

**Minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of  
Traffic and Transport Committee (T&TC)  
Southern District Council (SDC) (2016-2019)**

Date : 18 March 2019  
Time : 2:30 p.m.  
Venue : SDC Conference Room

**Present:**

Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP	(Chairman of SDC)
Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH	(Vice-Chairman of SDC and Chairman of T&TC)
Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH	(Vice-Chairlady of T&TC)
Mr AU Lap-sing, MH	
Mr AU Nok-hin	
Mr CHAI Man-hon	
Ms CHAN Judy Kapui	
Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying	
Mr CHU Lap-wai	
Mr FUNG Se-goun, Fergus	
Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH	
Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH	
Mr LO Kin-hei	
Dr MAK TSE How-ling, Ada, MH	
Mr TSUI Yuen-wa	
Ms YAM Pauline	
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	
Mr CHAN Man-chun, JP	
Mr LI Man-ching	
Mr Angus WONG	

**Absent with Apologies:**

Mr YEUNG Wing-yan

**Secretary:**

Miss LIN Man-wai, Michelle	Executive Officer (District Council) 3, Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department
----------------------------	--

**In Attendance:**

Mrs MA CHOW Pui-fun, Dorothy, JP	District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department
Miss CHENG Wai-sum, Sum	Assistant District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department

Mr LI Hui-fung, Kevin	Senior Transport Officer/Southern, Transport Department	
Miss CHUNG Wai-ying, Tracy	Transport Officer/Southern 1, Transport Department	
Mr SO Wing-kin	Engineer/Southern 1, Transport Department	
Mr HUNG Tsz-hin	Engineer/Southern 2, Transport Department	
Mr LI Yick-chun, Wing	Engineer/Housing & Planning 2, Transport Department	
Mr LING Chi-wai, Jimmy	Engineer 10 (HK Island Div 2), Civil Engineering and Development Department	
Ms WU Yuk-kwan, Crystal	District Engineer/South, Highways Department	
Mr YONG Kwok-chung	Officer-in-charge, District Traffic Team (Western), Hong Kong Police Force	
Ms O Fong-wa, Julie	Senior Engineer 1/Universal Accessibility, Highways Department	for agenda item 2
Mr YEUNG Ka-chun, Henry	Engineer 7/Universal Accessibility, Highways Department	
Mr LAM Wai-keung	Director, WSP (Asia) Limited	
Mr HO Yiu-chung	Associate, WSP (Asia) Limited	
Mr YEUNG Chun-wing, Jun	Senior Transport Officer/Bus/HK 1, Transport Department	for agenda item 4
Mr MOK Chun-hei, Gilbert	Transport Officer/Bus/HK 1, Transport Department	
Mr Simon WONG	Planning & Scheduling Manager, Citybus / NWFB Ltd	
Mr Calvin WONG	Senior Planning Officer, Citybus / NWFB Ltd	
Mr Kevin LI	Public Affairs Manager, Citybus / NWFB Ltd	
Mr Dick YIK	Assistant Operations Manager, NWFB Ltd	
Mr Philip WONG	Operations Manager (Dept. One), Citybus Ltd	

## **Opening Remarks:**

The Chairman welcomed Members and the following regular government representatives to the meeting:

- (a) Mr LI Hui-fung, Kevin, Senior Transport Officer of the Transport Department (TD);
- (b) Miss CHUNG Wai-ying, Tracy, Transport Officer of TD;
- (c) Mr SO Wing-kin, Mr HUNG Tsz-hin and Mr LI Yick-chun, Wing, Engineers of TD;
- (d) Mr LING Chi-wai, Jimmy, Engineer of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD);
- (e) Ms Wu Yuk-kwan, Crystal, District Engineer of Highways Department (HyD); and
- (f) Mr YONG Kwok-chung, Officer-in-charge, District Traffic Team of the Western Division, Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF).

2. The Chairman suggested that each Member should be allotted a maximum of two three-minute slots to speak in respect of each agenda item. Members agreed to this arrangement.

## **Agenda Item 1: Confirmation of the Minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 21 January 2019**

---

(Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH joined the meeting at 2:31 p.m.)

3. The Chairman said that prior to the meeting, the above draft minutes of meeting in Chinese and English had been circulated to Members for comments. The Secretariat had not received any amendment proposals from Members.

4. The minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> T&TC meeting in Chinese and English were confirmed by the Committee.

## **Agenda Item 2: Second Phase of the “Universal Accessibility” (UA) Programme — Provision of Lift Facilities to a Footbridge (Structure No. HKS01) in Southern District (Item raised by Highways Department) (TTC Paper No. 7/2019)**

---

(Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP, Mr LO Kin-hei, Mr AU Nok-hin, Mr CHU Lap-wai and Ms YAM Pauline joined the meeting at 2:32 p.m., 2:34 p.m., 3:00 p.m., 3:04 p.m. and 3:04 p.m. respectively.)

5. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

- (a) Ms O Fong-wa, Julie, Senior Engineer 1/Universal Accessibility, HyD;
- (b) Mr YEUNG Ka-chun, Henry, Engineer 7/Universal Accessibility, HyD;

- (c) Mr LAM Wai-keung, Director, WSP (Asia) Limited; and
- (d) Mr HO Yiu-chung, Associate, WSP (Asia) Limited.

6. The Chairman invited Ms Julie O to brief Members on the agenda item.

7. Ms Julie O said that under the Second Phase of the UA Programme, HyD had completed the site investigation works for the provision of lift facilities to three footbridges in the Southern District, and consulted the Committee on the investigation findings for two of the footbridges in September 2018. HyD would present at the meeting the preliminary design scheme of provision of lifts at the Footbridge (Structure No. HKS01) across Lei Tung Estate Road near Tung Sing House, Lei Tung Estate to the Committee, and seek Members' advice and support for the scheme concerned.

8. Mr LAM Wai-keung, with the aid of PowerPoint presentation (TTC Paper No. 7/2019), briefly presented the preliminary design scheme of provision of lift facilities at Footbridge HKS01. There were two exits (Exit A and Exit B) at the said footbridge. Exit A was close to Tung Sing House, Lei Tung Estate while Exit B was connected to St. Peter's Catholic Primary School. They had already come up with a preliminary design scheme for retrofitting of a lift near Exit A. However, the investigation findings revealed that due to limited space at Lei Tung Estate Road near Exit B, a lift could only be accommodated inside the land lot next to St. Peter's Catholic Primary School, which was partly on the private land of Lei Tung Estate. Pursuant to the current ambit of the UA Programme, the lift retrofitting works for a footbridge not maintained by the HyD should not involve any resumption of private land. Therefore, it was not feasible to retrofit a lift for Exit B. Regarding the proposed scheme for provision of lift at Exit A, local consultation and detailed design work would be conducted subject to the Committee's support. Upon completion of the detailed design work, HyD would proceed with the tendering procedure and commence the construction works as early as possible.

9. The Chairman invited Members to raise comments.

10. Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH made a declaration of interests. She worked in a kindergarten which was under the same governing body of St Monica's Anglo-Chinese Kindergarten of Lei Tung Estate.

11. The Chairman noted Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH's declaration of interests, and said that she could continue to take part in the discussion and resolution of this agenda item.

12. Members raised enquiries and comments on the proposed item, with details summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr LO Kin-hei said that he and Mr AU Nok-hin had many discussions with HyD and the Housing Department (HD) about the proposed project. The crux of the problem about the lift retrofitting works at Exit B of the footbridge lay with whether HD could lawfully allow other departments to carry out works on the piece of land owned by HD. In this regard, he hoped that HyD could give an account of the latest progress on the

relevant issue. Furthermore, the UA Programme was intended to provide convenience for the public. It would be a pity if the programme did not work well because of some inter-departmental restrictions. Lastly, he considered that the addition of only a lift to Exit A of the footbridge would not bring significant benefit. HyD should give a clear account to the residents for the land title issue of Exit B;

- (b) Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH enquired about ownership of the land title of Exit B of the footbridge. She continued that due to historical factors, no barrier-free access had been provided between certain housing estates to facilitate access of the residents. Concerning the proposed project, she requested HyD to study various comments in depth and consult different stakeholders, including the residents of Yue On Court, on the provision of barrier-free access for residents travelling between Lei Tung Estate and Yue On Court and serve the purpose of the UA Programme. She reiterated that it was undesirable to retrofit a lift at one end of the footbridge only. It would be a waste of the public money as well;
- (c) Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH said that the proposed mechanical ventilation system to be installed in front of the classrooms on the mezzanine floor of St Monica's Anglo-Chinese Kindergarten would affect the circulation of air of the classrooms. As such, she enquired HyD whether the department had liaised with the management of the kindergarten and explained to them the design and arrangement of the ventilation system. Furthermore, she said that if only the lift was retrofitted to only one end of the footbridge, it would fail to serve the purpose of UA Programme in providing a barrier-free access to Yue On Court for the elderly and persons with disabilities. She said that HyD should proactively identify a suitable location in Yue On Court or another location near Exit B of the footbridge for retrofitting a lift, and should discuss with the owners' committee of the housing estate concerned the suitable location for installing the lift. She expected that there would not be much objection from the residents but various stakeholders needed to reach a consensus on the location of the lift. Since several schools were providing school bus services nearby, HyD had to be mindful of the impact of road closure on school bus service;
- (d) Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH commented that retrofitting a lift to only one side of the the footbridge would not be able to achieve the purpose of barrier-free access. HyD should study in depth ownership of the land surrounding the proposed project and work out a long-term plan accordingly. She also pointed out that the paper provided by HyD had not clearly stated any information about the land title. Though the land owned by different government departments might be subject to different constraints, the departments should still be able to sort out the issue through discussion. To avoid wastage of public money, she requested HyD to furnish the Committee with more information about the land title so as to facilitate detailed study and discussion;

- (e) Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying supported the UA Programme but she was of the view that HyD should give due consideration for the aspirations of the Member of the constituency concerned as well as the public. Apart from providing barrier-free access for the public, the Programme would also be able to enhance the international image of Hong Kong. She hoped that HyD could listen to Members, eradicate all problems and work out a solution to solve the issue of retrofitting a lift at Exit B of the footbridge;
- (f) Mr CHAI Man-hon said that the Committee had no objection to the aim of the UA Programme, while HyD should review the Programme to see if there was room for refinement. He pointed out that a number of proposed projects under the UA Programme in Hong Kong could not be commenced due to the involvement of the land of MTR Corporation Limited, Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA) and Link Real Estate Investment Trust. The department should consider revising the policy related to land title, such as allowing the Government to carry out works on a piece of land with a certain percentage of title owned by the Government, so that projects that would benefit the public would not be hindered by the land title issue; and
- (g) Mr TSUI Yuen-wa enquired about the implementation timetable of the proposed project. Furthermore, he wished to know about the manpower deployed by HyD to monitor the contractor. He gave the example of the footbridge outside Ocean Court, Aberdeen to illustrate that the lift retrofitting works was originally scheduled for December 2018 but had to be completed. Therefore, he was worried that the proposed project would face the same problem and be delayed due to poor quality of works.

