

(Translation)

Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the Planning Development and Transport Affairs Committee
of Sham Shui Po District Council (6th Term)

Date : 12 March 2020 (Thursday)
Time : 9:30 a.m.
Venue : Conference Room, Sham Shui Po District Council

Present

Chairman

Ms CHOW Wing-heng, Zoé

Members

Ms CHAU Yuen-man, Eunice

Mr CHUM Tak-shing (Arrived at 12:20 p.m.)

Mr HO Kai-ming, Calvin (Left at 12:20 p.m.)

Mr HO Kwan-chau, Leo (Left at 1 p.m.)

Mr KONG Kwai-sang

Mr LAO Ka-hang, Andy (Arrived at 9:40 a.m.; left at 9:45 a.m.)

Ms LAU Pui-yuk, MH (Arrived at 12 noon; left at 1:30 p.m.)

Mr LEE Hon-ting, Howard

Mr LEE Man-ho, Leos (Arrived at 9:40 a.m.; left at 10 a.m.)

Mr LI Chun-hei, Joshua

Mr LI Kwing, Richard (Left at 12:20 p.m.)

Mr LI Ting-fung, Jay (Arrived at 9:45 a.m.)

Mr MAK Wai-ming (Arrived at 9:55 a.m.; left at 11 a.m.)

Ms NG Mei, Carman (Arrived at 9:53 a.m.; left at 12:27 p.m.)

Ms NG Yuet-lan, Janet (Arrived at 9:54 a.m.; left at 2:05 p.m.)

Mr SIN Kam-ho, Jeffrey

Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, MH, JP

Mr TSUI Yat-hin, Ronald (Arrived at 9:45 a.m.)

Mr WAI Woon-nam (Left at 1 p.m.)

Mr WONG Kit-long

Mr YAN Kai-wing

Mr YEUNG Yuk (Left at 1:10 p.m.)

Mr YUEN Hoi-man, Ramon

Co-opted Members

Ms LAM Tsz-kwan

(Arrived at 9:35 a.m.; left at 1:46 p.m.)

Ms LIN Wai-kwan

Mr TANG Siu-kei, John

(Left at 2:05 p.m.)

In Attendance

Mr LEE Wai-yin, Brett

Assistant District Officer (Sham Shui Po) 1

Ms FUNG Chi-wai, Katy

Senior Town Planner/Sham Shui Po, Planning Department

Mr WONG Chi-tak, Keith

Senior Transport Officer/Sham Shui Po, Transport Department

Mr KWOK Yue-fung, Samuel

Senior Transport Officer/Events & Projects, Transport Department

Mr WONG Siu-man, Simon

Senior Engineer/Kowloon District West, Transport Department

Ms HUI Yi-lam, Eunice

Engineer/Universal Accessibility Programme, Transport Department

Mr KWOK Chin-yeung

Engineer/Wong Tai Sin, Transport Department

Mr LEE Kwan-hon, Ricky

District Engineer/Lai Chi Kok, Highways Department

Mr YU Chung-him

District Engineer/Sham Shui Po, Highways Department

Mr FU Ting-hong, Derek

Senior Transport Officer/Bus/Kowloon, Transport Department

Mr LEE Sui-kit, Donald

Transport Officer/Bus/Kowloon, Transport Department

Mr WONG Hon-chung

Planning and Operational Arrangement Manager, Citybus Limited/New World First Bus Services Limited

Mr PANG Chun-ho

Planning Officer, Citybus Limited/New World First Bus Services Limited

Miss Joyce WAN

Assistant Public Affairs Manager, Citybus Limited/New World First Bus Services Limited

Mr Bryce WONG

Senior Operations Officer, New World First Bus Services Limited

Mr Utan WONG

Manager, Operations (Lai Chi Kok Depots), Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited

Ms Peggy WONG

Assistant Manager, Planning and Development Department, Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited

Ms Rennis LIP

Senior Officer, Corporate Communications and Public Affairs Department (Public Affairs), Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited

Mr Addie LAM

Head of Corporate Communications and Public Affairs Department, Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933)

	Limited
Mr TSE Yu-ngai	District Operation Officer, Sham Shui Po District, Hong Kong Police Force
Mr NG Chi-sing	Officer in-charge of District Traffic Team, Sham Shui Po District, Hong Kong Police Force
Mr CHEUNG Kam-hung	Neighbourhood Police Co-ordinator, Police Community Relations Office, Sham Shui Po District, Hong Kong Police Force
Mr CHAN Kin-hong	Engineer/Transport Services 1/1, Electrical and Mechanical Services Department

Secretary

Miss CHUNG Kit-nam, Mandy	Executive Officer (District Council) 3, Sham Shui Po District Office
---------------------------	--

Absent with Apologies

Co-opted Member

Ms YU Hoi-yan

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed members and representatives of government departments to the 2nd meeting of the Planning Development and Transport Affairs Committee (“PTAC”) of the 6th term of the Sham Shui Po District Council (“SSPDC”).

Agenda Item 1: Confirmation of minutes of the 1st meeting held on 14 January 2020

2. The Committee confirmed the above minutes.

Agenda Item 2: Matters for discussion

(a) Bus Route Planning Programme 2020-2021 of Sham Shui Po District (PTAC Paper 4/20)

3. Mr Derek FU introduced Paper 4/20.
4. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) apart from improving the transport network of the newly developed areas, he hoped that the Bus Route Planning Programme could respond to the views of the Council as well; (ii) the programme did not handle the suggestion of extending bus route number 6D to Kwun Tong; (iii) a bus route travelling directly from Sham Shui Po (“SSP”) East to the airport was not yet available. The request concerned had already been made clearly by the last-term Council, he regretted that New World First Bus (“NWFB”) neglected the residents’ needs; (iv) he hoped that the department would explain the principle of the arrangement for the alignment of the new route travelling to and from Queen’s Hill, he opined that the new route overlapped with the existing one.
5. Mr YEUNG Yuk raised the following views: (i) the programme neither adjusted nor strengthened the bus services for the new reclamation area in Lai Chi Kok to meet the needs arising from population growth in the district; (ii) it had been planned 2 years ago that the terminus of bus route number 286C would be relocated to Nam Cheong Station, but the plan had yet to be implemented; (iii) he hoped to improve the problem of lost trips of bus route number 702B; (iv) he was disappointed about this year’s programme.
6. Mr WONG Kit-long raised the following views: (i) he supported the re-routing of bus route number 37 via Lai Chi Kok Road, so that works could be divided with bus route number 33A; the situation of lost trips could be reduced by avoiding congested road sections. He hoped that the possibility of applying this approach to other routes could be explored; (ii) there was a lack of bus routes travelling to New Territories East in SSP. He suggested changing bus route number 272E to a circular route by making reference to the alignment of bus route number 286X so that there would be bus route travelling from Tsing Sha Highway Bus Interchange to Tai Po, and travelling from the new reclamation area to

New Territories East; (iii) he hoped that after the implementation of the new arrangement for bus route number 12P, it could be changed to whole-day service depending on the circumstances; (iv) he opined that the alignment of the new route travelling to and from Queen's Hill was not desirable, the route should avoid travelling via congested road sections; (v) regarding bus route number 36A, he suggested providing interchange concessions for travelling to New Territories West at Mei Foo interchange station.

7. Mr Ramon YUEN raised the following views: (i) he enquired about the increase in travelling time after the route of bus route number 12 extended and whether this would worsen the situation of lost trips; (ii) he welcomed the provision of an additional stop at Sham Shing Road for bus route number 701A, yet he expressed concerns over the situation of illegal parking at that area; (iii) he enquired whether the extension of the route of bus route number 701A would give rise to the situation of lost trips; (iv) he suggested that the new route of Queen's Hill could make reference to the alignment of airport routes so to ease the traffic burden on Cheung Sha Wan Road and optimise the use of Tsing Sha Highway Bus Interchange; (v) he requested to increase the frequency of bus route number 936 and extend the operation hours as soon as possible.

