

**Minutes of the 16th Meeting of the
Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC)
Southern District Council (SDC) (2020-2023)**

Date : 14 March 2023
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : SDC Conference Room

Present:

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	(Vice-Chairman of SDC)
Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun	(Temporary Chairman of the meeting)
Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH	

Secretary:

Miss WONG Hang-yu, Heidi	Executive Officer (District Council) 3, Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department
--------------------------	--

In Attendance:

Mr CHOY Ka-yeung, Gavin	Senior Transport Officer/Southern, Transport Department
Miss WONG On-yu, Ann	Senior Transport Officer/Housing and Projects, Transport Department
Mr TAM Sze-wai, Vincent	Engineer/Southern 1, Transport Department
Mr LEE Chun-yeung, Paul	Engineer/Southern 2, Transport Department
Mr CHAN Shu-hang, Isaac	Project Coordinator/Southern 3, Transport Department
Mr LO Chun-hong	Engineer/Peak, Transport Department
Mr LING Chun-him, Joseph	District Engineer/South West, Highways Department
Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian	Senior Transport Officer/Bus/HK 1, Transport Department
Mr TSE Ho-fung, Calvin	Transport Officer/Bus/HK 1, Transport Department

} for agenda
item 3

Mr Simon WONG	Head of Planning and Scheduling, Citybus Limited & New World First Bus Services Limited	for agenda item 3
Mr Calvin WONG	Manager (Planning), Citybus Limited & New World First Bus Services Limited	
Mr Albert LEUNG	Head of Service Delivery (HK Island), Citybus Limited & New World First Bus Services Limited	
Mr Bryce WONG	Operations Manager (HK Island), Citybus Limited & New World First Bus Services Limited	
Ms Penny CHUNG	Corporate Communications Manager, Citybus Limited & New World First Bus Services Limited	
Mr Calvin TSANG	Senior Corporate Communications Officer, Citybus Limited & New World First Bus Services Limited	for agenda item 4
Mr YUEN Wai-cheung, Bryan	Acting Senior Engineer/Urban, Transport Department	
Ms CHU Wing-laam, Crystal	Engineer/Special Duties, Transport Department	for agenda item 5
Mr YIM Cheuk-kwan	District Operations Officer (Western District), Hong Kong Police Force	
Mr YONG Kwok-chung	Officer-in-charge, District Traffic Team (Western), Hong Kong Police Force	

Part I – Items for Discussion

Agenda Item 1: Election of Temporary Chairman

1. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that as both the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of TTC had resigned, the Temporary Chairman of the meeting had to be elected in accordance with the Southern District Council Standing Orders. He invited nominations from the floor.
2. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH nominated Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun.
3. Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun had no objection to the nomination. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN declared that Mr Jonathan LEUNG Chun was the Temporary Chairman of the 16th TTC meeting.

Opening Remarks:

4. The Temporary Chairman said that before entering the venue, all persons attending or sitting in on the meeting were subject to the checking of body temperature with the assistance of the staff of the Southern District Office, and were advised to bring their own masks and water. Members were reminded to speak as concisely as possible, and representatives of Government Departments should refrain from repeating the content of the written replies when responding, so that the meeting could end by the estimated time, i.e. 4:25 p.m.
5. The Temporary Chairman welcomed members and the following standing representatives of Government Departments to the meeting:
 - (a) Mr CHOY Ka-yeung, Gavin, Senior Transport Officer/Southern of the Transport Department (TD);
 - (b) Miss WONG On-yu, Ann, Senior Transport Officer/Housing and Projects of TD;
 - (c) Mr TAM Sze-wai, Vincent, Engineer/Southern 1 of TD;
 - (d) Mr LEE Chun-yeung, Paul, Engineer/Southern 2 of TD;
 - (e) Mr CHAN Shu-hang, Isaac, Project Coordinator/Southern 3 of TD;
 - (f) Mr LO Chun-hong, Engineer/Peak of TD; and
 - (g) Mr LING Chun-him, Joseph, District Engineer/South West of the Highways Department.

6. The Temporary Chairman suggested that each member be allotted a maximum of two three-minute slots to speak in respect of each agenda item. Members agreed to the suggestion. He further said that to avoid suspending the meeting in the absence of a quorum, members should, as far as practicable, advise the Secretary of their early withdrawal before the meeting, and inform the Secretariat staff when they left the meeting.

Agenda Item 2: Confirmation of the Minutes of the 15th Meeting Held on 17 January 2023

7. The Temporary Chairman said that the draft minutes of the 15th TTC meeting had been circulated to members for comments prior to the meeting. The Secretariat had not received any amendment proposals before the meeting.

8. The Temporary Chairman asked members whether to confirm the minutes of the 15th TTC meeting. TTC confirmed the aforementioned minutes of meeting.