13. Ms Julie O gave a consolidated response to Members' comments and enquiries as follows:

- (a) according to page 6 of the Reference Information of TTC Paper No. 7/2019, the location near Exit B of the footbridge (i.e. north of Lei Tung Estate Road above the green dotted line) involved two types of non-government land ownership, i.e. the "reserved land" of HA and "private land of Lei Tung Estate". HyD had explored with HD the possibility of releasing a portion of the "reserved land" for construction of lift. Yet, according to available information, if HA was to separate the required "reserved land" from the lot of Lei Tung Estate and return it to the Government, it would entail various difficulties, including the need to obtain all owners' consent for the division of the land deed which should be signed by all owners. In addition, part of the "reserved land" provided emergency vehicular access to St Peter's Catholic Primary School. Any alteration to the emergency vehicular access of a building would require approval from the Fire Services Department. Priority over the use of the "reserved land" would be given to development of the primary school and the housing estate residents. Therefore, release of the land to the Government would

require consultation with the Incorporated Owners and school management concerned;

- (b) the Consultant had explored if it was feasible to create space from the government land on Lei Tung Estate Road near Exit B but there was no footpath on Lei Tung Estate Road around the location, so it was difficult to provide space for accommodating a lift. If the provision of a lift was required, the carriageway on Lei Tung Estate Road would need to be narrowed in order to make room for the lift. Lei Tung Estate Road was a single-lane carriageway for two-way traffic. Narrowing the carriageway would lead to permanent closure of the lane in one of the directions. Since traffic in Lei Tung Estate Road was busy, permanent closure of a one-way lane would have serious traffic impact, rendering the proposal not feasible;
- (c) at present, there was not yet a feasible option for HyD to add a lift to the location of Exit B. HyD hoped Members could consider that although the provision of a lift to Exit A of the footbridge only was not an ideal arrangement and could not fulfil the objective of barrier-free access, the proposal would benefit the residents using Exit A. HyD kept an open mind to the proposal and would respect the opinions and decisions of the Committee;
- (d) if the Committee supported the preliminary design scheme, HyD would conduct consultation with the local community according to the established procedure, and would also consult St Monica's Anglo-Chinese Kindergarten, the body responsible for the maintenance and repair of the footbridge, the nearby residents and school sponsoring body;
- (e) concerning a Member's suggestion to revise the existing policy as announced by the Chief Executive in the 2018 Policy Address, the Government would conduct a review to explore the scope for further expanding the ambit of the UA Programme. HyD had already commenced the task; and
- (f) on the timetable, the project would be tendered pending completion of the detailed design work.

14. Members raised enquiries and comments on the proposed item, with details summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN doubted that not many people would be using Exit A of the footbridge because the residents would not use the proposed lift for access to MTR Lei Tung Station. Moreover, the exit of the lift was connected to a narrow pavement and was not designed to meet the needs of wheelchair users and disabled persons. He also pointed out that the streets around the footbridge had low usage. Exit B of the footbridge was not of great use to the residents even if the location could accommodate a lift;

- (b) Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH asked HyD whether it had studied the feasibility of adding a lift to the other locations, say at the north end of the footbridge, extending the footbridge to the area of Yue On Court with the provision of a lift. She reiterated that the footbridge stretched across Lei Tung Estate Road. If installation of lifts to both ends of the footbridge was not possible, it would hardly be beneficial to the residents. She added that even though the land for retrofitting of lifts would involve different ownership or stakeholders, HyD should have the responsibility to study in depth a long-term feasible option, such as consulting the residents of Yue On Court in advance to tackle the issue of land title, instead of holding back by the difficulties of the current situation;
- (c) Mr AU Nok-hin said that since he was the project proponent of the proposed item, he would assist in resolving any difficulties encountered in the provision of lift to Exit B of the footbridge. Furthermore, he said that only adding a lift to one end of the footbridge would not be able to achieve the purpose of providing a completely barrier-free access. If the existing proposal of HyD was implemented, the temporary traffic management scheme that had to be adopted would affect the residents during the construction period, which entailed a relatively high price to be paid by the residents. In addition, he said that some of the Yue On Court residents wished to have the footbridge connected to Tse On House and Har On House in order to provide convenience for users of the car park at Yue On Court, residents of Yue On Court and Lei Tung Estate. As regards the land title of Exit B of the footbridge, he was willing to assist the department concerned to collect land title from the households in his capacity as the Secretary of the Incorporated Owners of Lei Tung Estate if necessary. However, he stressed that even if a lift could be added to the location of Exit B of the footbridge, part of the corridor connecting Yue On Court with Lei Tung Estate would still be a stairway and could not provide a complete barrier-free access. On the other hand, he said that the existing UA Programme also had certain drawbacks. He suggested that the Committee write a letter to the relevant department and request a review of the policy. For instance, HyD should be empowered to invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance and other relevant legislation to recover partially the land of estates under Home Ownership Scheme or those involving complicated land title, and devise the relevant compensation mechanism and clauses for the relevant agreements to help land owners to release their land for projects that could benefit people's livelihood and improve the UA Programme;
- (d) Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH queried that the proposal put forward by HyD was not helpful for wheelchair users and people with mobility difficulties. It also gave the public an impression that HD was very irresponsible. She commented that if there was no suitable government land, the department concerned might resort to recovery of non-government land by virtue of the Lands Resumption Ordinance in



order to take forward the works. Therefore, she hoped that HyD would proactively identify land for adding lifts to both ends of the footbridge;

- (e) Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying supported the proposal for providing lifts. She understood that the proposed project involved the land title issue, but providing lifts at both ends of the footbridge could bring significant benefits to the public. She thus hoped that HyD would make the best endeavour to retrofit a lift at Exit B of the footbridge;
- (f) Mr CHU Lap-wai said that the preliminary design scheme submitted by the HyD could not yield the maximum benefits to the public. He pointed out that since the proposed item would provide connection between the two large housing estates, HyD should not only provide a lift at one end of the footbridge near Lei Tung Estate while neglecting the aspiration of the Yue On Court residents. As such, he hoped that HyD would extend the scope of consultation to collect views from residents of the nearby housing estates such as Yue On Court, with due consideration for the project benefits and proper use of the public money. On the other hand, he suggested that in reviewing its policy, HyD should study the problems encountered by the UA Programme in the Southern District and consider relaxing the policy restrictions;
- (g) Mr LO Kin-hei commended the HyD's representatives for their effort in the proposed project. However, given that HyD was reviewing the relevant policy and there was no urgency with the proposed item, he suggested that the Committee shelve the existing lift design scheme and wait until HyD completed its review before giving further consideration. He also suggested that the Committee issue a letter to the Secretary for Transport and Housing (STH) to relay Members' comments on the UA Programme, including inadequacies of the prevailing policy and invoking the procedure for land resumption, in order to enable the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) to have a good grasp of the problem and introduce a more effective new policy accordingly. Besides, he pointed out that the prevailing policy which required the consent from all land owners before the land could be surrendered to the Government was unrealistic. Regarding the issue of designating the land as an emergency access or for other purposes, he maintained that this could also be resolved upon relaxation of the policy;
- (h) Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH said that as HyD was not able to provide a lift at Exit B of the footbridge for the time being, the whole project should not be implemented in haste. Moreover, she said that apart from considering the provision of lifts at both ends of the footbridge, HyD should also explore the feasibility of providing a completely barrier-free access to connect Lei Tung Estate and Yue On Court;
- (i) Mr TSUI Yuen-wa suggested that HyD make reference to the experience of the lift retrofitting works carried out at the footbridge outside Ocean Court, Aberdeen and take the initiative to conduct consultation in the nearby housing estates so as to address the residents' concern. He

stressed that it would be more appropriate and neutral for the government departments to conduct a consultation; and

- (j) Mr CHAI Man-hon supplemented that Mr AU Nok-hin had collected views on the proposed project from the residents in the vicinity and had been following up the project with the departments concerned. He hoped that this could also be put on record.

15. Ms Julie O gave a consolidated response to Members' comments and enquiries again as follows:

- (a) when HyD conducted district consultation, all relevant stakeholders would be included and so would the Yue On Court residents;
- (b) referring to a Member's offer to help communicate with the residents for HD to release the land, HyD expressed their gratitude and would convey the message to HD accordingly;
- (c) HyD noted all Members' suggestions and comments and would take them into consideration for the purpose of reviewing the scope of the UA Programme; and
- (d) HyD would respect the decision of the Committee as to whether the proposed project should be implemented according to the existing proposal or postponed for further discussion pending completion of the review on the UA Programme,.

16. In closing, the Chairman concluded that it was generally agreed that HyD should provide lifts to the exits at both ends of the Footbridge (Structure No. HKS01) across Lei Tung Estate Road near Tung Sing House, Lei Tung Estate. However, the feasibility of retrofitting a lift to Exit B would require discussion about the land title issue with the relevant departments. The Committee urged HyD to follow up the matter and proactively study the possibility of adding lifts to the exits at both ends of the footbridge. HyD was also asked to report to the Committee once the relevant design scheme was available. Furthermore, the Committee requested HyD to conduct a review of the conditions of the UA Programme in the light of the Committee's views. The Committee would also write to the STH to relay Members' comments on the UA Programme.

[Post-meeting note: The Chairman of T&TC wrote to the STH on 11 April 2019. Details are at *Annex I*.]

**Agenda Item 3: Urging the Government to Expedite the Construction of South Island Line (West)**  
**(Item raised by Mr TSUI Yuen-wa)**  
**(TTC Paper No. 8/2019)**

---

(Mr FUNG Se-goun joined the meeting at 3:44 p.m.)

17. The Chairman said that for Members' information, the written replies from HyD and MTR Corporation Limited (MTRC) were given at Annex 2 and Annex 3 to TTC Paper No. 8/2019 respectively. The relevant sections of HyD and MTRC were unable to assign representatives to attend the meeting owing to other official commitments. The Secretariat would forward Members' views to the departments concerned and MTRC after the meeting.

18. The Chairman invited Mr TSUI Yuen-wa to briefly introduce the agenda item.

19. Mr TSUI Yuen-wa was very disappointed that HyD failed to assign representatives to attend the meeting, and considered that disrespect to SDC. He also pointed out that although HyD had given a written reply in detail, Members were only provided with the reply only a few days before the meeting and hence did not have sufficient time to make the relevant preparations. He further pointed out that the Government had clearly stated that the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate was one of the factors for considering in the construction of South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)), and the redevelopment timetable had already been drawn up. He therefore queried why the Government failed to take forward the construction of SIL(W). Besides, the Government had recommended seven new railway schemes under the "Railway Development Strategy 2014", and invited MTRC to submit proposals for five railway schemes. In other words, those five schemes would be implemented. Although the Government played a dominant role in the railway development, it failed to duly request MTRC to submit a proposal for SIL(W). He was worried that alike South Island Line (East) (SIL(E)), SIL(W) would also take about ten years to construct. It would be difficult to meet the commissioning target proposed in the "Railway Development Strategy 2014" even if the Government resolved to construct SIL(W) immediately. He hoped that the Government would take forward the construction of SIL(W) as soon as possible. Moreover, in order to implement the SIL(E) project back then, the Government adopted the practice of landing financing and granted MTRC the property development rights of the former site of Wong Chuk Hang Estate. He was worried that the same problem would arise in respect of the sites around Wah Fu Estate. He predicted that due to its reluctance to directly invest in the SIL(W) project, the Government might take the land financing approach again and grant MTRC the property development rights of the sites around Wah Fu Estate to MTRC for implementing the project. Hence, he considered that the Committee should be informed of the Government's stance and the funding arrangement for SIL(W). As the residents in the Southern District earnestly looked forward to the construction of SIL(E) back then, SDC had no alternative but to accept the land financing arrangement which involved the former site of Wong Chuk Hang Estate. He also pointed out SDC also hoped that SIL(E) would be constructed underground at that time. However, according to MTRC, the project would take much longer to complete if the tracks were not constructed above the ground. He hoped that the said problems would not arise in the SIL(W) project.