8. Mr John TANG raised the following enquiries about bus route number 970X: (i) how the bus company would reduce the impacts on the travelling patterns of the existing passengers after the route changed to travel via Cheung Sha Wan Road; (ii) the necessity of extending the route to Trade Square.

9. Mr Joshua LI raised the following views: (i) he suggested bus route number 241X stopping at Mei Foo when travelling to Kowloon; (ii) regarding bus route number 970X travelling to Cheung Sha Wan, he suggested providing an additional stop in Lai Chi Kok at Cheung Lai Street; (iii) he hoped that at least one route passing by Tsing Sha Highway could stop at Mei Foo when travelling between Kowloon and New Territories in both directions for the whole day; (iv) he hoped that the frequency of bus route number A20 could be increased; (v) he supported the suggestion of extending bus route number 6D to Kwun Tong.

10. Ms Carman NG said that the population in SSP East increased continuously, yet there was a lack of overnight bus routes and bus routes travelling to Caritas Medical Centre ("CMC"). She hoped that the Transport Department ("TD") would actively consider introducing these routes.

11. Mr KONG Kwai-sang raised the following views: (i) he hoped that a bus route travelling from Cheung Sha Wan to Kwun Tong could be introduced, or the existing bus route number 6D could be extended to Kwun Tong; (ii) the red minibuses travelling to Kwun Tong almost reached the carrying capacity, the minibuses were always full when

they arrived at Lei Cheng Uk Estate; (iii) he had put forward the suggestion for many years yet no response had been received.

12. Mr Jay LI raised the following views: (i) the demand for the routes travelling between SSP and Kai Tak Development Area was keen. Currently, only Kowloon Motor Bus (“KMB”) route number 2A and NWFB route number 796A travelled between the 2 areas, yet the alignments were not desirable; (ii) he suggested extending the terminus of Citybus route number 22 to SSP (Yen Chow Street) Terminus so as to facilitate residents to travel between Kai Tak and SSP as well as improve the current low patronage.

13. Mr Leo HO raised the following views: (i) there were only 3 trips for bus route number 6P travelling from So Uk Estate to Kwun Tong, he hoped that the service could be enhanced and more options could be provided; (ii) extending the terminus of bus route number 970X to Kom Tsun Street might affect the residents who got on the first bus and worsen the situation of lost trips.

14. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) although the re-routing of bus route number 701A without travelling via Lin Cheung Road might provide convenience to the residents of “Four Little Dragons”, the travelling time would increase substantially; (ii) increasing the frequency while extending the route of bus route number 701A might give rise to lost trips; (iii) she enquired when bus route number 702B would be introduced. Even if Pak Tin Estate Terminus had not yet commenced operation, the bus route could still travel via SSP and Shek Kip Mei in the meantime; (iv) the buses of route number 936 were always fully loaded during the peak hours in the morning, she hoped that TD could follow up on that; (v) the new route of Queen’s Hill would travel via Hing Wah Street West and Cheung Sha Wan Road with heavy traffic, she suggested diverting via Tsing Sha Highway; (vi) she enquired about the utilisation rate of SSP (Yen Chow Street) Terminus.

15. Mr Derek FU responded as follows: (i) since many routes in the programme involved various districts, TD was consulting relevant District Councils (“DCs”) on the suggestions in the Bus Route Planning Programme. Views of different districts would be consolidated and considered as a whole; (ii) the re-routing of bus route number 701A mainly provided convenience to the residents of “West Kowloon Four Little Dragons”. Although the travelling time would be slightly lengthened, the frequency would be increased at the same time. It was estimated that the impacts on the existing passengers would be insignificant. The Department and the bus company would closely monitor the bus frequency after implementation of the re-routing; (iii) members’ suggestion of providing an additional stop at Mei Foo for bus routes passing by Tsing Sha Highway was noted; (iv) the Department and the bus company would further study members’ suggestion of providing an additional stop at Cheung Lai Street for bus route number 970X; (v) regarding the extension of the termini of bus route numbers 970X and X970, the public

need for travelling to work in the neighbourhood of Lai Chi Kok had mainly been taken into consideration; this could alleviate the pressure on the terminus of bus route number 970 at the same time. The bus company also planned to provide interchange concessions to passengers who would interchange with the above route after re-routing; (vi) suggestions on the alignment of the new route of Queen's Hill were noted. Besides, regarding members' views on the frequency of the route concerned, the Department would decide the service level of the route concerned with the contractor depending on the operational environment at that time and the passengers' demand when formulating the bus route concerned; (vii) members' suggestion of introducing bus routes travelling from SSP East to the airport was noted; (viii) the suggestion of extending bus route number 6D to Kwun Tong was noted. When considering whether to extend individual routes, apart from considering the traffic condition along the new alignment, the Department also needed to study whether there were suitable bus terminus facilities in the neighbourhood of the proposed termini. Taken Kwun Tong as an example, the traffic of Kwun Tong Road was already very heavy currently, and the redeveloped or newly developed projects in Kwun Tong District might reduce the number of locations that could be used as bus termini or for parking buses. Currently, the bus company provided special trips during peak hours to meet the passengers' needs. At the same time, KMB also provided interchange concessions for various bus routes to facilitate residents to travel to Kwun Tong; (ix) the suggestion of extending bus route number 22 to Yen Chow Street was noted, NWFB and Citybus also provided interchange concessions currently; (x) bus route number 702B was a circular route with Pak Tin Estate Bus Terminus as its terminus; the route would commence operation as soon as possible after trial; (xi) the Department noted other suggestions put forward by members and would consider them with the bus companies when necessary.

16. Mr WONG Hon-chung responded as follows: (i) the re-routing of bus route number 701A mainly provided the residents of "Four Little Dragons" with a more direct route to travel to and from Mong Kok so as to optimise the existing bus resources; (ii) after the re-routing of bus route number 701A, the travelling time would be increased by approximately 5 minutes while the travelling time of the whole route would still be less than one hour. The route was operated by 3 buses, it was not likely to result in lost trips; (iii) according to the survey result, after the extension of the termini of bus route numbers 970X and X970, 60% of the passengers could still travel to the destination directly by taking bus route number 970, while the remaining passengers could walk to Cheung Sha Wan Road or make use of the interchange concessions to take bus route numbers 970X and X970; (iv) the extension of bus route numbers 970X and X970 could facilitate residents in the neighbourhood of Cheung Sha Wan Road to travel to and from Hong Kong Island. NWFB also welcomed the suggestion of providing an additional stop at Cheung Lai Street. The estimated number of passengers in the neighbourhood of Trade Square was approximately 400 each day; (v) the views on the arrangement for the first bus of bus route number 970 were noted; (vi) the date of introducing bus route number 702B had to dovetail

with the completion of Pak Tin Estate Bus Terminus; (vii) Citybus was exploring various ways to introduce airport bus service into the community. However, more time was required for reviewing the effectiveness in view of the existing external circumstances; (viii) Citybus would actively consider the suggestion of extending bus route number 22 to SSP (Yen Chow Street) Terminus.