Agenda Item 3: Bus Route Planning Programme for the Southern District 2023 - 2024

(Item raised by the Transport Department)

(TTC Paper No. 3/2023)

9. The Temporary Chairman welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

- (a) Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian, Senior Transport Officer/Bus/HK 1 of the Transport Department (TD);
- (b) Mr TSE Ho-fung, Calvin, Transport Officer/Bus/HK 1 of TD;
- (c) Mr Simon WONG, Head of Planning and Scheduling of Citybus Limited (CTB) & New World First Bus Services Limited (NWFB);
- (d) Mr Calvin WONG, Manager (Planning) of CTB & NWFB;
- (e) Mr Albert LEUNG, Head of Service Delivery (HK Island) of CTB & NWFB;
- (f) Mr Bryce WONG, Operations Manager (HK Island) of CTB & NWFB;
- (g) Ms Penny CHUNG, Corporate Communications Manager of CTB & NWFB;
- and
- (h) Mr Calvin TSANG, Senior Corporate Communications Officer of CTB & NWFB.

10. The Temporary Chairman invited the representatives of TD to briefly introduce the agenda item.

11. Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian, with the aid of Powerpoint presentation, briefly introduced the Bus Route Planning Programme (BRPP).

12. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (a) Due to the policy of “railway as the backbone”, the bus company had been facing difficulties in its operation. Apart from monitoring the patronage, he hoped that the Government would also fully consider the public transport services in Hong Kong when drawing up BRPP;
- (b) BRPP only provided alternative proposals to CTB Route No. 43M and NWFB Route No. 971 but not to other routes. He hoped that TD would explain the reasons;
- (c) At present, it was very inconvenient for passengers to tap their cards again at the bus entrance to enjoy the sectional fare concession; and
- (d) Some of the cancelled bus routes had considerable patronage. He would like to know the reasons for cancelling those routes.

13. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH said that frequency reduction was understandable since patronage decreased amid the epidemic. However, the city was currently at a stage of returning to normalcy. She hoped that TD would consider restoring trip frequency and waiting time to the pre-epidemic level when drawing up BRPP.

14. The Temporary Chairman invited the representatives of TD to answer members’ enquiries.

15. Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) TD had been co-ordinating various public transport services to enhance overall transport efficiency, avoid duplication of transport resources, alleviate traffic congestion and improve roadside air quality. Currently, railway was the backbone of the transport system, and franchised bus services complemented railway services. Franchised bus mainly provided feeder services to and from railway stations and cross-district services;

- (b) Regarding bus-bus interchange, the bus company would put in place bus-bus interchange concession schemes at appropriate locations whenever practicable to allow passengers to reach more destinations with interchange concessions. For example, TD suggested maintaining the original bus-bus interchange concession scheme for CTB Route No. 43M (including CTB Route Nos. 1 and 5B, as well as NWFB Route No. 4); and
 - (c) Regarding the factors taken into account for route rationalisation, besides referring to the guidelines mentioned in paragraphs 5 and 12 of the paper, TD would review the entire public transport network as appropriate and review bus service holistically to maximise the complementarity of bus routes, so as to optimise the use of bus resources, enhance transport network efficiency and improve service quality.
16. The Temporary Chairman said that the bus routes would be considered one by one.

NWFB Route No. 33X

17. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN supported the provision of two additional departures operated from Sai Wan Ho to Cyberport during evening peak hours, and hoped that TD would consider replacing minibus Route No. 69 with NWFB Route No. 33X.
18. Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian responded that the routes of NWFB Route No. 33X and minibus Route No. 69 were different. Minibus Route No. 69 travelled to and from the Southern District via Aberdeen Tunnel while NWFB Route No. 33X did so via Sai Wan. Therefore, TD had no plans to cancel minibus Route No. 69 for the time being. He invited the representatives of the bus company to provide supplementary information.
19. The representative of the bus company thanked Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN for his comments and studies would be conducted at a suitable juncture.
20. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN hoped that TD would carefully consider his suggestion, as the implementation of the route plan of NWFB Route No. 33X would reduce the patronage of minibus Route No. 69, resulting in vicious competition.

21. Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian responded that TD would continue to keep an eye on bus and other public transport services.

NWFB Route Nos. 4 and 4X

22. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH pointed out that residents had expressed to her their hope for regularity of service of NWFB Route No. 4 and alleviation of the problems of “phantom bus” and lost trips. She also requested that the three trips of NWFB Route No. 4X in peak hours be retained.

23. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN pointed out that some residents in Wah Fu Estate expressed to him their strong opposition to BRPP, worrying that the residents would have no seats as a result of an extension of the bus routes. He hoped that TD would provide statistics on the journey time after the amalgamation of the aforementioned bus routes.

24. Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) BRPP proposed an extension of NWFB Route No. 4 to and from various major locations with an increase in service frequency to every eight to 12 minutes during peak hours;
- (b) He said that TD would request the bus company to ensure regularity of service of NWFB Route No. 4. and had always been monitoring the bus services;
- (c) With regard to NWFB Route No. 4X, TD would accept the views from the residents and adjust the time of the last departure to 1 p.m., and would consider providing a transitional period to retain three bus trips in the early stage; and
- (d) The statistics on journey time would be supplemented by the representatives of the bus company.

25. The representative of the bus company gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (e) The vehicle allocations of NWFB Route No. 4 would increase from 5 to 13 buses;
- (f) The frequency of NWFB Route No. 4 would be increased from every 20 minutes to every eight to 12 minutes; and

- (g) With regard to the service frequency of NWFB Route No. 4X, in BRPP, the proposed service headway of evening return trips of NWFB Route No. 4 was roughly the same as the existing combined headway of Route Nos. 4 and 4X, and the headway in certain hours of the day were even more frequent as compared to the current situation.

26. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN asked if TD had communicated or consulted with residents when drawing up BRPP and hoped that TD would publish BRPP on the Internet.

27. The Temporary Chairman concurred with Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's comments and said that residents expressed lots of concerns about BRPP (including the cancellation of CTB Route Nos. 48, 71 and 71P). He suggested that TD communicate more with the community, such as publishing on the Internet the alternative proposal intended to be adopted after the cancellation of the routes to allay the concerns.

28. Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian responded that the above BRPP had been uploaded to TD's website on 28 February 2023 to facilitate public access and comment. TD noted TTC's views and would discuss with the bus company how to inform the public and passengers of the details of the programme.

29. The Temporary Chairman hoped that TD would explain the details in a simple manner to facilitate the public's understanding.

30. The representative of the bus company noted members' suggestions and said that when implementing BRPP in the future, the company would endeavour to enhance the publicity through multiple channels (including the Internet and bus stops) to facilitate the public's and passengers' understanding.

31. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN suggested that the bus company distribute leaflets at bus stops.

32. The Temporary Chairman hoped that the bus company would accept Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's suggestion.

CTB Route Nos. 5X and 7

33. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH pointed out that a number of residents opposed the change of CTB Route No. 5X to CTB Route No. 7X due to the increase in waiting time from 15 to 25 minutes to 30 minutes. She added that CTB Route No. 7 was a route with high patronage and many residents opposed the fare increase from \$6.5 to \$8.5. She hoped that TD would reconsider.

34. Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian responded that TD intended to collect public views through SDC. Since there were currently many routes in the Southern District going to the northern shore of Hong Kong Island via Aberdeen Tunnel, the original planning concept was to provide an additional route to the northern shore of Hong Kong Island via Kennedy Town to provide the public with more route choices. He added that the headway of CTB Route No. 7 was 30 minutes, but would become 15 minutes if CTB Route No. 7X was considered together. He added that the bus company would provide passengers of CTB Route No. 7 with interchange concessions for interchanging at Queen Mary Hospital with other bus routes to Central and Sheung Wan.

35. The representative of the bus company responded that apart from CTB Route No. 7, passengers travelling to and from Sheung Wan and Sai Ying Pun could also choose to take CTB Route No. 7X and interchange with other routes at Queen Mary Hospital. Moreover, since two-way section fares were offered for CTB Route No. 7X, the total fare was the same as the existing CTB Route No. 7.

CTB Route No. 43M and NWFB Route No. 971

36. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that many residents strongly opposed the service rationalisation of these two routes, and hoped that TD and the bus company would reconsider matters including increase in service frequency and the use of double deckers. He pointed out that the patronage of the two routes was high during hours before school and hence parents were dissatisfied with the two route plans. He hoped that the bus company would ensure regularity of services and provide early bird discounts.

37. The Temporary Chairman said that BRPP would increase the number of vehicles in Aberdeen, and invited the representatives of TD to respond.

38. Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian pointed out that given the low patronage of CTB Route No. 43M, with an occupancy rate of 40% during peak hours, BRPP proposed using NWFB Route No. 971 to serve passengers of the existing CTB Route No. 43M, as well as deploying additional buses, extending service hours and offering two-way section fares. TD would continue to monitor the situation and discuss with the bus company whether service adjustments were required after implementation of BRPP.

39. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN queried the low patronage of CTB Route No. 43M, and pointed out that the patronage during peak hours was high given the high demand for services to and from school. He opined that even diversion of passengers to NWFB Route No. 971 might not be adequate to cope with the demand. He agreed to service rationalisation, but opined that TD should take into consideration patronage at different hours of a day, in particular before and after school.

40. The representative of the bus company responded that according to the assessment data of BRPP, including those after the epidemic, NWFB Route No. 971 was adequate to absorb the patronage of CTB Route No. 43M after service rationalisation. Moreover, when implementing BRPP, the bus company would deploy double-deckers to operate all the departures of NWFB Route No. 971 in order to meet the demand and minimize the impact on passengers.

41. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN asked whether the whole bus fleet of the route would be replaced with double-deckers.

42. The representative of the bus company responded that they would deploy double-deckers to operate all the departures of NWFB Route No. 971 after service rationalisation. The bus company closely monitor the passenger demand after rationalization and review the service level accordingly.

NWFB Route Nos. 63 and 65

43. The Temporary Chairman said that the aforementioned routes provided convenient access to the vicinity of Tai Hang Road for passengers going to work or school, and was concerned that cancellation of the departures of NWFB Route No. 63 on Saturdays would affect students' journey to extra-curricular activities.

44. Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian responded that the bus company would provide additional interchange alternatives, such as CTB Route No. 6 and NWFB Route No. 66, CTB Route Nos. 6 and 10, as well as CTB Route Nos. 6 and 41A.

45. The representative of the bus company responded that direct alternative services are available to about 70% of the existing NWFB Route No. 63 passengers while the remaining passengers are provided with new discounted Bus-bus Interchange schemes for their destinations.

NWFB Route No. 95, CTB Route No. 95C and NWFB Route No. 595

46. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH raised the following comments:

- (a) She had conducted a data survey and found that the occupancy rates of the morning departures of NWFB Route No. 95 (at 7:18 a.m., 7:33 a.m. and 7:53 a.m.) had reached 80% and 100% when the bus got to Ap Lei Chau West Estate and Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road respectively. Therefore, many residents opposed the route amalgamation;
- (b) Many students and elderly people took the special morning departure of NWFB Route No. 595 to Shek Pai Wan. According to the survey, the occupancy rate of the trips in the direction of Ap Lei Chau Estate had reached 90% between 7:20 a.m. and 8:05 a.m., and there were often no seats for the elderly;
- (c) Many residents expressed that if CTB Route No. 95C terminated at the Lee Nam Road Industrial Area, there would be no bus to the Ap Lei Chau Estate Bus Terminus; and
- (d) Residents were strongly opposed to the cancellation of NWFB Route No. 95 in general given that it was safer for the elderly to take this route to Ap Lei Chau Estate without having to cross the zebra crossing after alighting. Moreover, residents of Ap Lei Chau Estate had been taking the route for more than 40 years, and many of the elderly persons had already got used to it. She hoped that TD would re-examine it, and she could provide TD with the relevant data later.

47. Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian responded that TD would review with the bus company the patronage of NWFB Route No. 595 between 7 a.m. and 8 a.m. and consider how to meet the demand of passengers. Regarding the relocation of the terminal of CTB Route No. 95C to the Lee Nam Road Industrial Area, he said that there

was still a bus stop in Ap Lei Chau West Estate. After the extension of NWFB Route No. 595 to Shek Pai Wan, additional bus stops would be provided at the petrol filling station and a 7-11 convenience store to avoid unnecessary travelling time for the passengers.

48. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH was concerned that provision of an additional bus stop of CTB Route No. 95C at Lok Yeung Street would add to the traffic congestion there and considered that if TD cancelled NWFB Route No. 95, the frequency of NWFB Route No. 595 would have to be increased to the pre-epidemic level. She reiterated that the current frequency of every 15 to 20 minutes was inadequate to meet passenger demand.

49. Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian responded that there were currently three routes (namely NWFB Route Nos. 94A and 95, as well as CTB Route No. 95C) passing by the petrol filling station. If NWFB Route No. 95 was replaced by NWFB Route No. 595, there would still be three routes passing by the spot, but TD noted members' comments.

50. The representative of the bus company responded that at present, the headway of NWFB Route No. 95 to Shek Pai Wan was 15 to 25 minutes during the morning peak hours. After the route rationalisation, the frequency of NWFB Route No. 595 to Shek Pai Wan would be increased to every 12 to 15 minutes. He emphasised that the situation would be closely monitored after the route rationalisation and more buses with high carrying capacity would be deployed to run NWFB Route No. 595 and CTB Route No. 95C. He added that the bus company would discuss with TD the arrangement of bus stops in Ap Lei Chau Estate after the meeting to reduce the number of passengers affected.

(Post-meeting Notes: According to the operations statistics in March 2023, the maximum hourly occupancy of NWFB Route No. 595 during the morning peak hour was about 45%, the service level was adequate to cater for the passenger demand.)

CTB Route No. 260

51. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that residents were strongly opposed to frequency reduction and the extension of the route to Causeway Bay, worrying that the journey time would be lengthened.

52. Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian responded that the bus company had referred to the traffic records when drawing up BRPP, in a view to providing more options for passengers travelling from Stanley, Clear Water Bay and Deep Water Bay to Causeway Bay.

53. The representative of the bus company pointed out that there was more traffic on the flyover than on the road below the flyover most of the time, and therefore, it was proposed to take the road below the flyover so that the journey time would be more accurate and reliable, and passengers would find it more convenient.

54. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH said that some residents opposed extending the route to Causeway Bay.

55. The Temporary Chairman said that the majority of people were worried that the journey time of taking the road below the flyover would be longer.

56. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN doubted that the journey time of taking the road below the flyover was shorter, because it would be affected by the traffic lights and take longer. He found the explanation of TD unconvincing.

57. The Temporary Chairman concurred with Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's comments and queried that most drivers would take the road below the flyover should the statement of TD and the bus company be true. However, most drivers took the flyover according to site surveys.

58. The representative of the bus company responded that the bus company had reviewed the situation before and after the epidemic and the traffic data in January and February 2023. It was found that the journey time of taking the road below the flyover was generally comparable to that of taking the flyover during peak hours, or even one to two minutes less. Meanwhile, the journey time of taking the road below the Canal Road Flyover (including pick up/drop off time) was no more than three minutes longer than that of taking the flyover during off-peak hours. The bus company had taken into account the traffic data when drawing up the proposal. Given the journey times were comparable, the stopping at Canal Road flyover would consider enhancing the overall operational efficiency of the route and enhance the convenience of passengers for Causeway Bay.

59. The Temporary Chairman said that there were currently several means of transportation between the Southern District and Causeway Bay, and queried whether it was necessary to add a route passing through Causeway Bay, particularly when the destination of such route was Central. He considered that the public would not want the bus to pass through Causeway Bay, as it would increase the journey time. Moreover, he opined that Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's logic was sound in that no one would take the flyover if the public thought that taking the road below the flyover was faster.

60. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN requested TD to provide the data. He said that many residents had complained that the Central-bound buses were travelling on the ground level and the journey time was lengthened by waiting at the traffic lights.

61. The representative of the bus company responded that data could be provided after the meeting when necessary.

(Post meeting note: According to the latest blackbox data in March 2023, the journeys via Canal Road flyover was often congested by the traffic tailback from Cross Harbour Tunnel, the journey via at-grade Canal Road West was therefore comparable with that of the flyover and in some cases the traffic via at-grade was smoother than that via the flyover. In fact, CTB Route No. 260 had been approved by the Transport Department to operate via Morrison Hill Road and Canal Road west as the alternative routings to escape from the traffic congestions at the flyover.

On the other hand, the utilization of CTB Route No. 260 was unsatisfactory, the maximum hourly occupancy during peak and non-peak hours were only 48% and 17% respectively. CTB & NWFB believed this re-routing proposal could better utilize the existing spare capacities of CTB Route No. 260 by providing passengers along the Bay area a new alternative to Causeway Bay. However, Bus Company had taken note of Members' views on the proposal and would reconsider the proposed changes.)

62. Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian noted the comments from members and the residents in the Southern District.

63. The Temporary Chairman said that voting was about to take place and suggested that the routes not discussed by TTC earlier on be regarded as receiving no opposition from members. He asked if members agreed with the suggestion.

64. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN agreed.

65. The Temporary Chairman said that members had no comments on NWFB Route Nos. 66 and 27, as well as CTB Route Nos. 6, 973, 40, 40M, 85, 41A, 75 and 76, which implied that TTC did not oppose the route plans.

66. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH said that she would not vote on the aforementioned route plans. She hoped that TD would collect views from TTC, district organisations and other sub-districts before the implementation of BRPP since TTC, which had only three members, could not convey views on behalf of other constituencies on the aforementioned route plans.

67. The Temporary Chairman said that members had expressed views on NWFB Route Nos. 33X, 4 and 4X, as well as CTB Route Nos. 48, 71 and 71P, which he hoped that TD would take into careful consideration, but they did not strongly oppose the route plans.

CTB Route Nos. 5X and 7

68. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH strongly objected to the route plans because of residents' strong opposition.

69. The Temporary Chairman asked the bus company to note that there was strong opposition to CTB Route Nos. 5X and 7.

CTB Route No. 43M and NWFB Route No. 971

70. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that the route plans were causing great concern and opined that TD and the bus company had to communicate with residents to discuss issues such as frequency and school traffic. He hoped that TD would issue a statement to residents.

71. The Temporary Chairman hoped that TD and the bus company would accept members' comments.

NWFB Route Nos. 63 and 65

72. The Temporary Chairman queried that NWFB Route No. 63 had low patronage on Saturdays and requested that TD provide statistics after the meeting.

(Post meeting note: According to the operations statistics in March 2023, the average occupancy of NWFB Route No. 65 in Saturdays was about 25%.)

NWFB Route No. 95, CTB Route No. 95C and NWFB Route No. 595

73. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH hoped that TD would reconsider.

74. The Temporary Chairman asked TD and the bus company to note the comments of Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH.

CTB Route No. 260

75. The Temporary Chairman said that TTC unanimously opposed the changes to CTB Route No. 260. He asked TD and the bus company to note TTC's comments.