20. The Chairman invited Members to raise comments.

21. Members raised enquiries and comments on the subject which were summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr CHAI Man-hon said that before the submission of written reply by HyD, he had made several attempts to contact the department but in vain. A response was only received from HyD a couple of hours before the meeting and he was unable to obtain sufficient information for discussion. He condemned HyD for its perfunctory attitude. He pointed out that as regards SIL(W), the papers of both Town Planning Board (TPB) and the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council (LegCo) in 2018 stated that the Government would invite MTRC to submit a proposal by the end of 2018. The Government, however, had postponed the project but failed to give the public an explanation. Besides, CEDD had already gazetted the site formation and infrastructure works for public housing developments at Pok Fu Lam South. Also, when addressing the objections, the relevant government officials still responded that the Government would invite MTRC to submit a proposal by the end of 2018, which obviously ran counter to the facts. As such, he hoped that the departments concerned would give a clear account of the current progress of the SIL(W) project;
- (b) Mr LO Kin-hei expressed disappointment over HyD's failure to assign representatives to attend the meeting. Moreover, he said that according to the Government, MTRC would be invited to submit a proposal by the end of 2018. However, it was not until March 2019 when a Member submitted the agenda item for discussion at the meeting did HyD indicate that MTRC had not been invited to submit a proposal yet. That was unsatisfactory. Besides, the government officials still gave a response inconsistent with the facts when addressing the objections to the gazettal of the site formation and infrastructure works for public housing developments at Pok Fu Lam South. As such, he requested the departments concerned to clarify. He also suggested that SDC reject HyD's future request for consultation with the Council, if any, as a form of punishment;
- (c) Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP was of the view that it would be meaningless even if HyD sent representatives to attend the meeting. Nevertheless, he expressed regret at the absence of representatives from HyD at the meeting. He criticised that the Government's "Railway Development Strategy 2014" was a lie. The Government used the construction of SIL(W) as a pretext to lobby SDC and the public to support the developments around Pok Fu Lam. He quoted HyD's written reply that "subject to the pace of development of the area concerned, the Government would timely consider inviting MTRC to submit a proposal for SIL(W)". He questioned when would be a "timely" juncture and in his opinion, it meant that SIL(W) would not be implemented in the foreseeable future. He further pointed out that the rezoning of five sites for public housing developments at Pok Fu Lam South had already been approved by TPB, and funding application was expected to be made to LegCo in 2019. Also, the relevant departments were making preparations for the commencement of the site formation works. He therefore considered that it was the most opportune time to implement SIL(W) at the present stage. He

proposed that the Chairman should request the departments concerned to explain when would be a “timely” juncture in writing after the meeting. Also, he questioned whether the authorities would only invite MTRC to submit a proposal upon completion of all residential developments. He said that the Government failed to take up the responsibility. It had indicated time and again in the past that SIL(W) would be constructed, but no progress had been made over the years. The Government had also failed to implement the SIL(W) project and redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate in parallel;

- (d) Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH said that Member raised the agenda item at a fitting time, but HyD failed to report on the progress of the SIL(W) project in a timely manner. He said that HyD should respect SDC and send representatives to attend the meeting, so as to gather Members’ views and respond to questions. Therefore, he expressed discontent and regrets over the absence of HyD’s representatives at the meeting. He pointed out that the Committee should make its stance clear on major issues including the construction of SIL(W). In this connection, he suggested that Members’ views be relayed to the Chief Executive or Chief Secretary for Administration in writing. He agreed with the views of Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP that the Government deceived the public. When the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate was being taken forward, SDC had clearly stated that the SIL(W) project must be implemented in parallel. However, HyD currently indicated in the written reply that it would “timely consider” implementing the project, which was indeed irresponsible and unacceptable. He considered that it was the most opportune time to request MTRC to submit a proposal at the present moment. Finally, as many procedures including consultation were involved in the planning of SIL(W), he hoped that Members would make concerted efforts to compel the Government to report on the timetable and progress before the expiry of the current District Council term;
- (e) Mr Angus WONG expressed strong condemnation for HyD’s failure to send representatives to attend the meeting and considered that HyD failed to dispel public worries with the written reply. Moreover, HyD stated that the implementation of SIL(W) depended on the traffic needs of the district. However, the local traffic needs would significantly increase owing to several major developments in the district in future, including the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate and overhaul of Aberdeen Market. He therefore could not understand why the Government had not yet invited MTRC to submit a proposal. As such, he urged the Government to invite MTRC to submit a proposal as soon as possible, with a view to implementing the entire South Island Line. He also requested the Government to explain why the public were not informed of the revised timetable of the SIL(W) project;
- (f) Mr TSUI Yuen-wa pointed out that HyD indicated in the written reply that the objective of a railway development project was to “maximise development potential in the vicinities”. The Government had relaxed

the restrictions on development of the areas around Pok Fu Lam in recent years. In this connection, he enquired whether it meant that there would be more residential or commercial developments to facilitate the implementation of SIL(W) if the restrictions could be further relaxed in future. He was worried that similar to the ex-Wong Chuk Hang Estate site, the site of Wah Fu Estate would also be used for land financing. Hence, he hoped that SDC would be alert and make its stance clear. He stressed that the former site of Wah Fu Estate should be exclusively used for public housing development, and would strongly object to the use of this site for land financing purpose. Besides, the Government had stated that a new public housing estate would be constructed at the former site of Wong Chuk Hang Estate for rehousing the residents of Wah Fu Estate affected by redevelopment in future. This proposal, however, was eventually overturned by the Executive Council. Therefore, he agreed that the Committee should write to the senior government officials to express its views and copy the meeting minutes to them, so that they would know the Committee's stance and opposition to the arrangement for land financing;

- (g) Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying said that SDC had been lobbying for the construction of SIL(W) for many years. Yet, HyD failed to assign representatives to attend the meeting and listen to Members' views. She understood other Members' discontent and agreed that the views should be conveyed to the departments concerned in writing;
- (h) Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that the residents in Pok Fu Lam were discontent with the further delay in the SIL(W) project. He agreed that the Committee should issue a letter to THB to request it to explain the reasons for project delay. Besides, he pointed out that the proposed alignment of SIL(W) was shown on the map recently prepared by the Lands Department. Therefore, the Committee should also request the Government to provide the relevant information in the letter;
- (i) Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH said she started to actively lobby for the construction of SIL(W) shortly after the commissioning of SIL(E). Although SIL(E) had been commissioned, traffic congestion on the roads to Hong Kong Island from Western Harbour Crossing was still frequent and the overall traffic condition had not been improved. It was therefore necessary to construct SIL(W). Besides, as the site formation and infrastructure works for public housing developments at Pok Fu Lam South had already been gazetted, the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate would definitely proceed. Population around Wah Fu Estate and Aberdeen would substantially increase in future. The Government should therefore work out the plan and implementation timetable for the SIL(W) project as early as possible. Also, she requested the Government to construct SIL(W) in parallel with the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate;
- (j) Ms YAM Pauline said that HyD's respect for SDC was lacking as it

failed to assign representatives to attend the meeting. SDC had been striving for the construction of SIL(W) over the years but no progress had been made so far. Besides, she commented that the authorities should begin the planning of SIL(W) without waiting for the completion of the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate. She also pointed out that a timetable had already been drawn up for the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate, but there was no news on the SIL(W) project yet. She therefore enquired the Government of the reasons for not planning for redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate and SIL(W) project in parallel, and requested concurrent implementation of these projects; and

- (k) Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH said that SDC had all along been looking forward to the concurrent implementation of the SIL(W) project and redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate. She continued that it was a general practice for the Government to make road and infrastructure planning before carrying out district developments. Therefore, she considered that the most opportune time to plan the alignment of SIL(W) had come. She was disappointed at HyD's response that it would timely consider inviting MTRC to submit a proposal for SIL(W). Besides, she agreed that the Committee's views should be forwarded to the relevant government departments in writing.

22. The Chairman invited Members to raise comments or enquiries.

23. Members raised enquiries and comments on the subject again which were summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr CHAI Man-hon said that the Committee did not have confidence in the Government in the subject matter, mainly because it was not elected by the people. Moreover, policy implementation was ineffective due to the lack of communication between the Government and community. He continued that according to the Policy Agenda promulgated by the Chief Executive, it was mentioned in the section of railway development that THB would be responsible for taking forward detailed planning for Hung Shui Kiu Station and SIL(W). It could be seen that the Government planned to construct SIL(W). However, the frontline officials of HyD provided erroneous information in their reply and the Committee had been misled. As such, he hoped that the relevant officials would conduct a review. Besides, HyD did not respond whether the SIL(W) project and redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate would be delinked. However, the Government had indicated that the future development projects (e.g. East Lantau Metropolis) would not adopt the old development model, i.e. the traffic needs would only be considered upon completion of district developments. He held the view that the SIL(W) project should be planned according to the population growth. As there was no representative from HyD to clarify the said matters at the meeting, he hoped that HyD would state in writing that the planning of SIL(W) would not be delinked from the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate after the meeting;

- (b) Mr LO Kin-hei criticised HyD and the Housing Department (HD) for adopting a compartmentalized attitude and passing the buck to each other, even though these two departments were both under THB. On one hand, HD stated that railway development fell beyond its purview and was unable to reserve land because the SIL(W) project had yet to be implemented. On the other hand, HyD indicated that as the residents of the proposed residential developments had not moved in yet, it had difficulties in precisely estimating the population growth and thereby could not work out the railway planning. As a result, the SIL(W) project was delayed time and again. He urged the STH to explain to the public the project progress;
- (c) Mr AU Lap-sing, MH said that the residents of Wah Fu Estate were very concerned about the progress of the SIL(W) project. At a workshop on reprovisioning of Wah Fu Estate organised by HD earlier, the residents had made proposals for the locations of the stations, but the HD representatives did not give a clear response. He also pointed out that according to TD and HyD, the population would remain unchanged upon the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate because the existing residents of Wah Fu Estate would be rehoused to Kai Lung Wan. He was worried that not all of the five sites at Pok Fu Lam South would be used for public housing developments, and some sites might be reserved for other purposes. However, if all the sites concerned would be used for public housing developments, it had become timely to plan for the SIL(W), given that it would take three to five years to complete the railway planning and study; and
- (d) Mr TSUI Yuen-wa understood other Members' discontent. However, he considered that HyD had given a written reply in a more detailed and concrete manner. He hoped that the Government would invite MTRC to submit a proposal after completing the official procedures. Moreover, he believed that land financing was a great incentive for MTRC as it could make more profits for its shareholders. Given the past record of SIL(E), he was worried that the financial arrangement of SIL(W) would also be determined by the highest echelon of the Government without consulting LegCo and the public. He hoped that the site of Wah Fu Estate would not be developed into a luxury residential area, in order to protect the interest of the grassroots.

24. In closing, the Chairman said he understood Members' request for the construction of SIL(W) and discontent with the absence of representatives from the relevant government departments at the meeting. He would write to THB after the meeting to relay the Committee's discontent and views, as well as urging THB to give an account of the progress of the SIL(W) project.

[Post-meeting note: The Chairman of T&TC wrote to the STH on 10 April 2019, and THB replied on 18 April 2019. The details are given at *Annex 2 and 3* respectively.]

#### **Agenda Item 4: Bus Route Planning Programme for Southern District 2019-2020**

---



**(Item raised by Transport Department)**  
**(TTC Paper No. 9/2019)**

---

25. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives of TD and bus companies to the meeting:

- (a) Mr YEUNG Chun-wing, Senior Transport Officer/Bus/HK1, TD;
- (b) Mr MOK Chun-hei, Transport Officer/Bus/HK1, TD;
- (c) Mr Simon WONG, Planning & Scheduling Manager, Citybus Limited (CTB)/New World First Bus Services Ltd. (NWFB);
- (d) Mr Calvin WONG, Senior Planning Officer, CTB/NWFB;
- (e) Mr Kevin LI, Public Affairs Manager, CTB/NWFB;
- (f) Mr Dick YIK, Assistant Operations Manager, NWFB; and
- (g) Mr Philip WONG, Operations Manager (Dept. One), CTB.

26. The Chairman invited Mr YEUNG Chun-wing to brief Members on the agenda item.

27. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation (TTC Paper No. 9/2019), Mr YEUNG Chun-wing briefly introduced the Bus-Bus Interchange (BBI) Scheme and bus route proposals, namely CTB Route Nos. 71 and 99X as well as NWFB Route Nos. 971, 4X and 590, for implementation in the Southern District under the Bus Route Planning Programme (BRPP) for 2019-2020.