17. Ms Peggy WONG responded as follows: (i) apart from bus route number 37, KMB would actively consider improving different routes to balance the road traffic condition in SSP; (ii) the travelling time of bus route number 12P would be increased by approximately 10 minutes after extension, the special trips would not have significant impacts on the original route; (iii) the suggestion of providing an additional stop at Mei Foo for bus route numbers 41 and 241X was noted; (iv) the schedule for implementing the new arrangements for bus route numbers 86C and 286C had yet to be confirmed for the time being, KMB would inform relevant Members if there was any progress; (v) KMB would continue to follow up with TD on the suggestion on the routes travelling between SSP and Kwun Tong; (vi) the suggestions of the routes that travelled between SSP and New Territories East and passed by Tsing Sha Highway, including changing bus route number 272E to a circular route, were noted; (vii) KMB would consider enhancing the service of bus route number 936 depending on the circumstances; (viii) KMB would study the suggestion of providing interchange concessions for bus route number 36A; (ix) there was no suitable location for buses to make U-turn on the roads in the vicinity of CMC, KMB would further study how to provide a more direct route.

18. Mr YEUNG Yuk said that residents of the new reclamation area had a keen demand for travelling to and from SSP, the commencement of operation of NWFB route number 702B should not wait until the completion of Pak Tin Estate Bus Terminus. He hoped that NWFB could study whether there was any location in the vicinity suitable for using as a temporary terminus so that the proposed route would not remain unfulfilled.

19. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) regarding the airport bus service in SSP East, there was no luggage rack in the buses of route number 702 which provided interchanging service currently, members of the public also used that route for travelling to and from the market; (ii) he opposed the re-routing of bus route number 22; the route used The Festival Walk Terminus yet it did not serve the residents of SSP. He opined that the route should use Yen Chow Street Bus Terminus; (iii) the Children's Hospital would be relocated to Kai Tak Development Area, the transport demand for travelling between different districts and Kai Tak would increase; (iv) since bus route number 40 did not travel via SSP any more, there was no route travelling directly to Kwun Tong until then. He requested TD to address the Council's suggestion of extending bus route number 6D to Kwun Tong; (v) the extension of bus route number 12P to Hung Hom Station would overlap with West Rail Line, he enquired whether the same arrangement would be applied

to bus route number 12 in the future; (vi) the effectiveness of the alignment of the new route of Queen's Hill was rather low.

20. Ms Carman NG raised the following views: (i) she suggested the routes travelling to CMC could pass by SSP East and travel from Lung Cheung Road; (ii) she did not agree with the explanation that bus route number 702B had still not yet commenced operation due to the redevelopment of Pak Tin Estate. She suggested the route commence operation as soon as possible by using Hoi Ying Estate as the terminus.

21. Mr Calvin HO raised the following views: (i) considering that the route of bus route number 970X would be extended without increasing the frequency, he enquired how the situation of lost trips could be reduced; (ii) passengers of bus route numbers 970X or 970 needed to wait for 10 minutes to interchange with bus route number 796C, he enquired whether there were other alternatives; (iii) he suggested according priority to bus route numbers 970X or 970 for introducing the bus stop announcement system so that the passengers could know about the interchange situation.

22. Mr Joshua LI raised the following views: (i) he hoped that TD and the bus companies could consider providing an additional stop at Mei Foo for bus routes passing by Tsing Sha Highway; (ii) he hoped that Citybus would integrate the bus routes in Kowloon that overlapped with each other so that bus route number A20 could have the resources to increase the frequency.

23. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) she suggested bus route number 702B use a bus stop in Shek Kip Mei or SSP as the terminus first, or change to use Hoi Ying Estate as the terminus; (ii) residents of the new reclamation area had a keen demand for bus routes travelling to SSP.

24. Ms Peggy WONG responded as follows: (i) the objective of re-routing bus route number 12P was to provide residents of SSP and Tai Kok Tsui with a route connecting Hung Hom South and facilitate the public to travel to Hung Hom South Road for work; (ii) if members considered that the route of bus route number 12P overlapped with West Rail Line excessively, KMB would study the further extension of the terminus to Laguna Verde.

25. Mr Derek FU responded as follows: (i) it was estimated that bus route number 702B would commence operation in the middle of this year. He understood members' concerns over Pak Tin Estate Terminus, the Department would actively follow up on members' suggestions with relevant units; (ii) the Department would actively consider with the bus companies the suggestion of providing an additional stop at Mei Foo for bus routes travelling via Tsing Sha Highway.

26. Mr WONG Hon-chung responded as follows: (i) bus route number 702B was a circular route. Since relevant rest room facilities for bus captains could be provided at Pak Tin Estate Terminus only, the location concerned must be used as the terminus; (ii) after the extension of bus route number 970X to Kom Tsun Street, 2 more buses would be used for the route to offset the impacts of route extension on the bus frequency. For each trip, approximately one passenger would be affected; (iii) since 10 September 2018, all franchised bus routes of NWFB and Citybus had provided real-time bus stop announcement service with an accuracy rate of 90%; (iv) currently, when passengers travelled from SSP to the airport, they could take bus route number 702 and interchange with bus route number A21 at the same stop free of charge. NWFB would consider providing the same concession after the commencement of operation of bus route number 702B; (v) the patronage of bus route number A20 was only 40% in general, the bus frequency would be adjusted accordingly to meet the demand.

27. Mr Derek FU added as follows: (i) DCs had already been consulted on the suggestion on bus route number 22 early in the Bus Route Planning Programme 2017-2018 to serve the newly developed area in Kai Tak. The re-routing of this year mainly concerned the diversion via Muk Tai Street in Kai Tak; this did not conflict with members' suggestion of extending bus route number 22 to SSP; (ii) the suggestion of extending bus route number 22 to centre of Sham Shui Po would be considered thoroughly. However, since this would involve a major change in the route, time was required for studying the suggestion with the bus company.

28. Ms LIN Wai-kwan enquired whether the Department had taken into account the options of stopping at Wing Ming Street or using single-decked buses when considering the routes travelling to CMC.

29. Ms Carman NG raised the following views: (i) there were spaces for buses to stop at the bus stops of route numbers 86 and 86A near CMC; (ii) she suggested bus route number 702B use Hoi Ying Estate as the temporary terminus until the completion of Pak Tin Estate Terminus since bus route number 702A also used that location as the terminus.

30. Mr Derek FU responded as follows: (i) the Department would follow up with the bus companies on the situation of bus routes travelling to CMC. Using single-decked buses was also one of the options worth considering, yet it was necessary to take into account other factors such as the length of the bus body and the restrictions on road design; (ii) the Department would further study the suggestion of using Hoi Ying Estate as the terminus of bus route number 702B and actively follow up with relevant units on the date of commencement of operation of the route.

31. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu introduced the provisional motion: (i) the buses of route number 702 were always full when they arrived at Pei Ho Street Market, it was not a suitable route for interchanging with airport buses; he requested for a more desirable proposal; (ii) the service provided to SSP would not be enhanced after the extension of bus route number 22, resources were not used properly; (iii) he hoped that the Department would seriously consider the needs of members of the public travelling to the hospital for follow-ups and study the routes travelling to the hospital.

32. The Chairman asked members to vote on the first provisional motion put forward by Mr TAM Kwok-kiu. The motion was moved by Mr TAM Kwok-kiu and seconded by Mr Calvin HO and Mr Jay LI. It read as follows:

33. “In view that the Bus Route Planning Programme 2020-2021 continues to deprive more than 100 000 residents of SSP East of the right to take airport buses and disregard the requests of DC Members, PTAC of SSPDC strongly condemns NWFB/Citybus and TD and expresses deep regrets for that. PTAC of SSPDC urges Citybus/NWFB and TD again to formulate proposals immediately, consult the views of DC Members and implement airport bus service within this year to cover and address the needs of more than 100 000 residents of SSP East for taking airport buses!”

