries about public roads in the district, Members were welcome to directly contact District Engineer/Kwun Tong of HyD. If the issues involved departments other than HyD, the department would also be happy to assist in liaising with the departments and staff concerned so as to refer relevant cases to appropriate units.

31. The Chairman reiterated that the current problem was that the staff concerned were not clear about the remit and responsibilities of HyD. He explained that all engineers responsible for the lift projects under the UA programme in the district were invited to the meeting because the regular

representative of HyD was unable to respond to enquiries from Members at the meeting.

32. The representative of HyD responded that the department's remit was very broad with a sophisticated division of labour. Therefore, his colleagues attending the meeting might not be able to instantly provide detailed information and statistics in response to Members' enquiries. He said that his colleagues would be happy to act as intermediaries to help resolve problems if Members had any enquiries on district issues.

33. The Chairman stated that he was very familiar with district affairs and departmental operations. Taking KS43 as an example, Members had been enquiring about the project for a long time, and the regular representative of HyD indicated that relevant views and enquiries would be relayed to HyD for follow-up. However, it was not until this meeting that Members were informed of the contractor's financial difficulties. He concluded by (i) asking the Secretariat to arrange site inspections of KS43, the slope near On Tat Estate and On Tai Estate, and the pedestrian crossing at On Sau Road near Kam Tai House in early October; (ii) urging KTDO to provide assistance on the weed problem with the slope, and to coordinate and oversee the improvement work of different departments through the District-led Actions Scheme; and (iii) hoping to sort out the difficulties encountered previously by the departments and Members in KS43 and to write to the Deputy Chief Secretary for Administration in the capacity of TDTC, urging him to coordinate unresolved issues among departments.

34. Members noted the paper.

(Post-meeting note: the Secretariat had arranged for Members and representatives of HyD and other relevant departments to conduct site inspections of KS43 for the pedestrian subway across Chun Wah Road near Lok Wah South Estate, the slope near On Tat Estate and On Tai Estate, and the pedestrian crossing at On Sau Road near Kam Tai House. In addition, the Secretariat wrote to the Deputy Chief Secretary for Administration on 12 October 2023, relaying Members' views on the progress of KS43.)

V. List and Timetable of Major Traffic Improvement Works Completed, Being Implemented or Planned by the Transport Department / Highways Department in the Last Two Months
(KTDC TDTC Paper No. 29/2023)

35. Mr HSU Yau-wai (i) enquired about the works of the provision of roadside motorcycle parking spaces at Sau Mau Ping Road in item 4 of the paper. He pointed out that during his earlier site inspection, works staff of the Water Supplies Department ("WSD") were conducting repair works.

As the relevant excavation permit would expire on 30 December, the department was required to re-apply for a new permit before continuing the works. He urged HyD to communicate with WSD to ascertain the construction timetable for the motorcycle parking spaces; and (ii) cited the paper as stating that the construction of the roadside motorcycle parking spaces at On Chui Street near Ching Tat House would commence in November 2023 and be completed in February 2024. He said the provision of the motorcycle parking spaces there had been awaited for many years, and enquired whether the project would indeed commence in November as scheduled, or there might be variables.

36. The highlights of the response given by the representative of HyD were as follows:

36.1 Regarding the provision of roadside motorcycle parking spaces at Sau Mau Ping Road, HyD had communicated with WSD. According to its latest reply, WSD would complete the laying of water pipes by the end of October. HyD would then arrange for conducting works for the provision of motorcycle parking spaces.

36.2 With regard to the motorcycle parking spaces at On Chui Street, HyD was in discussion with the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”) on the arrangements for the diversion of watering pipes. LCSD would start the project as scheduled and expected to complete it in the first quarter of next year.

37. Members noted the paper.

VI. Any Other Business

38. Members did not raise other items for discussion.

39. This was the last meeting of TDTC under the current-term KTDC. The Chairman thanked all Members, the representatives of government departments who attended the meeting, and the Secretariat for their contributions for the past term.

The minutes of the meeting were confirmed on 27 December 2023.

Kwun Tong District Council Secretariat
October 2023