28. The Chairman asked Members to raise enquiries and comments on the subject.

29. A number of Members raised enquiries and comments on the proposals, with details summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN did not object to the draft BRPP. However, he was worried that the problem of illegal parking in the vicinity of World-wide House would hinder U-turn movement of CTB Route No. 71 at Connaught Road Central near Pedder Street in the future. Therefore, he asked if TD would consider introducing measures to improve traffic condition at the section of Connaught Road Central between World-wide House and Hang Seng Bank Headquarters, including stringent enforcement of stopping restrictions and widening of the aforesaid turnaround to increase road capacity, etc. Besides, noting that Man Kat Street Bus Terminus would be designated as the terminal of CTB Route No. 71, he enquired TD whether consideration would be given to enhancing the footbridge network across Connaught Road Central, e.g. constructing a new footbridge to connect CTS House and Harbour Building to provide a direct and convenient access to the bus terminus from either Des Voeux Road Central or Connaught Road Central. Lastly, he wished to know the latest development of NWFB Route No. 33X, and asked TD to provide the implementation timetable of this route;
- (b) Mr FUNG Se-goun did not object to the draft BRPP, but was concerned

about the service levels of other local bus routes, namely CTB Route Nos. 72, 6, 6A, 6X and 260. Regarding CTB Route No. 72, given that traffic congestion at Aberdeen Tunnel Toll Plaza had been alleviated since commissioning of the South Island Line (East) (SIL(E)), he suggested cancelling the arrangement for CTB Route No. 72 not to stop at Aberdeen Tunnel Toll Plaza between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays. As for the departures of CTB Route Nos. 6, 6A, 6X and 260 from Stanley, passengers at Bays Area were unable to board the buses as the buses were full, he requested TD to increase the service frequency of the above bus routes during afternoon peak hours and swimming season. On the other hand, in the light of the serious loss of trees after the Typhoon Mangkhut, and coupled with the narrow roads in Bays Area, he urged TD to request the bus companies to deploy single-decker buses as appropriate to provide services to residents in Bays Area. Lastly, in view of the number of traffic accidents involving public buses, he hoped the bus companies could instruct their bus captains to exercise due care on the road, in particular narrow and rugged road sections, so as to reduce the number of traffic accidents, prevent traffic gridlocks and ensure passenger safety;

- (c) Mr AU Lap-sing, MH said that the majority of residents supported the proposed re-routeing of NWFB Route No. 4X to avoid some relatively congested road sections of Queen's Road West and Pok Fu Lam Road, thereby reducing journey time;
- (d) Mr AU Nok-hin criticised the draft BRPP for its lack of foresight, which would even lead to deterioration of bus services. He expressed discontent with the arrangement for CTB Route No. 99X because TD had failed to take into account the working hours of residents and had reduced residents' choices of transportation. He suggested that TD and the bus companies consider incorporating other routes that had been discussed and assessed over the past years in the current BRPP, including redeployment of buses from Cross-Harbour Tunnel (XHT) Route No. 671 to Route No. 671X and introduction of XHT Route No. 176. He requested TD and the bus company to reconsider the introduction of XHT Route No. 671X. He noted that the bus company had no plan to regularise the service of CTB Route No. NA10 so far. Despite residents' complaint about the excessively high fare, the bus company should nevertheless regularise that overnight airport bus service for residents in the Southern District as well as the Central and Western District as soon as possible;
- (e) Mr LO Kin-hei said that the cancellation of the special departure of CTB Route No. 99X from Main Street, Ap Lei Chau at 7:55 a.m. would cause inconvenience to residents. He considered that notwithstanding that some passengers could take a bus departing at other times, that arrangement might not necessarily satisfy passenger demand. He suggested TD adjust the headways of CTB Route Nos. 99 and 99X in the morning to meet the specific needs of passengers. As for XHT Route No. 671X, he pointed out that such proposal had

been discussed for years, and stressed that to achieve the objective, all TD had to do was to redeploy one or two buses in the existing fleet operating on XHT Route No. 671 to XHT Route No. 671X during morning peak hours. Noting that XHT Route No. 671X was not supported by the Eastern District Council (EDC), he commented that as Ap Lei Chau would be designated as the starting point of this route, TD should give priority to the aspirations of residents in the Southern District. He continued that as a number of existing bus routes operating in the vicinity of North Point overlapped with XHT Route No. 671, the impact of an insignificant reduction in the number of vehicles operating on XHT Route No. 671 on passengers travelling to and from North Point should be minimal. Besides, he pointed out that CTB Route No. NA10 might also stop at the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (HZMB) Hong Kong Port to increase patronage which would be conducive to the regularization of the service and fare reduction;

- (f) Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH said that following discussion with TD on the arrangement for CTB Route No. 99X in February 2019, she had conducted a site inspection with the representatives of the bus company to assess the operational efficiency of bus departures at 7:45 a.m. and 7:55 a.m., which had revealed a very steady patronage of 73 and 62 passengers respectively. Besides, in the course of inspection, she had collected views from some passengers and found that passengers preferred departure at 7:45 a.m. to avoid traffic congestion. In view of this, she said that TD should not cancel departures on the ground of low occupancy rate, which would disrupt residents' daily lives. In addition, she welcomed the fare concessions provided under the BBI Scheme, and enquired about the implementation timetable;
- (g) Ms CHAN Judy Kapui welcomed the bus company's efforts to take into account the travel habits of residents when adjusting the service frequency of NWFB Route No. 590 during peak hours by adding two departures at 8:30 a.m. and 9:00 a.m.. However, the cancellation of off-peak service of NWFB Route No. 590 from Monday to Friday would cause inconvenience to other passengers. She criticised TD for failing to provide point-to-point bus services as an alternative during off-peak periods. She continued that if the bus companies had adequate resources, TD's traffic and transport strategies should not be tilted in favour of the railway system. Instead, it should review and enhance bus services. Taking NWFB Route No. 590A cancelled years ago as an example, she had suggested that the bus company adopt CTB Route No. 90 as an alternative, but the bus company had yet to report to Members on their findings. As for NWFB Route No. 595, the situation of lost trips had seen no improvement over the years. In this regard, she enquired TD about the possibility of redeploying the buses saved from the reduction in the number of buses operating on NWFB Route No. 590 to NWFB Route No. 595, so as to improve the lost trip situation of NWFB Route No. 595. Lastly, she emphasised that the bus companies should duly take into account residents' needs instead of

merely focusing on considerations such as patronage and profit when preparing the BRPP;

- (h) Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP said that BRPP prepared by TD contained quite a number of proposals for bus route planning, but proposals for service enhancement were relatively limited. Besides, the communication between TD, the bus companies and relevant Members on the proposals before the meeting was conducive to resolving differences. He hoped that the upcoming term of SDC could step up communication with TD to improve bus services in the district in a concerted effort. Regarding NWFB Route No. 4X, he expressed support for the re-routeing proposal which could help tackle issues such as the keen demand for green minibus (GMB) Route Nos. 22, 23 and 23M and a serious shortage of drivers. He also welcomed the BBI Scheme, but considered that there was still room for improvement. Citing NWFB Route No. 38 as an example, he pointed out that although passengers interchanging for other routes at the en-route stop at Aberdeen Tunnel Toll Plaza were entitled to fare concession, it was difficult for them to board the buses as they were already full, thus preventing them from enjoying the interchange concession. Therefore, he suggested relocating the interchange to the en-route stop at Aberdeen Praya Road, which could benefit many residents. Lastly, he wished to know the alternative traffic arrangements after cancellation of the overnight service of GMB Route No. 31;
- (i) Mr Angus WONG was glad to see frequency improvement in NWFB Route No. 590 in the morning. He continued that there was still a strong demand for off-peak bus services from passengers travelling to and from South Horizons and Wan Chai. He hoped that TD and the bus company could explore the feasibility of extending CTB Route No. 90 to South Horizons as soon as possible. He also welcomed the BBI Scheme. Considering that the Scheme could provide a wider choice of bus routes for passengers, he looked forward to its early implementation and requested TD to provide the implementation timetable. However, he was worried that upon implementation of the Scheme, there would be a drastic increase in the patronage of some bus routes such as CTB Route No. 70A. He requested the bus companies to consider increasing the service frequency. In addition, he urged TD and the bus company to regularise the service of CTB Route No. NA10. Given an increase in patronage after the extension of the route to the HZMB Hong Kong Port, there should be room for downward fare adjustment. He continued to request for introduction of the long-awaited bus routes between the business areas in Kowloon East and the Southern District. Lastly, he suggested enhancing bus services operating between the Eastern District and the Southern District, e.g. adjusting the headway of CTB Route No. 77A;
- (j) Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying said that TD should enhance services of a number of bus routes operating in Stanley and Shek O. Regarding

bus stop facilities, TD should expeditiously make improvement to the bus stop at Wong Ma Kok Road near Chek Chue Barracks which posed potential danger to passengers. As for bus services, since the buses of NWFB Route No. 9 running between Shau Kei Wan and Big Wave Bay were often packed with visitors, she urged TD to explore improvement measures and consider increasing service frequency during school finishing times to bring convenience to students. Also, she pointed out that notwithstanding that the bus company had switched to double-decker buses for NWFB Route No. 63, the problem of insufficient seating capacity was still unsolved. The elderly often had to stand on the bus. She urged TD to consider frequency improvement for the above bus route;

- (k) Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH regretted that the draft BRPP contained too few service enhancement proposals. In November 2018, she had, together with Ms CHAN Judy Kapui and Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH, recommended TD to extend the catchment of CTB Route No. N90 to Kennedy Town. But there was no reply from TD so far. Moreover, TD had failed to put forward improvement proposals to address the lost trip problem of NWFB Route No. 595 and turned a deaf ear to Members' suggestion for introducing a new bus route plying between South Horizons and Stanley Market. She elaborated that in fact, NWFB had introduced a bus route plying between South Horizons and Stanley Market in 1991, but that route had ceased operation in 2008 purportedly due to inadequate resources. She requested TD and the bus company to consider providing bus services operating between South Horizons and Stanley with the buses redeployed from NWFB Route No. 590;
- (l) Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH shared Ms CHAN Judy Kapui's views on the bus services in Ap Lei Chau, and agreed that TD should plan for increasing the service frequency of NWFB Route No. 590 in the morning. However, he considered that when implementing the proposals, TD and the bus companies should establish an observation period to ensure that the arrangements were able to achieve the desired results;
- (m) Mr TSUI Yuen-wa said that notwithstanding that local residents in Wong Chuk Hang did not have strong objection to the re-arrangement of CTB Route No. 71, there were other views for TD's consideration. Since the peak-hour traffic condition at Man Kat Street might affect journey time, he suggested to TD operating the new service on a trial basis for a period of about one month to assess the operational efficiency of the route concerned; if proven successful, the proposal could be formally implemented. Furthermore, to meet passenger demand in the vicinity of Sham Wan and boost patronage, it was proposed to extend CTB Route No. 71 to Sham Wan Bus Terminus. Subject to consent of TD, consideration should be given to offering sectional fares to passengers boarding at the en-route stop at Wah Fu Road, with a view to boosting patronage of CTB Route No. 71 and

redistributing passengers of CTB Route No. 48. Finally, he asked whether the paper suggested that the existing service frequency of CTB Route No. 71 with a 15 to 20-minute headway between 5:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. would remain unchanged;

- (n) Ms YAM Pauline said that TD should consider increasing the service frequency of CTB Route No. 70A in the evening. She pointed out that the bus company had merely provided scheduled bus service at 5:55 p.m. and 6:30 p.m., but the buses of both departures simply did not get enough passengers. Presumably quite many residents could not leave work at 6:00 p.m. As such, she suggested that TD find out the time slots or departures with the highest occupancy rate by providing additional departures at 7:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. before making adjustment. Besides, she had received public complaints about the outdated compartment facilities. It was mentioned in the paper that to improve service quality, franchised bus companies had included air-conditioning system, Octopus card payment system, low-floor entrance/exit, environmentally-friendly engine and two-by-two seats as standard facilities on their new buses. She questioned that the existing buses operating in the Southern District had yet to be equipped with the above new facilities, and urged the bus companies to be mindful of that;
- (o) Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH shared Ms YAM Pauline's view and asked TD to increase the service frequency of CTB Route No. 70 because scheduled bus service with a 20-minute headway during certain time slots was not able to meet the demand of passengers along the route. Citing departures from Wah Kwai Estate as an example, she said that as the buses were nearly full when they arrived at Tin Wan, passengers at the en-route stop at Aberdeen had no choice but to choose other bus routes. This situation was far from desirable. Moreover, she said that as the majority of residents were opposed to the proposed re-routeing of NWFB Route No. 4X, it was hoped that TD could take into account public views. Lastly, she suggested that TD should consider providing more BBI concessions, so as to benefit the elderly and many commuters who opted not to use the railway system;
- (p) Mr CHAI Man-hon was delighted that TD had eventually implemented the BBI Scheme after years of discussion, and pointed out that the fare concessions, if implemented in the early years, would have been even more well-received by the residents. He looked forward to the early implementation of the Scheme, preferably before the start of the school year in September 2019, in order to give passengers a wider choice. As for the routes covered by the Scheme, he suggested including bus routes via Nam Fung Road, and that the bus companies should not confine the offer of BBI concessions to one or two selected en-route stops. It was suggested using the memory of Octopus card to calculate fare concession, so as to attract the passengers to use bus service. Besides, he said that TD and the bus company should make good use of resources by resuming the operation of NWFB Route No.