34. The Committee voted on the first provisional motion by open ballot and the voting result was as follows:

For: Ms Janet NG, Mr Joshua LI, Ms Carman NG, Mr TAM Kwok-kiu,
Ms Eunice CHAU, Mr Calvin HO, Mr Leo HO,
Mr KONG Kwai-sang, Mr Howard LEE, Mr Richard LI,
Mr Jay LI, Mr Jeffrey SIN, Mr WAI Woon-nam,
Mr WONG Kit-long, Ms LIN Wai-kwan (15)

Against: (0)

Abstain: Ms LAM Tsz-kwan, Mr John TANG (2)

35. The Secretary announced the voting result: 15 members voted for it, no member voted against it and 2 members abstained.

36. The Chairman declared that the above motion was carried.

37. The Chairman asked members to vote on the second provisional motion put forward by Mr TAM Kwok-kiu. The motion was moved by Mr TAM Kwok-kiu and seconded by Mr Calvin HO and Mr Jay LI. It read as follows:

“TD and Citybus have disregarded the fundamental and reasonable requests of more than 100 000 residents of SSP East for improvement in bus service for a long time, including: 1. They do not take into account the needs of most of the residents of SSP East for travelling to and from Kai Tak Development Area including the Cruise Terminal; 2. They refuse to address the needs of residents of SSP East as well as the residents living in the vicinity of Castle Peak Road for taking airport buses. In view of this, PTAC of SSPDC expresses strong dissatisfaction. Regarding the suggestion of extending the service area of Citybus route number 22 proposed in the Bus Route Planning Programme 2020-2021 by TD and Citybus, the Committee does not agree with the suggestion and opposes the amended suggestion on the route of bus route number 22.”

38. The Committee voted on the second provisional motion by open ballot and the voting result was as follows:

For: Ms Zoé CHOW, Ms Janet NG, Mr Joshua LI, Ms Carman NG, Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, Ms Eunice CHAU, Mr Calvin HO, Mr Leo HO, Mr KONG Kwai-sang, Mr Howard LEE, Mr Richard LI, Mr Jay LI, Mr Jeffrey SIN, Mr WAI Woon-nam, Mr Ramon YUEN, Ms LIN Wai-kwan (16)

Against: (0)

Abstain: Ms LAM Tsz-kwan, Mr John TANG (2)

39. The Secretary announced the voting result: 16 members voted for it, no member voted against it and 2 members abstained.

40. The Chairman declared that the above motion was carried.

41. The Chairman concluded as follows: (i) it was hoped that TD and the bus companies could follow up on the suggestions put forward by members and make improvements to provide convenience to the public; (ii) the suggestions on individual routes could be followed up by the Working Group on Public Transport Services.

(b) A deadline must be set for demolishing the footbridge so as to release idle land for development (PTAC Paper 5/20)

42. Mr Jay LI introduced Paper 5/20.

43. The Chairman asked members to refer to Response Paper 14/20 of the Lands Department.

44. Ms Katy FUNG introduced Response Paper 15/20.

45. Mr Simon WONG responded as follows: (i) the future development of Cheong San Lane Footbridge would be considered together with the development of the nearby sites; (ii) TD was open-minded towards the use of the site of the footbridge and the long-term development of the nearby sites, it had no plan to demolish the footbridge for the time being.

46. Mr John TANG raised the following enquiries: (i) there were already many parks in the vicinity, he enquired why Cheong San Lane Footbridge was zoned as open space; (ii) the approved South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan was endorsed in 2014, he enquired about the reasons for zoning the site as open space at that time; (iii) he enquired whether the Planning Department ("PlanD") intended to change the land use of the site concerned; (iv) he enquired whether the public would be consulted on the development of the footbridge.

47. Ms LAM Tsz-kwan raised the following enquiries: (i) how to count the term of the land use; (ii) whether the user could apply for extension if the five-year term of temporary use expired; (iii) the progress of the implementation of the underground smart car park by TD and whether the construction of the car park and the transitional housing would commence at the same time; (iv) which department would take the lead to decide on the demolition of the footbridge and which factors would be taken into account.

48. Mr WONG Kit-long raised the following views: (i) since the closure of Cheong San Lane Footbridge, there was no concrete plan to handle the matter so far; (ii) he had consulted the views of the residents, most of them supported the demolition of the footbridge; (iii) although a small number of residents had suggested revitalising the footbridge, the most opportune time for revitalisation had been missed after such a long lapse; (iv) he suggested releasing the space of the footbridge for construction of a multi-storey car park to alleviate the demand of the residents of Fu Cheong Estate for parking spaces and the problem of illegal parking; (iv) he hoped that the departments could give the Council a clear response as to whether Cheong San Lane Footbridge would be demolished.

49. Mr WAI Woon-nam raised the following views: (i) he enquired about the situation of Sham Shui Po District Office (“SSPDO”) following up on the demolition of Cheong San Lane Footbridge; (ii) he enquired why the above location could not be changed to residential area and could only be used for constructing modular housing for temporary use instead; (iii) the utilisation rate of Cheong San Lane Footbridge had remained low for many years and had been closed eventually. The footbridge should be demolished to release the land; (iv) he suggested using the ground level as a hostel for street sleepers and constructing a multi-storey car park on top of the hostel.

50. Mr Calvin HO raised the following views: (i) Cheong San Lane Footbridge had been idle for a long time. Over the years, different suggestions had been put forward yet there was no concrete plan so far; (ii) he requested that actions be taken as soon as possible.

51. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) a report of the Ombudsman pointed out that the cost for maintenance and demolition of idle flyovers should be reviewed; (ii) different departments had given reasons for retaining Cheong San Lane Footbridge while the footbridge was still idle until then; (iii) he hoped that TD and the Highways Department (“HyD”) could discuss the actual operation of the demolition of the footbridge; (iv) the space for development would be limited if the footbridge was not demolished.

52. Ms Janet NG raised the following views: (i) DC had expressed its concerns over Cheong San Lane Footbridge for many years, yet no concrete response had been received; (ii) she hoped that the departments would address DC’s views on the demolition of the footbridge.

53. Ms Katy FUNG responded as follows: (i) there were parks with larger area in the vicinity of the relevant site; this kind of open space with larger area could be used as district open space to provide a variety of facilities including outdoor recreational facilities for use by residents in the district. On the other hand, the area of the site of Cheong San Lane Footbridge was smaller, the site was used as local open space for use by nearby residents; (ii) in general, the year of land grant marked the commencement of the term of a short-term tenancy. Upon the expiry of the tenancy, the occupant could submit an application for extension to the Government. PlanD would consider whether to permit the extension of the term of tenancy based on the justification of the applicant and the circumstances at that time; (iii) regarding TD’s plan on the construction of a smart car park, TD noted that it must first submit a planning application to the Town Planning Board (“TPB”).

54. Mr Simon WONG responded as follows: (i) regarding the construction of a car park in the vicinity of Cheong San Lane Footbridge, TD had already consulted DC in mid-2019

and suggested constructing a smart car park and providing open space in the junction of Yen Chow Street and Tung Chau Street. It was estimated that the car park could provide approximately 200 parking spaces and would complement the development of the transitional housing in the vicinity; (ii) the demolition of the footbridge would complement the future development of the nearby sites. If there was a development plan, the Department would give advice on the transport aspect and provide necessary support.

55. Assistant District Officer 1 responded as follows: (i) SSPDO was open-minded towards the demolition of Cheong San Lane Footbridge and would not exclude any feasible plan that utilised land resources, provided that there was a detailed development plan available; (ii) some non-government organisations (“NGOs”) had indicated their interests in the development of the footbridge concerned and the nearby lands, the relevant suggestions had already been studied; (iii) the departments concerned would inform the Council of further updates.

56. Mr WAI Woon-nam raised the following views: (i) there were many opposing views when DC had been consulted on the smart car park, he was concerned that the vehicular flow of going in and leaving the car park would make Yen Chow Street and Tung Chau Street more congested; (ii) he suggested constructing a permanent conventional car park; (iii) there was no direct relationship between the demolition of Cheong San Lane Footbridge and the plan of the NGOs; (iv) he requested the departments to actively consider demolishing the footbridge.