76. The Temporary Chairman asked the representatives of TD and the bus company to conclude.

77. When concluding, Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian said that he noted TTC's comments on BRPP. He would sum up the views from all parties after the consultation and consider whether to implement the plan. He thanked TTC for their valuable comments and said that TD and the bus company would take them into consideration.

(Post meeting note: As at 4 May, Transport Department was still consulting the TTCs of the relevant District Councils on the proposals.)

78. The Temporary Chairman hoped that TD and the bus company would enhance communication with the public.

79. When concluding, the Temporary Chairman said that he agreed with Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH that at present, TTC was only comprised of three members and was unable to fully relay the views of other constituencies on BRPP to TD. He appealed for understanding. He hoped that the bus company would provide more information to convince the public and enhance the exchange of views in the district. In addition, he considered that there was room for improvement in the interchange scheme and suggested expanding the coverage of interchanges, reducing the number of times of interchange and providing fare concessions to benefit residents.

80. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN concurred with the Temporary Chairman's comments and hoped that the bus company would install Octopus fare collection readers at bus stops to facilitate passengers' access to the interchange concessions.

81. The Temporary Chairman agreed with the suggestion of Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN and considered that it would be convenient for the public.

Agenda Item 4: Real-time Adaptive Traffic Signal System
(Item raised by the Transport Department)
(TTC Paper No. 4/2023)

82. The Temporary Chairman welcomed Mr YUEN Wai-cheung, Bryan, Acting Senior Engineer/Urban and Ms CHU Wing-laam, Crystal, Engineer/Special Duties of the Transport Department (TD) to the meeting.

83. The Temporary Chairman invited the TD representatives to briefly introduce the agenda item.

84. Ms CHU Wing-laam, Crystal, with the aid of Powerpoint presentation, briefly introduced the agenda item.

85. The Temporary Chairman invited members to raise comments or enquiries.

86. The Temporary Chairman raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (a) He expressed support for the project, and acknowledged the need to promote smart city development;

- (b) He would like to know whether pushbuttons, commonly known as the “yellow boxes”, at the crossings would be retained upon the implementation of the Real-time Adaptive Traffic Signal System (“the System”). He hoped that the pushbuttons could be retained to serve the needs of the visually impaired;
- (c) He asked about the future publicity plans for introducing the System and how members of the public could distinguish the System from the existing pushbuttons;
- (d) He asked whether the new system could detect unattended articles on the streets such as handcarts or styrofoam boxes, and whether it could distinguish pedestrians from unattended articles; and
- (e) Some children would stand further behind at the crossings to prevent accidents. He asked whether the System could detect pedestrians standing further behind.

87. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (a) He expressed support for the project, and said that there was also a pilot scheme at the junction of Victoria and Sandy Bay, in which members of the public had good experience;
- (b) Adjustments and verifications for the System were required at the initial stage of the project. However, there were no signs, phone numbers or QR codes displayed at the crossings under the pilot project. Members of the public would have difficulty in seeking assistance when they encountered any problems during the operation of the System. He opined that TD should establish a mechanism for direct communication and liaison among TD, the contractor and members of the public, such as by making use of the offices of District Council members;
- (c) Given that some approaches of the junctions were curved and there were multiple trees nearby, these might obstruct the sensors. He asked whether the operation of sensors would be affected and whether TD would carry out relevant assessment, including evaluating whether sensors should be located away from trees to prevent interference and whether installation of sensors at different heights would affect its detection range;
- (d) As for the crossing at the Stanley Village Road near Stanley New Street, he opined that the pedestrian waiting time was too long. Since the traffic flow at

the concerned crossing was low, there was no necessity to install a costly system. The problem could be resolved by making full utilisation of the existing pushbuttons and adjusting the traffic signal timings; and

- (e) He was unhappy that the installation of the System would not be completed until 2025-2028 at the earliest, taking quite a long time, and asked whether it was due to a limited budget.

88. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH expressed support for the project, and would like to learn about the coverage areas and installation locations of the sensors.

89. Mr YUEN Wai-cheung, Bryan gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The pushbuttons would still be retained upon the installation of the System. Pedestrians could activate the pedestrian traffic signals via the System or by pressing the pushbuttons;
- (b) The detection range of the sensors was determined by the sensor types, installation locations and road conditions. The detection area at the crossings would be delineated by yellow grids and the pedestrian traffic signals would be activated when pedestrians waited within the yellow grids. Meanwhile, TD would update the labels on the traffic signal posts to guide the pedestrians on the use of the System and prevent congestion at the crossings caused by pedestrians who were unaware that they needed to press the pushbuttons to activate the pedestrian traffic signals;
- (c) The sensors could identify different objects such as pedestrians, animals and other objects via the learning process. TD would also appoint a consultant to explore the types of sensors to be adopted;
- (d) During the initial stage of installing the System, adjustments and verifications were required. TD would consider displaying the operation status of the System in prominent locations and providing contact information for the public to make direct inquiries;
- (e) As regards the issue of trees and sensors, TD would work with the consultant on the installation location of sensors (including the existing traffic signal posts or other locations) so as to avoid the obstruction by trees; and

- (f) As for the implementation programme for the System, TD was currently conducting consultations. It was anticipated that funding approval from the Legislative Council would be obtained by the end of 2023 or early 2024. Upon completion of the detailed design and tender exercise, installation of the System would be carried out progressively between 2025 and 2028. TD would review the implementation programme when appropriate and expedite the progress where feasible.

90. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (a) He pointed out that delays might be resulted as pedestrian traffic signals would only be displayed after a while when pedestrians were detected. He questioned the reason for not displaying pedestrian traffic signal immediately after members of the public pressing the pushbuttons, and suggested putting up reminders such as large arrows to instruct members of the public to press the pushbuttons;
- (b) At present, some pedestrians crossed the road without pressing the pushbuttons as they had to wait for one to two minutes for the pedestrian traffic signals after pressing the pushbuttons. He asked whether the traffic lights could be adjusted so that the pedestrian traffic signals would be displayed immediately after the pushbuttons were pressed, encouraging the use of pushbuttons; and
- (c) He asked whether bigger signs listing the contact information would be put up for drivers to make enquiries when necessary.

91. The Temporary Chairman said that the implementation of the System would not be completed until 2028, spanning a period of time, and asked whether there were ways to speed up. He supported the Government's new information technology policies. However, he noticed that the sensors at the pilot locations were black in colour, with only the contact information provided beneath them. He asked whether publicity could be carried out in a positive manner, such as by adding colourful pictures to elaborate on how the future transport system would be enhanced.

92. Mr YUEN Wai-cheung, Bryan gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) In addition to assisting pedestrians who were unaware that they needed to press the pushbuttons to call for the pedestrian traffic signals, the System could also help cancel the call for pedestrian traffic signals when pedestrians pressed the pushbuttons but left the pedestrian waiting zone, reducing the waiting time of road users;
- (b) The pedestrian traffic signals were with reference to the junction layout and operation mode. In particular, if the junction was under a linked operation mode, pedestrian traffic signals would only be displayed after a certain period of time so as to balance and match the transport demand in the network. TD would continue to monitor the actual traffic conditions of the junctions and adjust the traffic signals in a timely manner to balance the needs of road users; and
- (c) Regarding the publicity of the System, TD noted the opinions of the members, and would further enhance the promotion of the System.

93. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that it took four years for the installation of the System, which was a very long time, and asked whether the implementation programme could commence at once. He could not understand why it was imperative to set up a new system instead of enhancing the existing one.

94. Concurring with the Temporary Chairman's comments, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH could not understand why it would take four years for the implementation programme to be completed. She said that the outcome of the pilot project was satisfactory and would like to learn about the relevant cost.

95. Mr YUEN Wai-cheung, Bryan gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) At present, TD had no plans to allow displaying the pedestrian traffic signals immediately after the pushbuttons were pressed, in view of the existing traffic flow on Stanley Village Road. However, TD would review the actual traffic conditions of Stanley Village Road in a timely manner and adjust the traffic signal setting to minimise the pedestrian waiting time;

- (b) Regarding the implementation programme, installation of the System would be completed progressively between 2025 and 2028. The installation works also included sites outside the Southern District; and
- (c) The cost estimate of the project was currently under preparation. Funding application would be made to the Legislative Council upon completion of the cost estimate.

96. When concluding, the Temporary Chairman said that SDC supported this project. Earlier, the Government published the Smart City Blueprint for Hong Kong. He believed that this project was part of “Smart Mobility”, which integrated information technology with urban planning to facilitate public commuting and improve the quality of life. Nevertheless, he said that the various technologies integrated into daily life were not only for use but could also add value in other ways, for instance, the devices could be designed to look nicer. He hoped that TD would note his view that embracing technology was not just for promoting economic development but also for enabling members of the public to enjoy a quality life.

Agenda Item 5: Progress Report on Previously Discussed Items (as at 28.2.2023)
(TTC Paper No. 5/2023)

97. The Temporary Chairman welcomed Mr YIM Cheuk-kwan, District Operations Officer (Western District) and Mr YONG Kwok-chung, Officer-in-charge, District Traffic Team (Western) of the Hong Kong Police Force to the meeting.

98. The Temporary Chairman asked members to note the report and raise enquiries after citing the page number. The representatives of the Departments concerned would respond to their enquiries one by one.

(A)1 Multi-Storey Carpark and Public Transport Terminus on Stanley Village Road

99. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN would like to learn about the progress of the project.

100. Mr TAM Sze-wai, Vincent responded that the Transport Department was compiling the report on the latest progress of the project and the traffic impact assessment full steam ahead, and would consult SDC later.