399 plying between Ap Lei Chau and Stanley during holidays or summer holidays. As for CTB Route No. 90, TD might also consider extending the route, say, via South Horizons or via Ap Lei Chau Estate Bus Terminus for access to South Horizons, so as to enhance the service and minimise the impact on passengers. Regarding the proposed re-routeing of NWFB Route No. 4X, he was worried that the half-baked proposal would affect the passengers' travel habits and waiting time. Therefore, he objected to that proposal; and

- (q) the Chairman agreed that the benefits of the BBI Scheme to passengers were manifold. Also, he said that residents had complained about buses of CTB Route No. 70 skipping the en-route stop at Tin Wan Street during peak hours. As such, he urged TD to pay attention to this and requested the bus company to remind the relevant bus captains.

30. Mr YEUNG Chun-wing gave a consolidated response to Members' enquiries and comments as follows:

- (a) as regards the arrangement for CTB Route No. 71, TD would closely monitor the traffic condition of road sections the route operated. If the bus company deemed re-routeing necessary, TD would conduct a detailed assessment and explore feasible improvement proposals accordingly. To access Man Kat Street Bus Terminus, members of the public could use the footbridges connecting Infinitus Plaza and Two Chinachem Plaza. Both footbridges had been retrofitted with escalators. As there were not too many passengers boarding and alighting at Wing Wo Street Bus Terminus, TD believed the existing footbridge system would be able to meet public demand travelling between Man Kat Street Bus Terminus and the vicinity of Central;
- (b) trial operation of NWFB Route No. 33X was still underway. Depending on the trial results, the route would be introduced as soon as possible;
- (c) TD had received the email from Mr FUNG Se-goun and would give a written response later;
- (d) the bus company had conducted site inspection on CTB Route No. 99X, upon collection of the latest data, TD would review the proposal concerned and take into account Members' views;
- (e) TD noted that Members had proposed the introduction of XHT Route No. 671X as early as the commissioning of SIL(E), and that XHT Route No. 671 was a jointly operated route, TD was exploring the feasibility of the route proposed by Members in collaboration with the two bus companies;
- (f) TD was aware that Members' prime concern was the excessively high fare of CTB Route No. NA10. In fact, TD had all along urged the bus company to take into account Members' views. With the

commissioning of the HZMB, the service of CTB Route No. NA10 had been altered. In this regard, TD would request the bus company to consider downward fare adjustment or offer additional fare concessions to passengers;

- (g) TD noted Members' views on the BBI Scheme, and understood that Members looked forward to its early implementation. TD would discuss with the bus companies with a view to implement the Scheme in 2019. As for the proposed addition of interchange en-route stops, TD would ask the bus companies to take note of the view and consider the proposal in resources and operational perspectives;
- (h) TD and the bus company had revised the proposal in response to Members' views on the service frequency of NWFB Route No. 590 during morning peak hours. However, as regards its service frequency during afternoon off-peak hours, given the low patronage, the availability of alternative transport means (e.g. SIL) and the soon-to-be-launched BBI Scheme, TD was of the view that the current proposal was able to meet the commuting needs of residents in South Horizons. Regarding the suggestion to monitor the patronage of the route for a longer period by a Member, TD would consider;
- (i) TD noted the Member's proposal on the re-routeing of CTB Route No. 90 via South Horizons. Nevertheless, given the frequency reduction of NWFB Route No. 590 as a result of low patronage, the re-routeing of CTB Route No. 90 would contradict with the proposed frequency reduction of NWFB Route No. 590. Therefore, TD had no such plans for the time being;
- (j) the headway of CTB Route No. 71 during morning peak hours was 20 to 30 minutes, while the headway during afternoon peak hours would remain unchanged. As regards Members' proposals on the operation of CTB Route No. 71 and the re-routeing via Sham Wan on a trial basis, TD would like to invite the representatives of the bus companies to give a preliminary response;
- (k) TD noted objection from some Members to the proposed re-routeing of NWFB Route No. 4X. Further discussion with the Members concerned would be made after the meeting; and
- (l) as regards the lost trips of buses, frequency improvement of CTB Route Nos. 70 and 70A, comments on CTB Route No. N90, the proposed introduction of a new bus route plying between South Horizons and Stanley, the deployment of bus resources in the district as well as the problem of CTB Route No. 70 skipping the en-route stop at Tin Wan Street, TD would like to invite the representatives of the bus companies to give a consolidated response.

31. Mr Kevin LI gave a supplementary response to Members' comments and enquiries as follows:



- (a) the bus company was conducting trial run of NWFB Route No. 33X after the recent commissioning of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass. If the trial run was proven successful, TD would put NWFB Route No. 33X into service as soon as possible; and
- (b) regarding Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying's comments on the bus services operating in Stanley and Shek O, a detail explanation would be given after the meeting. As regards public concern about the difficulty in boarding the bus of NWFB Route No. 9 departing from Big Wave Bay at around 5:40 p.m., upon investigation, TD considered that the situation was still acceptable. TD will arrange a follow-up site inspection if situation warrants.

32. Mr Simon WONG gave a supplementary response to Members' comments and enquiries as follows:

- (a) frequency adjustment had been proposed in view of the low patronage of CTB Route No. 99X. However, as the bus company had recently detected a change in patronage, a critical review on the proposal concerned would be conducted;
- (b) he thanked Members for accepting the revised proposal on NWFB Route No. 590 with the latest service schedule geared to the specific needs of the majority of commuters;
- (c) in response to Members' concerns on the impact of the traffic condition in the vicinity of Central on the departures of CTB Route No. 71 from Rumsey Street, the bus company was aware that the overall traffic condition in Central had improved upon commissioning of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass, and would continue to closely monitor the operation of the route concerned. As for Members' suggestion to extend the route to Sham Wan, the bus company had to consider the possibility of a reduction in service frequency and availability of space at Sham Wan Bus Terminus to accommodate the route concerned, which would also be designated as the terminating point of CTB Route No. A17 as proposed in the BRPP for 2018-19;
- (d) passengers of NWFB Route No. 4X would alight at places other than Wah Fu area and there were a number of alternative routes. In the future, the BBI concessions would be applicable to quite many routes via Wah Fu Estate at the en-route stop at Queen Mary Hospital for offering greater convenience to passengers travelling between the Central and Western District and Wah Fu;
- (e) regarding Members' comments on service levels of bus routes, including CTB Route Nos. 6, 6X, 260 and 70A as well as NWFB Route No. 595, the bus companies would keep tabs on the operation of the above routes and make adjustments as and when necessary; and

- (f) the bus company would keep an open mind on the proposed re-routing of some departures of XHT Route No. 671 via the Eastern Harbour Crossing. However, since that route was jointly operated with The Kowloon Motor Bus Co. (1933) Ltd. (KMB), it was necessary to reach a consensus with KMB before submitting the proposal to TD for consideration. The process took time.

33. A number of Members raised further enquiries and comments on the subject, with details summarised as follows:

- (a) Mr AU Lap-sing, MH said that since KMB had offered BBI concessions for a number of routes at Tai Lam Tunnel, he had recommended other bus companies to follow suit by offering BBI concessions in the Southern District. The bus companies concerned had eventually decided to offer BBI concessions on a substantial scale at the en-route stops at Queen Mary Hospital and Aberdeen Tunnel Toll Plaza for the convenience of residents. In particular, he expressed gratitude to TD for significantly saving the waiting time of passengers interchanging at the en-route stop at Queen Mary Hospital;
- (b) Mr CHU Lap-wai did not object to the proposed re-routing of NWFB Route No. 971 because the addition of one vehicle would bring convenience to residents as well. However, he drew the bus company's attention to the frequent missing trips of NWFB Route No. 971 departing at 8:10 a.m. As it was a popular departure, he requested the bus company to address the lost trip problem in a pragmatic manner. On the other hand, he had expressed disappointment at the lack of bus route proposals relating to Shek Yue area under the BRPP. He reiterated that given that except for several departures of CTB Route No. 70P, there were no regular bus routes plying between Shek Yue area and other districts via the Aberdeen Tunnel. The bus company was requested to consider including special departures of bus routes such as CTB Route Nos. 77 and 99 via Shek Yue area in next year's BRPP, so as to bring convenience to residents;
- (c) Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH hoped that TD would consider converting CTB Route No. A10 to a 24-hour route with the cancellation of CTB Route No. NA10. Despite that CTB Route No. 90 was not covered by the BRPP, on behalf of the residents in Ap Lei Chau Estate, she wished to raise objection to the proposed re-routing of CTB Route No. 90 via South Horizons;
- (d) Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH requested that either the frequency schedule of CTB Route No. 99X should remain unchanged or the frequency reduction proposal be shelved in the light of the steady patronage in recent months. Moreover, given that the route was intended to serve the entire Ap Lei Chau area instead of residents living at Main Street, Ap Lei Chau, indeed there was much demand for the service;

- (e) Mr AU Nok-hin said that in view of the widespread public criticism against the excessively high fare of CTB Route No. NA10, sectional fare should be implemented as early as practicable. Under this proposed arrangement, CTB Route No. NA10 would be designated as an alternative route via Pok Fu Lam Road to compensate for the shortage of bus resources in the district and enhance versatility of bus services. He was aware that XHT Route No. 671X was a jointly operated route, but commented that if the bus companies were determined to carry out a reform, the redeployment of vehicles from XHT Route No. 671 to the new Route No. 671X would not encounter many difficulties. Regarding CTB Route No. 99X, he considered that the frequency reduction proposal was not well thought out because quite many residents who had to start work at 9:00 a.m. would arrive at North Point Government Offices between about 8:30 a.m. and 8:40 a.m. if they boarded the bus departing at 7:55 a.m.. That departure might not be so agreeable to some residents. Therefore, it was hoped that the bus company could consider rescheduling that departure at about 8:00 a.m. to attract more passengers. Besides, despite the low patronage of CTB Route No. 99X, the bus company might consider deploying buses with a length of less than 12 metres or single-deckers to operate on this route;
- (f) Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that TD had yet to respond to his two questions: first, whether TD would construct a new footbridge to connect CTS House and Harbour Building; and second, whether TD would enforce stopping restrictions at the turnaround of World-wide House, e.g. prohibiting vehicles from loading/unloading goods during peak hours, to facilitate the passage of bus traffic, thereby reducing the likelihood of erratic bus services as a result of traffic obstruction;
- (g) Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying said that TD had yet to respond to her aspirations raised on behalf of the residents. She thus reiterated the request for the following: (1) re-routeing NWFB Route No. 14 via Ma Hang Estate throughout the day, omitting the en-route stop at Stanley Fort for the convenience of the residents in Tai Tam and Red Hill Peninsula, routeing via Stanley Plaza for access to Stanley Fort and increasing service frequency during afternoon peak hours; (2) frequency improvement for NWFB Route No. 65, especially on Saturday afternoon and Sunday; (3) frequency improvement for special departures of CTB Route Nos. 6X and 973 between 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.; (4) the 15 to 30-minute headway of NWFB Route No. 9 remain unchanged, set up priority queues for the elderly and installation of bus shelter; (5) implementation of sectional fare for CTB Route No. 260; (6) frequency improvement for CTB Route No. 314 during holidays; (7) implementation of sectional fare for CTB Route No. 973 starting from Aberdeen and installation of luggage racks inside bus compartment; (8) provision of Octopus interchange discount for CTB Route No. 6X starting from the Ocean Park and Aberdeen; and (9)

introduction of special departures of CTB Route No. 73 via Ma Hang Estate to pick up students and commuters;