57. Mr WONG Kit-long raised the following views: (i) a response must be given as to whether Cheong San Lane Footbridge would be demolished, a schedule should be provided if the footbridge was to be demolished; (ii) the construction of smart car park was objected by DC, yet TD had neither addressed the views nor responded to DC’s request for the construction of a conventional multi-storey car park.

58. Ms LAM Tsz-kwan raised the following views: (i) she enquired about the ways of handling the renewal of the short-term tenancy upon its expiry since the term of tenancy was an important factor for NGOs to consider whether to rent the land; (ii) she enquired whether the option of changing the land use of the site to “Government, Institution or Community” would be considered.

59. Mr John TANG enquired whether PlanD would study the option of changing the land use of the location concerned and asked about the relevant schedule, he also hoped that the Department would listen more to the public views.

60. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) when planning the land use, the Government should take into account the situation of population mobility for long-term

planning; (ii) he hoped that the Government would utilise DC as a consultation platform; (iii) some NGOs hoped to utilise that land and suggested demolishing the footbridge, he enquired how the cost of the works would be shared; (iv) he supported the demolition of Cheong San Lane Footbridge during the development of the transitional housing.

61. Mr Richard LI raised the following views: (i) the nearby residents had a consensus on the demolition of the footbridge already; (ii) there was a section of idle down ramp of West Kowloon Corridor, he suggested that it could first be used as a place for clothes-drying instead.

62. Ms Janet NG raised the following views: (i) public housing instead of transitional housing should be built; (ii) she requested to add this item into the follow-up matters.

63. Mr Jay LI said that regarding the issue as to whether the footbridge should be retained, he hoped that the departments would give a clear response to the organisations who proposed to use that land.

64. Ms Katy FUNG responded as follows: (i) when changing the land use, it was necessary to consider whether there was still a need for the planned long-term use as well as take into account the proposed long-term use and the technical feasibility including the conduct of a technical assessment; (ii) if the open space was rezoned for other uses, there would be less open space in the district for the residents' use; (iii) when the temporary tenancy of the land expired, it was necessary to take into account the implementation schedule for the planned long-term use and consider whether there were more urgent uses for the land concerned, before deciding whether the term could be extended.

65. Mr Simon WONG responded as follows: (i) when developing government lands, the authorities would apply the principle of "single site, multiple use" as far as possible. For example, regarding the proposal for the above smart car park, the design incorporated the development elements of open space and underground car park at the same site; (ii) whether it was a conventional or smart car park, it was necessary to conduct a technical feasibility assessment. Currently, the matter of the smart car park concerned had been handed over to the Buildings Department ("BD") for follow up on the relevant assessment and design.

66. The Chairman concluded as follows: (i) the Council had all along expressed its concerns over Cheong San Lane Footbridge, it was hoped that PlanD and TD would report the situation regularly; (ii) the item would be added into the list of follow-up actions for matters of discussion at PTAC meeting.

(c) Submission of an application by the developers again for increasing the number of flats to be built at the sites of Yuen Fat Godown/Kerry Warehouse Objection to the developers for pushing their luck (PTAC Paper 6/20)

67. Mr Ramon YUEN introduced Paper 6/20.

68. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) she opposed the developers' approach of increasing the number of flats to be built by reducing the area of the flats since increasing the number of households would increase the demand for parking spaces; (ii) the supply of parking spaces at the road sections in the vicinity to the project had nearly reached full capacity.

69. Ms Katy FUNG introduced Response Paper 16/20, and added as follows: (i) the applicant could submit further information to TPB to supplement the application documents; (ii) PlanD would forward the relevant information to different departments for consideration; (iii) at the present stage, the departments required the applicant to provide more information about the technical assessment for explaining/supporting the assessment result; (iv) the applicant had already submitted an application to TPB for deferral of consideration, the matter would be handled at the meeting of TPB on 17 March; (v) based on the information submitted by the applicant, the advice given by PlanD to the applicant at the present stage was mainly about the technical problems of the assessment report used for supporting the assessment result submitted.

70. Ms Eunice HUI responded as follows: (i) the number of flats to be built which was recently revised by the applicant was 3 647 and the number of household parking spaces was 616, this complied with the higher standard of the number of parking spaces under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines ("HKPSG"); (ii) according to HKPSG, flats with smaller area required less parking spaces.

71. Mr John TANG raised the following enquiries: (i) the justification for approving the relaxation on the plot ratio of the project (Application Number: A/K20/128); (ii) the factors of considering the application for increasing the number of flats to be built.

72. Mr Ramon YUEN raised the following views: (i) he enquired which department was responsible for considering the application for increasing the number of flats to be built by reducing the area of flats; (ii) HKPSG's requirements on the parking spaces could not meet the actual needs; (iii) the project occupied public land, TD should require the developers to provide additional public parking spaces to alleviate the problem of illegal parking in the neighbourhood; (iv) he requested PlanD to briefly introduce the latest technical advice on the project given by various departments.

73. Ms Eunice HUI responded as follows: (i) TD had already invited a consultant to study the demand and supply of parking spaces and review the guidelines on private car parking spaces under HKPSG, with the hope of increasing the number of private car parking spaces of the housing development projects in the future; (ii) the Department would consult the stakeholders on the proposed amendments in a timely manner, it was expected that the revised standards would be announced within this year; (iii) the suggestion of requiring the provision of additional parking spaces was noted, the matter would be followed up when the applicant submitted further information.

74. Ms Katy FUNG responded as follows: (i) regarding Application Number A/K20/128 for increasing the plot ratio, the applicant had submitted the technical assessment concerned on aspects such as transport, landscape, air ventilation, sewage and drainage, as well as supplementary information in response to the advice of various departments; the application had been endorsed by TPB in 2018; (ii) regarding Application Number A/K20/132, no department had commented on the quantity/area of the flats to be built; (iii) currently, the departments required the applicant to provide more information to explain in detail and support the assessment result, including information about the air ventilation simulation assessment, the relationship between the visual aspect of the project and its surrounding environment, the information about traffic assessment, etc.

75. The Chairman asked members to vote on the motion in Paper 6/20 which was moved by Mr Ramon YUEN and seconded by the Chairman. It read as follows:

“The Committee objects to the developers for pushing their luck by further increasing the number of flats to be built regarding project A/K20/132 since the application concerned would cast negative impacts in aspects such as transport and air ventilation on the community. At the same time, the Committee requests TPB to reject the application concerned.”

76. The Committee voted on the motion in Paper 6/20 by open ballot and the voting result was as follows:

For: Ms Zoé CHOW, Mr YEUNG Yuk, Ms Janet NG, Mr Joshua LI,
Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, Ms Eunice CHAU, Mr KONG Kwai-sang,
Mr Howard LEE, Mr Jay LI, Mr Jeffrey SIN, Mr Ronald TSUI,
Mr WONG Kit-long, Mr Ramon YUEN, Ms LIN Wai-kwan
(14)

Against: (0)

Abstain: Ms LAM Tsz-kwan, Mr John TANG
(2)

77. The Secretary announced the voting result: 14 members voted for it, no member voted against it and 2 members abstained.

78. The Chairman declared that the above motion was carried and it was hoped that various departments would take practical follow-up actions on the enquiries and suggestions in the paper.

(d) Concern over Lawsgroup's application for redeveloping No. 822 Lai Chi Kok Road into a commercial building (PTAC Paper 7/20)

79. Mr Ramon YUEN introduced Paper 7/20.

80. The Chairman asked members to refer to Response Paper 18/20 of MTR and Response Paper 22/20 of the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD").