101. The Temporary Chairman said that Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN was very concerned about the matter, and hoped that a report would be provided at the next meeting.

(A)4 Special Scheme of the “Universal Accessibility” Programme

102. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH would like to know whether the two projects for Footbridges LT03 and WK01 would be undertaken together, as well as whether the objections to the installation of an additional lift for Footbridge WK01 from stakeholders would affect the lift project for Footbridge LT03. Given that a stakeholder reiterated his objection to the proposal in his reply and the other stakeholder had not replied yet, she asked whether there was a deadline for replies, as well as whether the grounds for objection could be provided.

103. The Temporary Chairman concurred with the comments of Ms LAM Yuk-chun, BBS, MH, and would like to learn about the grounds for objections of the stakeholders, whether the grounds were reasonable, as well as what the Highways Department (HyD) would do if the stakeholders maintained their objections.

104. Mr LING Chun-him, Joseph responded that regarding whether the two projects for Footbridges LT03 and WK01 would be undertaken together, HyD would consult SDC about the LT03 project and report the progress of the feasibility study to SDC. As for the WK01 project, as stated in the report, there were two stakeholders raising objections. He would have to ask the project team about the deadline for replies. As far as he was aware, letters were sent on 11 November 2022 to the two stakeholders having objections, one of whom had replied while the other had yet to do so. The project team would contact the two private owners again later to learn about their grounds for objection and confirm their other views on the installation of an additional lift. It was understood that they objected on the grounds that there were already lifts nearby. HyD would have to communicate with them before knowing the actual reasons.

105. The Temporary Chairman said that the grounds for objection might be related to the structural problems of the existing buildings. He asked HyD to consider what to do if the stakeholders maintained their objections and report it at the next meeting.

(E) Hong Kong Police Force and Transport Department
2022 Southern District Traffic Accident Report (December 2022)

106. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN pointed out that according to the report, there were a total of three motorcycle accidents on Shek O Road in December. He expressed worries about road safety, and asked whether a site inspection would be arranged or whether changes would be made to the road design. In addition, another traffic accident took place at To Tei Wan a year later, in which people were hit when crossing the road. Given that the road section in Dragon's Back was narrow and full of hikers, he asked whether HyD had ways to tackle this, such as cutting the slopes or paving the road at the foot of the hill, to prevent accidents.

107. The Temporary Chairman said that he had inspected the site and opined that the bends and slopes there were prone to accidents. He hoped that HyD would note the matter and repair the aforementioned road section to enhance road safety.

108. Mr LING Chun-him, Joseph responded that HyD had noted the suggestion on slope improvement. Further review on areas for improvement will be required by the Slope Maintenance team and the Geotechnical Engineering Office of the Civil Engineering and Development Department after the meeting.

109. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN considered it necessary to provide a pedestrian crossing facility at the crossing in To Tei Wan because the road there was very narrow, making it quite dangerous to cross the road.

110. The Temporary Chairman would like to know whether HyD would consider conducting an in-depth study.

111. Mr LING Chun-him, Joseph asked whether they were referring to the crossing in Dragon's Back, and said that priority would be given to inspecting the location.

112. The Temporary Chairman asked the HyD representative to contact members after the meeting.

**(E) Hong Kong Police Force and Transport Department
2023 Southern District Traffic Accident Report (January 2023)**

113. The Temporary Chairman said that there was a traffic accident on Repulse Bay Road near Repulse Bay Road Garden involving a 77-year-old pedestrian, and that a relatively large number of the recent accidents involved motorcycles. He would like to learn about the details.

114. Mr YONG Kwok-chung responded that a motorcyclist made a report that his motorcycle, while heading towards Repulse Bay along Repulse Bay Road, unfortunately hit a pedestrian who crossed the road out of the blue when it reached Headland Road. Both the motorcyclist and the pedestrian were injured. However, according to the investigation, the accident was unrelated to the road design and the road conditions. Rather, it happened because the pedestrian crossed the road out of the blue.

115. The Temporary Chairman hoped that the accident was not caused by a lack of pavements or crossing facilities. He said that many locations in the district lacked pavements or had relatively narrow roads. Given that the Government planned to launch the “Happy Hong Kong” Campaign, implement the “Invigorating Island South” initiative, as well as develop a “Round-the-Island Trail” in the future, he expected that there would be a lot of visitors, and hoped that they would enjoy the visit. He asked whether HyD could construct pavements in a proactive manner, and hoped that HyD would address the lack of pavements as soon as possible.

Agenda Item 6: Any Other Business

116. The Temporary Chairman said that the Secretariat had not received any proposals under this agenda item.

Date of Next Meeting

117. The Temporary Chairman said that the 17th meeting of TTC under SDC would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 16 May 2023 (Tuesday) at the SDC Conference Room.

118. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:32 p.m.

Secretariat, Southern District Council

May 2023