- (h) Mr LO Kin-hei said that with the approach of Easter holidays, there would be an apparent passenger demand for CTB Route No. NA10. He suggested that the bus company should consider lowering the fare of CTB Route No. NA10 in the long run, or alternatively, implementing fare reduction on a trial basis or offering fare discount for special departures to gauge public reaction. Given that the existing routeing of NWFB Route No. 4X had overlapped with that of NWFB Route Nos. 91 and 94 in Central, residents had all along complained about the undesirable services of NWFB Route Nos. 91 and 94 because the buses were often fully occupied due to inadequate services. In view of the high patronage of alternative routes, he was worried that the re-routeing of NWFB Route No. 4 might affect passengers of other bus routes. He hoped that TD and the bus company could reconsider the re-routeing proposal. As regards CTB Route No. 99X, he suggested that the bus company should look into the headway of this route. Lastly, after years of discussion on XHT Route No. 671X, presumably residents in Ap Lei Chau would not have strong objection to that proposal. He considered the proposed route worthy of implementation and hoped to see its eventual implementation;
- (i) Mr CHAI Man-hon said that as the existing routeing of NWFB Route No. 4X had been designed by TD, it should have foreseen the overlapping service with NWFB Route No. 4. It had been previously suggested that Central should be designated as the terminal of NWFB Route No. 4. He deemed it feasible, thereby obviating the need to redeploy existing resources of the route. He continued that although bus routes plying between Kennedy Town, Wah Fu and nearby areas (such as CTB Route No. 43M) had been providing alternative services, residents had all along been complaining about the inadequate services. Yet it seemed the bus companies were not very interested in taking up the operation of bus routes plying through Victoria Road, resulting in a decline of public transport feeder services operating between Kennedy Town and Wah Fu. He questioned why the bus company had failed to consider improving the service of CTB Route No. 43M but proposed the re-routeing of NWFB Route No. 4X instead. In his opinion, it was not the right time to re-route NWFB Route No. 4X as that would only arouse public skepticism that the bus company intended to pave way for substantial service reduction or even cancellation of CTB Route No. 43M. Besides, in 2016, TD had proposed frequency improvement for NWFB Route No. 4X. However, the bus company had time and again delayed its implementation and did not even provide service on holidays. The patronage had dropped a level that did not require frequency improvement. If the proposed re-routeing of NWFB Route No. 4X was not properly handled, it would risk even greater repercussions. Lastly, he requested TD and the bus companies to implement the BBI Scheme as soon as possible to benefit the public. In doing so, the bus company should be given credit for this; and

- (j) as regards the proposed re-routing of CTB Route No. 71 via Sham Wan, Mr TSUI Yuen-wa understood that there might not be adequate departure bays at Sham Wan Bus Terminus, and hence suggested that the buses return to the bus terminus at Nam Long Shan Road after passing through Sham Wan, in the same way as CTB Route No. 71P. This could not only avoid overburdening the existing departure bays but also help improve bus services during afternoon peak hours. If successfully implemented, both the bus company and passengers would benefit.

34. Mr YEUNG Chun-wing gave a consolidated response to Members' enquiries and comments as follows:

- (a) TD thanked the Committee for its support for the BBI Scheme;
- (b) regarding the lost trip problem of NWFB Route No. 971 in the morning, TD would request the bus company to take follow-up action after the meeting. Under the proposal on NWFB Route No. 971, the deployment of an additional double-decker bus would help improve its services;
- (c) TD was aware of residents' aspiration for downward fare adjustment of CTB Route No. NA10 and would continue to discuss with the bus company on fare arrangements. TD would endeavour to regularise the service of the route as soon as possible;
- (d) TD was aware of Members' aspiration that the bus company could express its stance on the proposal on CTB Route No. 99X. However, whether or not to implement a proposal required consultation with relevant District Councils, e.g. CTB Route No. 99X would involve EDC as well. Therefore, TD would like to conduct further assessment after hearing views from various parties. In addition, in view of the stabilised patronage of CTB Route No. 99X, TD would further discuss whether to maintain the existing proposal after the bus company had collected more information. TD noted Members' suggestions on the fine-tuning of headways and deployment of bus models, and would exercise prudence in handling them;
- (e) given the commissioning of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass, TD considered the proposed U-turn movement of CTB Route No. 71 at Pedder Street feasible. Moreover, given the comprehensive footbridge system in Central, passengers from CTS House could access Harbour Building and the new terminating point of CTB Route No. 71 via the footbridge after ascending the escalator inside Infinitus Plaza or Two Chinachem Plaza. TD considered that the existing footbridge system connecting Man Kat Street could provide convenience for passengers of CTB Route No. 71;

- (f) in response to Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying's requests, TD had already prepared a written reply and would follow up with Members after the meeting; and
- (g) regarding CTB Route No. 4X, TD was aware of Members' concerns that even if there were alternative services operating between Central and Wah Fu during afternoon peak hours, they might not be adequate to meet passenger demand. TD would request the bus company to actively consider deploying additional resources to provide direct alternative services for the affected passengers.

35. Mr Simon WONG gave a consolidated response to Members' enquiries and comments as follows:

- (a) the bus company undertook to conduct a detailed review of the proposal on CTB Route No. 99X and noted Members' comments on frequency adjustment;
- (b) regarding the lost trip problem of NWFB Route No. 971 in the morning, the bus company was confident that the deployment of an additional vehicle would help improve reliability of bus service; and
- (c) upon the recent commissioning of the West Island Line, the bus company had assessed the passenger demand for NWFB Route No. 4X, and frequency for that route had been increased to a 10-minute headway during peak hours. So far, the existing services of NWFB Route Nos. 4 and 4X were able to meet the demand of passengers from Wah Fu Estate for interchanging to the railway at MTR HKU Station.

36. Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH reiterated her request for maintaining the existing service of CTB Route No. 99X without postponing the time for departure. She stressed that a comprehensive consultation had to be carried out for any frequency adjustment.

37. In closing, the Chairman concluded that Members were generally in support of the BBI Scheme. However, they had divergent views on the draft BRPP, in particular NWFB Route No. 4X and CTB Route No. 99X. He invited TD and the bus companies to note Members' comments on other bus routes and bus services operating in the district, and consider revising the proposals under the BRPP, with a view to benefiting residents through service enhancement.

(Mr CHAN Man-chun, JP and Mr FUNG Se-goun left the meeting at 5:15 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. respectively.)

**Agenda Item 5: Progress Report on Previously Discussed Items (as at 28.2.2019)**  
**(TTC Paper No. 10/2019)**

---

38. The Chairman asked Members to give their views on the items in order of

their appearance in the report.

**(A)2 Works of Replacement and Rehabilitation of Water Mains Stage 4 Phase 1**

39. Mr Angus WONG said that the mainlaying works under item (f)(ii) at Aberdeen Praya Road were only 65% complete and enquired whether it could be completed in March 2019 as scheduled.

40. Mr Jimmy LING said that the works involved the laying of two mains that were 60 – 70 metres long. He had enquired the Water Supplies Department (WSD) which indicated that it was confident of completing the work by March 2019.

**(A)3 Proposed Addition of Lifts to Existing Footbridges and Subways in the Southern District**

41. Mr LO Kin-hei said that some items could be deleted from the report. For example, the retrofitting of a lift at item (b) Flyover (H107) across Wong Chuk Hang Road, Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road had been dropped as reported to the Legislative Council, while the lift at item (d) Flyover (H116) at Wong Chuk Hang Road near Nam Fung Road was opened to public on 18 January 2019. It was proposed that these items be deleted.

42. The Chairman noted the Member's comments.

**(A)4 “Universal Accessibility” Programme – Provision of Universal Access Facilities at Public Footbridges, Elevated Walkways and Subways Package 1 – Investigation, Design and Construction**

43. Mr TSUI Yuen-wa said that regarding the works progress of item (c) Footbridge (HF105) across Aberdeen Praya Road near Ocean Court, he learned recently that the completion date would be delayed to April 2019. He had doubt about the statement and urged the relevant department to provide the exact completion date. Besides, as quite a number of people enquired about the completion date of item (b) Footbridge (HF104) across Aberdeen Praya Road near Nam Ning Street, he urged the relevant department to provide the latest progress.

44. Mr Jimmy LING responded that the enquiries about items (b) and (c) would be referred to the section responsible for the UA Programme, which would notify the Member of the latest works progress direct.

45. Ms YAM Pauline said that since Aberdeen Praya Road occupied a vast area, she hoped that WSD could provide the specific locations of the works undertaken. She also hoped to know the latest progress of item (b) Footbridge (HF104) across Aberdeen Praya Road near Nam Ning Street.

46. Mr Jimmy LING responded that he would ask the section responsible for the UA Programme to maintain close liaison with Members and report the latest works progress. Besides, he pointed out that the mainlaying work under item (f)(ii) of Section (A)2 at Aberdeen Praya Road was carried out near Bayshore Apartments.

**(A)6 Request to add a pedestrian crossing facility between Ocean Park Road and Aberdeen Sports Ground**

47. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that pedestrian crossing facilities from the Ocean Park Road to the Aberdeen Sports Ground were lacking. Neither was there a suitable walkway outside the MTR Ocean Park Station. Besides, there was no suitable walkway between Shek O and Big Wave Bay. If the department concerned could not provide a 2 metre-wide walkway that was up to standard, it might as well provide a substandard walkway to reduce the risk. He had repeatedly proposed to TD the addition of pedestrian crossing facilities at the aforesaid locations, but to no avail. He urged TD to follow up.

48. Mr SO Wing-kin responded that he had noted the Member's comments and would follow up with the Member after the meeting.

49. Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying said that there were a lot of visitors to Shek O and Big Wave Bay in recent years. There were also a large number of hikers and cyclists. She enquired whether the department concerned could widen the road or provide walkways when maintaining and repairing the slopes so as to enhance road safety.

50. Mr SO Wing-kin responded that when the relevant department carried out development works in the district, TD would request the department to reserve as much space as possible for the provision of walkways. Wherever possible, TD would continue to make such requests.

**(A)9 Additional Walkway Cover Works at Wong Chuk Hang Public Transport Interchange (WCHPTI)**

51. Mr CHAI Man-hon noted that a site inspection on the additional walkway cover works at WCHPTI would be conducted on 19 March 2019, but would nevertheless like to know the reason for the works delay and suggested that supplementary information about the latest works progress be provided to the public.

52. Ms Crystal WU responded that she would refer the Member's enquiry about the works delay to the Railway Development Office for follow-up and would consider giving an account of the issue by way of post-meeting note.

[Post-meeting note: When the cover construction contract was awarded by MTRCL in January 2019, pre-construction works including application of excavation permit, discussion with bus companies on temporary relocation of bus stops and application of temporary traffic management scheme commenced immediately. After the temporary traffic management scheme was endorsed and the excavation permit was issued, the construction started on 11 April 2019.]

**(A)10 Tai Tam Road (Dam Section) Traffic Signal Arrangement**

53. Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying thanked TD for installing the traffic signal at Tai Tam Road (Dam Section) and said that it could help divert the traffic at Tai Tam Road



and Repulse Bay Road. Since TD indicated that it would conduct a review six months after the commissioning of the traffic signal, she hoped to know the results of the review as early as possible.