81. Ms Katy FUNG introduced Response Paper 17/20 and added as follows: (i) the application concerned had already been approved by TPB on 6 March this year, with the condition that proposed parking spaces, loading/unloading facilities and vehicular run-in/out should be designed and provided and sewage connection facilities should be constructed; (ii) TPB also required that setback of buildings at Lai Chi Kok Road and Cheung Lai Street for 3.5 metres should be designed and provided to optimise the pedestrian space to be moved backward; (iii) in accordance with the consultancy report on air ventilation assessment of PlanD in 2010, Cheung Yee Street and Cheung Shun Street acted as the air paths of the location concerned. If the height of the buildings could not be capped at 60 metres above Principal Datum, the width of the two streets should not be less than 17 metres; (iv) PlanD had added the requirement of building setback at Cheung Yee Street and Cheung Shun Street for 5 metres and 3.5 metres respectively when amending the Outline Zoning Plan. The requirement concerned had to be complied with when redeveloping the industrial buildings; (v) the applicant explained that the area of the construction site was only around 1 300 square metres, with a setback for 3.5 metres for the whole building along Lai Chi Kok Road and Cheung Lai Street and a specified number of parking spaces needed to be provided. Therefore, there was no more space for constructing a passage connecting the MTR station; (vi) the applicant said that the practice note of BD, which included the requirement on the sunlight reflected by glass curtain walls, would be complied with; (vii) the applicant also said that the roof garden and the podium on the third floor of the project would not be used for large-scale activities, thus no excessive noise would be produced; (viii) when changing the land use, the Department would make reference to the above consultancy report on air ventilation assessment and conduct an individual air ventilation assessment on the proposed development.

82. Ms Eunice HUI responded as follows: (i) TD was open-minded towards the provision of covers for footpaths in compliance with the standards by the applicant to enhance the comfort of pedestrians; (ii) the Department was open-minded towards members' suggestion of connecting the project to the MTR Station, yet review and assess on whether it would affect the design for the car park and the number of parking spaces would be done.

83. Mr Ricky LEE responded that HyD did not have any views on the application at the present stage.

84. Ms LAM Tsz-kwan raised the following enquiries: (i) whether PlanD had required the applicant to provide setback at Cheung Yee Street when processing the application concerned; (ii) whether the provision of setback at Cheung Yee Street would not be required for the redevelopment project at Lai Chi Kok Road.

85. Mr Ramon YUEN raised the following views: (i) Lai Chi Kok Road was relatively wider, there was a greater need for providing setback at Cheung Yee Street; (ii) since there was no application for proposed redevelopment at Cheung Yee Street currently, he enquired whether it would be desirable to require the provision of setback at Cheung Yee Street; (iii) he hoped that the developer would listen to the suggestion of connecting the project and the MTR station; (iv) he hoped that EPD would provide more detailed information about the noise that would be created during the construction period.

86. The Chairman raised the following views: (i) she hoped that EPD would regulate the situation of light nuisance before the construction of the project commenced; (ii) in the long run, the situation concerned should be improved at policy level.

87. Ms Katy FUNG responded as follows: (i) the applicant had also suggested that setback for one metre be provided on the ground floor and the first floor of the building towards the direction of Cheung Yee Street, with the net height of approximately 10 metres; (ii) the applicant said that since space needed to be reserved for the loading/unloading area for goods vehicles and the underground car park, the setback for one metre could only be provided on the ground floor and the first floor; (iii) there were also requirements on setback for other streets in that industrial and commercial area, setback was required at Lai Chi Kok Road for the project concerned; (iv) the requirement on setback could only be imposed when the building was being redeveloped.

88. The Chairman asked members to vote on the motion in Paper 7/20 which was moved by Mr Ramon YUEN and seconded by the Chairman. It read as follows:

“The Committee objects to the developer for relaxing the plot ratio and the height restriction on buildings in respect of (A/K5/813). The application concerned makes residents worry about the negative impacts such as the transport, air ventilation and light nuisance, etc., and it cannot respond effectively to the residents’ hope for enhancement of the walking environment. The Committee requests the Government and TPB to face up to the views of the residents and impose binding requirements on the developer.”

89. The Committee voted on the motion in Paper 7/20 by open ballot and the voting result was as follows:

For: Ms Zoé CHOW, Mr YEUNG Yuk, Ms Janet NG, Mr Joshua LI, Mr CHUM Tak-shing, Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, Ms Eunice CHAU, Mr Leo HO, Mr KONG Kwai-sang, Mr Howard LEE, Mr Jay LI, Mr Jeffrey SIN, Mr Ronald TSUI, Mr WAI Woon-nam, Mr WONG Kit-long, Mr YAN Kai-wing, Mr Ramon YUEN, Ms LIN Wai-kwan
(18)

Against: (0)

Abstain: Ms LAM Tsz-kwan, Mr John TANG
(2)

90. The Secretary announced the voting result: 18 members voted for it, no member voted against it and 2 members abstained.

91. The Chairman declared that the above motion was carried.

92. The Chairman concluded that it was hoped that various departments would consider members’ views and give a response to the enquiries raised.

(e) Request for mitigating the noise problems at Kwai Chung Road Flyover and Ching Cheung Road Flyover (PTAC Paper 8/20)

93. Mr Joshua LI introduced Paper 8/20 with the aid of PowerPoint.

94. Mr TSE Yu-ngai introduced Response Paper 19/20.

95. Ms Eunice HUI responded as follows: (i) currently, TD had no plan to install fixed speed enforcement cameras at the relevant road sections, yet it would continue to closely monitor the situation of speeding and traffic accidents; (ii) if necessary, the Department

would install new fixed speed enforcement cameras in accordance with the criteria of the mechanism and resource allocation.

96. Mr Ricky LEE responded as follows: (i) over the past 5 years, HyD had completed the resurfacing works for a section of both bounds of Ching Cheung Road near Nob Hill and the replacement works for 13 expansion joints of Kwai Chung Road Flyover in phases; (ii) the Department had already completed the resurfacing works for a section of eastbound Kwai Chung Road near Mei Foo Bus Terminus last year; (iii) low noise material had been used for the resurfacing works for the two road sections. The Department would continue to monitor the road condition and carry out maintenance work in a timely manner.

97. Mr YEUNG Yuk raised the following views: (i) since the Police took fewer enforcement actions, the situation of speeding occurred more frequently on highways; (ii) regarding Hoi Lai Estate which was located between West Kowloon Expressway and Castle Peak Road, the complaints on noise nuisance had increased substantially in the beginning of this year; (iii) he hoped the Police report the result of relevant enforcement actions and step up enforcement.

98. Ms Janet NG enquired whether TD would install speed enforcement cameras according to public views and asked about the schedule concerned.

99. Mr Joshua LI raised the following views: (i) TD should install speed enforcement cameras at the locations concerned as soon as possible if certain requirements were met; (ii) he enquired whether the Department would consider using average speed control and whether a study had been carried out; (iii) he requested the Police to step up speed enforcement operations to ensure road safety.

100. Ms Eunice CHAU raised the following views: (i) although the number of operations carried out by the Police had reduced, the number of drivers being prosecuted was still high; this reflected that enforcement must be stepped up; (ii) she hoped that EPD could provide the information about the number of vehicles carrying out annual inspection, and suggested the Department make it mandatory for speeding vehicles to carry out annual inspection earlier to review whether they had been converted.

101. Mr John TANG raised the following enquiries: (i) the reasons for the Police carrying out speed enforcement operations less frequently in recent years; (ii) whether the Police would charge the drivers with dangerous driving apart from prosecuting them for speeding; (iii) the percentage of successful prosecutions.

102. Mr TSE Yu-ngai responded as follows: (i) the Police would step up enforcement efforts in traffic matters, including setting up road blocks and carrying out speed

enforcement operations more frequently; (ii) the offenders would be charged with offences such as dangerous driving; (iii) the Police would step up data collection work, carry out unannounced inspections at suspected locations of illegal car racing, and tow away the vehicles for inspection immediately if necessary.

103. Ms Eunice HUI responded as follows: (i) TD would install additional fixed speed enforcement cameras from time to time, and decide the number and locations of additional cameras each year in accordance with the criteria; (ii) the Department was carrying out a study and preparatory planning for the average speed camera system with the Police, it was expected that road tests could commence within this year.

104. Ms Janet NG raised the following views: (i) she enquired about the factors for TD to consider installing additional speed enforcement cameras; (ii) the Department should face up to the views of the public and the Committee.

105. Ms Eunice HUI responded as follows: (i) the criteria for installing speed enforcement cameras included the record of traffic accidents, the general vehicle speed and the danger posed as observed by the Police, the geographical and environmental factors of the carriageways concerned; (ii) members' views were noted and would be relayed to the Traffic Control Division for follow up.

106. The Chairman concluded as follows: (i) the situation of noise nuisance on highways was a matter of concern for residents of various areas; (ii) it was hoped that the Police would play the role of gate-keeper and take vigorous enforcement actions against illegal car racing; (iii) it was hoped that TD would install more speed enforcement cameras and report the relevant locations.

(f) Traffic lights must be repaired as soon as possible to ensure road safety (PTAC Paper 9/20)

107. Mr Jay LI introduced Paper 9/20.

108. Mr CHAN Kin-hong responded as follows: (i) during the period from August to December last year, there had been approximately 1 500 cases of severely damaged traffic lights in the territory that had resulted in the traffic lights of the entire road junction going off; (ii) approximately 90 traffic lights at 144 road junctions in SSP District had been damaged, among which more than 10 cases were rather serious; (iii) the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("EMSD") had already completed major emergency repair works in the territory on 21 December last year, and the operation of traffic lights of the entire road junction had resumed; (iv) due to a large number of damaged traffic lights, it took time to purchase materials for the repair works. The Department had already

requested the supplier to provide the materials as soon as possible; (v) the Department had also integrated the parts of damaged traffic lights into usable components in order to expedite repair works; (vi) it was not possible to estimate the date of completion of all repair works for the time being.

109. Ms Eunice HUI responded as follows: (i) TD had sent staff to review the condition of damage of the traffic lights after the traffic lights had resumed basic operation; (ii) although some parts such as light cases, light shades and light panels had yet to be repaired, the operation of the road junctions was not significantly affected; (iii) the Department would post notices to remind pedestrians to cross the roads carefully at road junctions with heavy traffic such as the junction of Cheung Sha Wan Road/Yen Chow Street; (iv) the Department would continue to work closely with EMSD to arrange for repair works and replacement of parts of the traffic lights.

110. Ms LIN Wai-kwan enquired about the criteria for according priority for repair works for the traffic lights.

111. Mr CHUM Tak-shing raised the following views: (i) he had doubts about the stock of the parts for repair works; (ii) he did not understand why no temporary measure had been implemented or no substitute had been provided after the traffic lights had been damaged; (iii) he requested for the information about the details of the condition of damage, such as the damaged parts and the situation.

112. Ms LAM Tsz-kwan enquired how to calculate the number of damaged traffic lights.

113. The Chairman said that the departments should provide details of the condition of damage of the traffic lights to allay public concerns.

114. Ms Eunice HUI responded as follows: (i) apart from posting notices, temporary traffic arrangements, for instance the provision of temporary traffic lights, would also be implemented at the affected road sections subject to the actual traffic condition; (ii) however, there were certain limitations on temporary traffic arrangements. It might be necessary to close some of the lanes and the arrangements had to be considered depending on individual circumstances.

115. Mr CHAN Kin-hong responded as follows: (i) TD would accord priority for repair works based on the traffic flow and number of pedestrians/vehicles crossing the roads of the road junctions; (ii) the figure on the damage was calculated in terms of each damaged traffic light; (iii) there were certain technical requirements on traffic lights and substitutes could not be found easily; (iv) only the figure on damaged traffic lights was available for the time being, while the figure on the degree of damage was not available.

116. Mr CHUM Tak-shing enquired whether the departments had no statistics on the condition of damage or the damaged parts.

117. Ms LIN Wai-kwan said that the condition of damage could be inferred from the statistics on the parts used for repair works.

118. Mr CHAN Kin-hong responded as follows: (i) there were still a few damaged traffic lights on the streets, the repair works would be carried out as soon as the parts were available; (ii) the entire traffic light must be replaced regardless of the degree of damage, thus the statistics on the degree of damage was not available.

119. Mr Ricky LEE responded that HyD was responsible for repairing street lamps only, EMSD was responsible for repairing traffic lights.

120. The Chairman concluded as follows: (i) in view of varied degree of damage of the traffic lights, the departments should provide more information to allay public concerns; (ii) it was hoped that various departments would continue to follow up on the repair works.

(g) Pedestrian crossing must be provided as soon as possible in order to improve the safety of pedestrians crossing Tai Hang Sai Street (PTAC Paper 10/20)

121. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu introduced Paper 10/20.

122. Mr TSE Yu-ngai introduced Response Paper 20/20, and added that fixed penalty notice would be issued through the electronic system starting from this month in SSP District.

123. Mr KWOK Chin-yeung responded as follows: (i) since some pedestrians crossed Tai Hang Sai Street near the entrance/exit of the car park of Tai Hang Sai Estate currently, TD suggested providing cautionary crossings and safety islands there; (ii) to ensure crossing safety, a tree there needed to be removed to improve the sightline. The Department had held discussion with the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD"), yet a feasible proposal was not available for the time being; (iii) the suggestion concerned also required that vehicles would be prohibited from turning left from the car park of Tai Hang Sai Estate to Tai Hang Sai Street. The Department would arrange for the conduct of local consultation after confirming the feasibility of the proposal.

124. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) the situation of illegal parking at Nam Shan Chuen Road posed danger to the traffic, he hoped that the Police would pay attention to the situation; (ii) it was necessary to improve the safety of pedestrians crossing

the road junction from Nam Shan Chuen Road to Nam Cheong Street in Shek Kip Mei, he enquired about the follow-up actions on the matter.

125. Mr TSE Yu-ngai responded that the situation of illegal parking at the road section concerned was noted, enforcement would be stepped up in the future.

126. Mr KWOK Chin-yeung responded that the Department had already sent staff to inspect Nam Shan Estate and worked out a preliminary proposal. However, since a tree had to be removed at the location concerned, the Department still needed to discuss the matter with LCSD.

127. Mr Jeffrey SIN raised the following views: (i) the problem of illegal parking occurred in different areas of SSP District, even taxi stations were fully parked with taxis; (ii) members of the public had to wait for buses in the middle of the road because the illegally parked vehicles obstructed their sightlines, ambulances could not be parked at suitable locations; the situation was very dangerous; (iii) he hoped that the departments would follow up on the problem concerned.

128. Mr TSE Yu-ngai responded as follows: (i) SSP Police District actively combatted illegal parking at bus stops including initiating prosecution and towing away vehicles; (ii) it was hoped that drivers' attitudes and the situation of illegal parking would be improved through enforcement actions and publicity; (iii) the Police would step up enforcement.

129. The Chairman asked members to vote on the first motion in Paper 10/20. The motion was moved by Mr TAM Kwok-kiu and seconded by Mr Calvin HO and Mr WAI Woon-nam. It read as follows:

“The existing crossing facilities at Tai Hang Sai Street cannot meet and respond to the daily needs of residents crossing Tai Hang Sai Street, the lax prosecution of the Police also makes the situation of illegal parking at Tai Hang Sai Street become the norm; these severely harm the safety of the residents crossing Tai Hang Sai Street. In view of this, the Committee strongly requests TD to formulate measures immediately, including but not limited to the provision of pedestrian-crossing safety islands at Tai Hang Sai Street, so as to improve the safety of the residents crossing Tai Hang Sai Street!”

130. The Committee voted on the first motion in Paper 10/20 by open ballot and the voting result was as follows:

For: Ms Zoé CHOW, Ms Janet NG, Mr CHUM Tak-shing, Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, Ms Eunice CHAU, Mr KONG Kwai-sang, Mr Howard LEE, Mr Jay LI, Mr Jeffrey SIN, Mr Ronald TSUI, Mr WONG Kit-long, Mr YAN Kai-wing, Mr Ramon YUEN (13)

Against: (0)

Abstain: Ms LAM Tsz-kwan, Mr John TANG (2)

131. The Secretary announced the voting result: 13 members voted for it, no member voted against it and 2 members abstained.

132. The Chairman declared that the above motion was carried.

133. The Chairman asked members to vote on the second motion in Paper 10/20. The motion was moved by Mr TAM Kwok-kiu and seconded by Mr Calvin HO and Mr WAI Woon-nam. It read as follows:

“The existing crossing facilities at Tai Hang Sai Street cannot meet and respond to the daily needs of residents crossing Tai Hang Sai Street, the lax prosecution of the Police also makes the situation of illegal parking at Tai Hang Sai Street become the norm; these severely harm the safety of the residents crossing Tai Hang Sai Street. In view of this, the Committee strongly opposes Carrie Lam’s government for requisitioning district police force as the power to protect its ineffective governance and the incompetent authorities! The district police force should address the district needs, step up efforts in formulating effective enforcement arrangements and plans, improve the situation of illegal parking at Tai Hang Sai Street and the streets nearby, and report the matter to the Committee regularly.”

134. The Committee voted on the second motion in Paper 10/20 by open ballot and the voting result was as follows:

For: Ms Zoé CHOW, Ms Janet NG, Mr Joshua LI, Mr CHUM Tak-shing, Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, Ms Eunice CHAU, Mr KONG Kwai-sang, Mr Howard LEE, Mr Jay LI, Mr Jeffrey SIN, Mr Ronald TSUI, Mr WONG Kit-long, Mr YAN Kai-wing, Mr Ramon YUEN (14)

Against: (0)

Abstain: Ms LAM Tsz-kwan, Mr John TANG (2)

135. The Secretary announced the voting result: 14 members voted for it, no member voted against it and 2 members abstained.

136. The Chairman declared that the above motion was carried.

137. The Chairman concluded as follows: (i) it was hoped that the departments would implement the arrangements for enhancement of the crossings as soon as possible; (ii) it was hoped that the departments would step up efforts in combating illegal parking.

(h) Danger arising from illegal parking at Nam Cheong Street and Wai Lun Street (PTAC Paper 11/20)

138. Mr YAN Kai-wing introduced Paper 11/20 with the aid of PowerPoint.

139. Mr TSE Yu-ngai introduced Response Paper 21/20, and added that the enforcement figures of Nam Cheong Street covered the entire section of Nam Cheong Street.

140. Mr YAN Kai-wing raised the following views: (i) the road section concerned had often been neglected in the past, yet there was potential danger; (ii) large vehicles that were illegally parked there were rarely prosecuted, this would encourage more vehicles to be parked illegally; (iii) he hoped that the Police would step up enforcement.

141. Mr John TANG raised the following views: (i) the shortage of parking spaces led to the problem of illegal parking, thus the Government had to review the number of parking spaces; (ii) he agreed that it was necessary to tow away vehicles that were illegally parked at bus stops; (iii) he hoped that the Police would continue to combat illegal parking.

142. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) it was necessary to address the shortage of parking facilities, TD had to continue to study various proposals on increasing parking spaces; (ii) the Department should study the traffic design of Pak Wan Street; (iii) he hoped that the Police could tow away vehicles that were illegally parked at bus stops and road sections marked with double yellow lines and make it a regular practice to strengthen the deterrent effect.

143. Mr KONG Kwai-sang raised the following views: (i) the situation of the road section from Po On Road to Hing Wah Street was the same as that of the location mentioned in the paper; (ii) drivers might stop their vehicles at bus stops for convenience or loading/unloading activities, he enquired how the Police would handle the situation; (iii) he hoped that the Police would carry out more unannounced prosecution operations; (iv) he agreed that it was necessary to increase parking spaces in the long run.

144. Mr Jay LI raised the following views: (i) the number of licensed vehicles had increased from 401 692 in 2006 to 616 220 in 2018, while the number of parking spaces had increased from 607 411 in 2006 to 675 264; (ii) the ratio of vehicles to parking spaces had decreased from 1.51 in 2006 to 1.1 in 2018, the increase in private cars far exceeded the increase in parking spaces; (iii) the severity of the situation of illegal parking was subject to the following factors, including the government policies, the market for parking spaces and the police enforcement; (iv) he hoped that the Police would step up enforcement and the Government would consider adjusting the rent for its parking spaces and implement measures on controlling the rent for parking spaces. At the policy level, the number of parking spaces should be increased or the number of vehicles should be reduced.

145. Mr TSE Yu-ngai responded as follows: (i) e-Ticketing would be adopted to strengthen enforcement; (ii) photography equipment would be used regularly for recording the situation of illegal parking and initiating prosecution; (iii) he hoped that enforcement actions could be taken at different times and locations when resources permitted, while the current enforcement efforts mainly focused on combating illegal parking at bus stops; (iv) he hoped that the media reports could maximise the publicity impact.

146. Mr KWOK Chin-yeung responded as follows: (i) the Government was implementing a series of measures to increase the supply of parking spaces. Short-term measures included providing on-street parking spaces as far as possible without affecting road safety and other road users, providing additional parking spaces at temporary car parks under short-term tenancies, etc.; (ii) medium and long-term measures included providing additional public parking spaces in suitable government projects or other development projects under the principle of “single site, multiple use” to optimise land use.

147. Mr Jeffrey SIN said that when buses turned right from Pak Tin Street to Woh Chai Street, the illegally parked vehicles made the buses not able to make turns. As a result, the tailback was extended to Tai Po Road. He hoped that the Police would note the situation concerned.

148. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) illegal parking would reduce the number of carriageways, traffic congestion would occur when there was only one traffic lane left; (ii) he hoped that the Police would pay attention to the situation of illegal parking at turning junctions and step up enforcement.

149. Mr TSE Yu-ngai responded as follows: (i) the Police would consider members' views when formulating various policies; (ii) the Police would definitely accord priority in taking enforcement actions against situations that obstructed buses from proceeding.

150. The Chairman concluded as follows: (i) it was hoped that various departments would continue to work together to combat illegal parking; (ii) enforcement should be stepped up in the short term. In the medium term, technology could be used for assisting in taking enforcement actions. In the long term, it was hoped that TD could identify sites for constructing car parks.

Agenda Item 3: Follow-up matters

(a) List of follow-up actions for matters of discussion at PTAC meeting (PTAC Paper 12/20)

151. The Committee noted and endorsed the above report.

(b) Project items and schedules of district traffic improvement works completed, under construction or under planning within the past two months by the Transport Department/Highways Department (PTAC Paper 13/20)

152. The Committee noted and endorsed the above report.

Agenda Item 4: Any other business

153. Members did not raise any other business.

Agenda Item 5: Date of next meeting

154. The next meeting would be held at 9:30 a.m. on 28 May 2020 (Thursday).

155. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 2:15 p.m.

District Council Secretariat
Sham Shui Po District Office
April 2020