54. Mr SO Wing-kin responded that the traffic signals had been in operation for half a year. The review showed that the traffic signal was considered effective in terms of enhancing road safety and traffic flow, and would thus be operated in the long run.

#### **(A)11 Installation of Journey Time Indication System in the Southern District**

55. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH said that TD was assessing the tenders received and enquired when the assessment would be completed and the expected installation date.

56. Mr SO Wing-kin responded that TD would install journey time indicators at Repulse Bay Road. The installation works were expected to commence in the second quarter of 2019 and complete by the end of 2020.

57. Mr LO Kin-hei said that TD had consulted the Committee's views on the design of journey time indicators. He hoped that TD could provide the latest information of the design of journey time indicator to facilitate follow-up and ensure their convenience to the public.

58. Sharing Mr LO Kin-hei's views, Mr CHAI Man-hon said that the public had a lot of comments on some of the existing journey time indicators. He thus hoped to know more about the design of indicators that would be installed.

59. Mr SO Wing-kin responded that he would ask the responsible section to respond to Members direct or provide written supplementary information on the design of journey time indicators.

[Post-meeting note: The design of journey time indicators is at *Annex 4*.]

#### **(B)2 Lost Trip Situation of Bus Services in Southern District**

60. Mr TSUI Yuen-wa said that there was no major problem with the frequency of CTB Route No. 48 in the past, but recently he received quite a number of complaints about the lost trips. He hoped that TD would remind the bus company to be mindful of this.

61. Mr AU Lap-sing, MH said that quite a number of people complained that they had to wait for half an hour for the next departure of CTB Route No. 48 after 8:10 a.m. every day. He believed the lost trip problem might have arisen, and urged TD to be mindful.

62. Mr CHAI Man-hon said that shortage of bus captains was not an acceptable explanation for the lost trip situation. Moreover, as CTB Route No. 48 was a feeder route for MTR station, he urged TD to make improvement as soon as possible. In view of the frequent lost trips of NWFB Route No. 970, he suggested reviewing its

timetable afresh as in the case of NWFB Route No. 42, instead of just relying on measures such as reminding the bus companies or issuing warning letters.

63. Mr LO Kin-hei said that CTB Route No. 98 used to have a good service record, but the recent survey results showed that the actual number of departures fell short of the scheduled number of departures by five. He urged TD to enquire the bus company the reasons for the problem.

64. The Chairman also said that CTB Route No. 70 did not go to Tin Wan Street during peak hours and asked TD to follow up.

65. Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying said that as Stanley was remote, the residents had to rely on the bus services. She urged TD to remind the bus companies to pay attention to the bus services for that area, especially the lost trip problems of CTB Route Nos. 6, 6X and 260, NWFB Route No. 14 as well as XHT Route No. 973.

66. Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP said that lost trips in respect of CTB Route Nos. 37A and 37B as well as NWFB Route No. 38 occurred nearly every month. The situation of CTB Route No. 37A was especially serious as the actual number of departures fell short of the scheduled number of departures by two. He called on TD to study the improvement options. For example, if the lost trip problem caused by its circular route, TD could consider changing it to a non-circular route.

67. Mr Kevin LI gave a consolidated response to Members' enquiries and comments as follows:

- (a) the lost trips of CTB Route No. 48 were mainly due to the relatively high crew shortage rate in December 2018. TD had requested the bus companies to pay more attention to those routes with lower frequencies and deploy resources to ensure their service regularity and shorten the passengers' waiting time;
- (b) TD had noticed the occasional lost trips of NWFB Route No. 970 during the evening peak hours owing to insufficient journey time. TD would review the overall journey time of the route and make reference to the improvement plan made for NWFB Route No. 42. TD had also followed up on the problem of the bus route with the bus company concerned;
- (c) TD noted that some buses of CTB Route No. 70 did not observe the bus stops at the Tin Wan Street during the morning period in January 2019. The bus company concerned had issued notices to remind the bus captains to observe the stops in Tin Wan and each bus captain concerned had been reminded individually. TD found that the situation had already improved in March 2019. TD would keep watch on the situation and follow up as appropriate;
- (d) the lost trip problem of CTB Route No. 98 was mainly due to crew shortage. As for the reasons for lost trips in respect of individual bus routes as mentioned by a Member, TD would respond to the Member

after the meeting after they had studied the problems in detail;

- (e) TD would follow up on the frequencies of buses serving Stanley after the meeting; and
- (f) since CTB Route Nos. 37A and 37B were circular routes, lost trips might occur due to prolonged journey time when the buses went past Central. TD would discuss the improvement options with the bus company.

**(E) Hong Kong Police Force and Transport Department – Southern District Traffic Report of 2019**

68. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that regarding the traffic accident involving pedestrians at Upper Baguio Villa, he had repeatedly requested TD to provide a pedestrian crossing facility there. However, TD had made no active response. He thus requested TD to reconsider providing a pedestrian crossing facility there as soon as possible in order to protect pedestrian safety.

69. Mr HUNG Tsz-hin responded that he had noted the Member's suggestion of providing a pedestrian crossing facility at Upper Baguio Villa and would study the request again.

[Post-meeting note: TD had conducted public consultation on the above suggestion before. It could not be implemented due to residents' objections. TD had tried to identify other appropriate location in the vicinity to provide a pedestrian crossing, but there was no appropriate location due to site constraints.]

70. Mr LO Kin-hei said that several traffic accidents had occurred at the bus stop on Aberdeen Praya Road near Tin Wan Praya Road. Although no serious casualties had been caused, he enquired whether the recurring accidents were due to speeding vehicles or other factors. He enquired whether TD had taken any measures to avoid the reoccurrence of accidents.

71. Mr HUNG Tsz-hin responded that in view of the recurring accidents at the bus stop in Aberdeen Praya Road near Tin Wan Praya Road, TD had arranged with HyD to install a road sign and apply anti-skid dressing to the carriageway there in the first quarter of 2019. TD would further study whether there are other feasible improvement measures that could be carried out for the bus stop. On the other hand, the relevant bus company had repaired the damaged bus stop cover.

72. The Chairman said he learned that TD would ask HyD to provide bollards at the bus stop. He hoped that HyD would commence works as soon as possible to reduce the risk faced by waiting passengers.

[Post-meeting note: To enhance road safety, TD had arranged with HyD to provide energy absorbing bollards at the bus stop. The works is expected to be completed by the end of March 2019.]

73. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN welcomed the provision of bollards at the bus

stop. However, he was of the view that the recurring accidents there were due to vehicular speed. He pointed out that there were several en-route bus stops and turnout lanes on the road section between the traffic lights outside Aberdeen Police Station and the bus stop there. He considered that the speed limit of 70 km/h was still high. Moreover, the speed difference between the left-side and right-side lanes was quite large. Accidents could easily occur when the buses cut across the lane to reach the bus stop. He suggested that the vehicular speed between Aberdeen Police Station and that bus stop should be restricted to 50 km/h and urged TD to implement the measure as soon as possible.

74. Mr HUNG Tsz-hin responded that he noted the Member's comments and would study the suggestion after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: Upon installation of the energy absorbing bollards, anti-skid and traffic signs, TD would review their efficiency and keep in view of the traffic situation.]

75. In view of the accident at Victoria Road near Caritas Wu Cheng-chung Secondary School, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN asked TD and the Police to review the necessity of improving the pedestrian crossing facility there.

76. Mr HUNG Tsz-hin responded that he noted the Member's comments and would liaise with the Police after the meeting. He would also study his suggestion after obtaining further information.

77. Mr YONG Kwong-chung responded that he would obtain detailed information of the accident from the accident investigation section after the meeting and deliberate with TD on the feasible improvement options.

[Post-meeting note: TD had been liaising with the Police to obtain information about the accident and would keep in view of the traffic situation at the concerned location.]

78. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH pointed out that the three accidents at Shum Wan Road listed on page 19 should be counted as accidents in the East Area instead of the South Area.

79. The Chairman noted the Member's comment.

## **Reference Information 2 – Traffic Blackspot Figures of Southern District (Progress Report for DAS of SDC) Sep 2018 to Feb 2019**

80. Mr LO Kin-hei said that traffic blackspots referred to places where casualties were caused and suggested renaming the list as "Illegal Parking Blackspot Figures of Southern District".

81. Ms YAM Pauline said that the number of visit to the streets in Aberdeen and number of fixed penalty tickets issued by the Police had clearly dropped in recent months. She enquired whether the Police planned to reduce the number of visits or had reduced the number of visits because it considered that the problem of illegal parking in Aberdeen had greatly improved. For example, the number of fixed

penalty tickets issued for parking offences had drastically dropped from 600-odd in September 2018 to 100-odd in February 2019, which was a more significant decrease than those in other areas. She called for an explanation from the Police.

82. Mr YONG Kwok-chung responded that owing to the stringent law enforcement operations in Aberdeen by the Police in recent months, the number of fixed penalty tickets issued for parking offences had dropped significantly. The Police had educated quite a number of motorists through enforcement actions. Although illegal parking still occurred in Aberdeen, the motorists left quickly when they saw the Police taking enforcement actions and that resulted in a decreased number of fixed penalty tickets issued. Apart from issuing fixed penalty tickets, the Police would also tow away illegally parked vehicles without prior warning which created a deterrent effect on the motorists. He hoped that Members could understand that the reduction in the number of fixed penalty tickets issued did not mean that the Police had reduced its enforcement operations against illegal parking in Aberdeen. The Police would keep watch of the illegal parking at the streets in Aberdeen and take stringent enforcement operations.

(Mr AU Nok-hin and Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH left the meeting at 6:06 p.m. and 6:26 p.m., respectively.)

#### **Agenda Item 6: Any Other Business**

---

83. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had received a proposed agenda item from Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP.

84. Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP concerned about the incident on 12 March 2019. He said that some people ignored the advice from staff and intruded into the Conference Room before the meeting between the Secretary for Justice and the District Councillors, they jumped on the conference table and ran around, impeding the conduct of the meeting. As the Chairman of SDC, he expressed regret at the incident and considered that the dignity of the Council was tarnished. Therefore, he hoped that the Southern District Office would review the security measures as soon as possible to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents.

85. Mr LO Kin-hei said he agreed with the views of Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP. However, he hoped that it would also review the need for intensively arranging for meetings between senior government officials and District Councillors, as well as the practice for holding closed-door meetings.

86. Mr CHAI Man-hon thought that the matter raised by Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP was unrelated to traffic and therefore, it was not appropriate to discuss the matter at this meeting. Moreover, he pointed out that MTR Wong Chuk Hang Station public transport facility (PTF) could not be designated as a no smoking area because it was not gazetted as a public transport interchange. In this connection, he suggested that SDC provide amendment proposals to the departments concerned, with a view to designating this PTF as a no smoking area.

87. The Chairman noted the views of Mr CHAI Man-hon.

88. Mr CHAI Man-hon said he had contacted the Secretariat of SDC and was advised to raise the said matter for discussion under Any Other Business.

89. Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP said that Members were welcomed to express views under Any Other Business in case the matter was of an urgent nature, but it was not appropriate to discuss or vote on the matter. Otherwise, it would be unfair to Members who had already left the meeting.

90. Mr LO Kin-hei said that Any Other Business was one of the agenda items. Hence, he felt puzzled as to why Members could not discuss the matter raised by Mr CHAI Man-hon under the agenda item.

91. The Chairman made an enquiry with the Secretariat, and confirmed that Mr CHAI Man-hon's proposal on this agenda item had not been received prior to the meeting.

92. Mr CHAI Man-hon said he had made a request for discussing the said matter under Any Other Business to the Secretariat of SDC via email on 20 February 2019, and the staff of the Secretariat replied him on the phone. He would follow up with the Secretariat again in due course. Nevertheless, he hoped that the issues relating to MTR Wong Chuk Hang Station PTF could be resolved within the current term of District Council, such as designating it as a no smoking area and the terminal for some bus routes.

93. Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH said that it was not appropriate to put forth matters for discussion or vote on an issue under Any Other Business. Hence, he recommended that Mr CHAI Man-hon should formally submit an agenda item to the Secretariat for discussion at the next meeting.

94. Mr LO Kin-hei said that many matters were endorsed under Any Other Business at the meetings of SDC and its committees. In this connection, he queried why the matter raised by Mr CHAI Man-hon could not be discussed under Any Other Business at this meeting.

95. The Chairman clarified that Members could express views on the matter concerned, but it was not appropriate to hold an in-depth discussion under Any Other Business. He advised Mr CHAI Man-hon to formally submit an agenda item to the Secretariat for discussion at the next meeting.

96. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that THB anticipated that the completion of the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate would be delayed to 2026. As a result, the SIL(W) project had not been implemented yet. However, it was stated in a TPB paper that the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate was expected to be completed between 2025 and 2027. In other words, there was no delay in the project delivery. He therefore recommended that the Committee should be prudent in issuing a letter to THB.

97. The Chairman noted Members' views.

**Date of Next Meeting**

98. The Chairman advised the meeting that the 21<sup>st</sup> meeting of T&TC under SDC would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 20 May 2019 (Monday) at the SDC Conference Room.

99. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:54 p.m.

Secretariat, Southern District Council  
May 2019

(Translation)

**(By post and fax: 2523 9187)**

Ref. No.: HADS DC/13/30/3/7/016

11 April 2019

Mr CHAN Fan, Frank, JP  
Secretary for Transport and Housing  
Secretary for Transport and Housing's Office,  
22/F, East Wing, Central Government Offices,  
2 Tim Mei Avenue,  
Tamar, Hong Kong

Dear Mr CHAN,

**Improve the Conditions of the Universal Accessibility Programme**

At the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Traffic and Transport Committee (T&TC) under Southern District Council (SDC) on 18 March 2019, Highways Department (HyD) briefed Members on the “Second Phase of the ‘Universal Accessibility’ (UA) Programme — Provision of Lift Facilities to a Footbridge (Structure No. HKS01) in Southern District”.

According to the information provided by HyD, while it is feasible to add a lift to the exit near Tung Sing House at the Footbridge (Structure No. HKS01) across Lei Tung Estate Road near Tung Sing House, Lei Tung Estate, lift retrofitting works for the exit at the other end near St. Peter's Catholic Primary School can only be conducted upon resumption of part of the Lei Tung Estate's private land. However, given that the UA Programme should not involve any resumption of private land, it is not feasible to retrofit a lift at the exit near St. Peter's Catholic Primary School.

As only the lift can be retrofitted at the exit at one end of the proposed Footbridge (Structure No. HKS01), the footbridge fails to serve the purpose of UA Programme to provide a barrier-free access for the elderly and persons with disabilities travelling between Lei Tung Estate and Yue On Court. Besides, the conditions of the UA Programme are excessively stringent, and works that could benefit people's livelihood are either delayed or shelved because of the land title issue. As such, T&TC suggests that the Government relax the relevant conditions and allow HyD to resume private land for provision of lifts, so that HyD can provide lifts to the exits at both ends of the Footbridge (Structure No. HKS01).

In order to respond to the aspirations of T&TC and the residents, I would like to urge the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) to seriously consider the comments of T&TC and study thoroughly the relaxation of the relevant requirements in order to allow HyD to resume private land, so as to facilitate implementation of the projects under the UA Programme that could benefit the public, including the construction of the aforesaid footbridge which can provide convenience to the elderly and people in need in the district.



The relevant discussion papers and the draft minutes (extract) of the 20<sup>th</sup> T&TC meeting are enclosed (at **Annex 1** and **Annex 2** respectively), and the floor audio has also been uploaded onto the SDC website ([https://www.districtcouncils.gov.hk/south/tc\\_chi/meetings/committees/dc\\_committees\\_meetings\\_audio.php?meeting\\_id=16040](https://www.districtcouncils.gov.hk/south/tc_chi/meetings/committees/dc_committees_meetings_audio.php?meeting_id=16040)) for reference.

Should you have any enquiries, please feel free to contact Miss LIN Man-wai, Michelle, the Secretary for T&TC, at 2814 5812. I look forward to your reply.

Yours sincerely,

(signed)

(CHAN Fu-ming)

Chairman, Traffic and Transport Committee,  
Southern District Council

Encl.

c.c.

Director of Highways (Attn: Ms O Fong Wa, Julie, Senior Engineer 1/Universal Accessibility)  
District Officer (Southern)

(Translation)

Ref: HADS DC/13/30/3/7/016

**By Post and By Fax**  
**(Fax: 2523 9187)**

10 April 2019

Mr CHAN Fan, Frank, JP  
Secretary for Transport and Housing  
Secretary for Transport and Housing's Office  
22/F, East Wing, Central Government Offices,  
2 Tim Mei Avenue,  
Tamar, Hong Kong

Dear Mr CHAN,

**Urging the Government to Expediently Report on the Progress of  
South Island Line (West) Project**

At its 20<sup>th</sup> meeting on 18 March 2019, the Traffic and Transport Committee (the "Committee") under the Southern District Council (SDC) discussed issues relating to "Urging the Government to Expedite the Construction of South Island Line (West) (SIL(W))". However, the Highways Department (HyD) failed to assign representatives to attend the meeting and submitted a written reply only three days prior to the meeting. The Committee expressed grave dissatisfaction at HyD in this regard.

The Committee learnt from the reply of the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) to a question in the Examination of Estimates of Expenditure 2018-19 raised by the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council that THB intended to issue an invitation to the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRC) within 2018 to submit a proposal for the SIL(W) project. Although the project is delayed, the Government fails to proactively give an account to the public. Moreover, the Town Planning Board has already approved the public housing developments in Pok Fu Lam South. The first batch of the reception units for the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate is expected to be available for in-take in 2026 at the earliest. By that time, the population and traffic needs in the Southern District will increase drastically. It is therefore necessary to plan and construct SIL(W) as soon as possible. HyD, however, only indicated in its written reply that "subject to the pace of development of the area concerned, the Government would timely consider inviting MTRC to submit a proposal for SIL(W)", without explaining when would be an opportune time.

Based on the above considerations, the Committee holds the view that although the Government has not formally invited MTRC to submit a proposal for SIL(W) yet, HyD should assign representatives to attend the Committee's meeting in order to solicit views and respond to Members' questions, as well as explaining the meaning of "timely considering inviting MTRC to submit a proposal for SIL(W)". A Member is worried that in order to implement the SIL(W) project, the Government

will adopt the practice of land financing and sell some of the land in Pok Fu Lam South to MTRC, sacrificing the interest of the grassroots level.

SDC has been looking forward to the concurrent implementation of the SIL(W) project and redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate. However, the SIL(W) project is further delayed because of the compartmental mentality of HyD and the Housing Department even though both departments are under THB. In this connection, the Committee urges THB to explain the reasons for the delay in the SIL(W) project and take forward the project as soon as possible, as well as providing the relevant timetable and locations of the sites reserved for the construction of railway tracks and stations.

The relevant papers and draft minutes (excerpt) of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Committee are enclosed as **Appendices 1** and **2** respectively for your reference. The audio recordings have been uploaded onto the SDC homepage ([https://www.districtcouncils.gov.hk/south/tc\\_chi/mee\tings/committees/dc\\_committees\\_meetings\\_audio.php?meeting\\_id=16040](https://www.districtcouncils.gov.hk/south/tc_chi/mee\tings/committees/dc_committees_meetings_audio.php?meeting_id=16040)).

Should you have any queries, please feel free to contact Miss LIN Man-wai, Michelle, Secretary to the Committee at 2814 5812.

Yours sincerely,

(signed)

(CHAN Fu-ming)  
Chairman, Traffic and Transport Committee  
Southern District Council

w/encl.

c.c.

Director of Highways

(Attn: Mr TSUI Wing-kim, Edmund, Senior Engineer/WIL(1))

MTR Corporation Limited

(Attn: Ms Alice LO, Senior Manager - Projects & Property Communications)

District Officer (Southern)

(Translation)

18 April 2019

To: Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH  
Chairman of Traffic and Transport Committee  
Southern District Council  
1/F, Ocean Court  
3 Aberdeen Praya Road, Hong Kong

Dear Mr CHAN,

**Urging the Government to Expediently Report on the Progress of  
South Island Line (West) Project**

Your letter dated 10 April 2019 was received, please find our reply on the captioned issue below.

The Government announced the Railway Development Strategy 2014 (RDS-2014) in September 2014. Having regard to transport demand, cost-effectiveness and the development needs of New Development Areas, the RDS-2014 recommends that seven new railway projects, including the South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)), be completed in the planning horizon up to 2031.

As clearly stated in the RDS-2014, the taking forward of individual proposed railway projects set out in the Strategy will be subject to the outcome of detailed engineering, environmental and financial studies relating to each project, as well as updated demand assessment and availability of resources. Moreover, for railway projects which are primarily intended to complement new development areas and new housing developments, the implementation timetable for the development areas and new housing developments in question will be an important planning parameter for the railway projects. Therefore, the indicative implementation windows recommended in the RDS-2014 may be adjusted having regard to any change in circumstances. Due to the tight housing supply and the potential housing supply that may be brought about by railway development, the Government is also reviewing the railway projects in this light.

To tie in with the redevelopment of Wah Fu, the implementation of the SIL(W) is subject to the actual programme for the development in the Wah Fu area and redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate as well as the build-up of transport demand. Besides, to implement the SIL(W), it is necessary to free up space within Wah Fu Estate for railway construction, including Wah Fu Station proposed in the preliminary conceptual scheme of the SIL(W).

The rezoning of the five Government sites at Pok Fu Lam South was completed in 2018. These sites will be developed for public housing to serve as the major reception resources for the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate. The Government has recently gazetted the proposed site formation and infrastructure works at Pok Fu Lam South, and commenced the detailed design of site formation and infrastructure

works for these five sites. If the relevant statutory procedures and the application for funding approval from the Legislative Council could be completed smoothly, the site formation and infrastructure works are expected to commence in early 2020 to enable the completion of the first phase of the reception units for the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate in 2025 and population intake in 2026 the earliest.

The Civil Engineering and Development Department had carried out a traffic impact assessment in respect of the potential impact to the traffic in the vicinity during and after the construction of the proposed public housing development of the five Government sites at Pok Fu Lam South. As revealed from the assessment result, the road-based transport system would be adequate to cope with the transport demand arising from the proposed public housing development of the five Government sites at Pok Fu Lam South, following implementation of improvement works at the junction of Victoria Road and Pok Fu Lam Road. We expect that the population of Pok Fu Lam will have a more significant growth only after the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate. Besides, we will only be in a position to implement the works of the SIL(W) after the residents have gradually moved from Wah Fu Estate to the reception estates at Pok Fu Lam South, thereby vacating the relevant space within Wah Fu Estate.

Based on the above considerations, subject to the manpower resources and the pace of development of the areas concerned including the programme for redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate and its new population intake as well as build-up of transport demand, the Government will invite the MTR Corporation Limited at the appropriate juncture to submit a proposal for the SIL(W). In line with established procedures, prior to the finalisation of the railway scheme of SIL(W), we will consult the public, including the Legislative Council and the relevant District Councils, on the scheme (including detailed alignment, locations of stations, and mode of financing).

Thank you for your concern on the railway matters.

Yours sincerely,

(signed)

---

Thomas SZE

for Secretary for Transport and Housing

cc:

Principal Government Engineer, Railway Development Office, Highways Department  
(Attn: Mr TSUI Wing-kim, Edmund)

附件四  
Annex 4

# 淺水灣道 Repulse Bay Road



Existing Directional Sign 現時的路線指示標誌:



Directional Sign after Addition of Proposed Journey Time Indication System

加設擬議行車時間顯示系統後的交通標誌:

