

Sha Tin District Council
Minutes of the Special Meeting of
the Traffic and Transport Committee in 2021

Date: 25 March 2021 (Thursday)

Time: 2:30 pm

Venue: Sha Tin District Office Conference Room 441
 4/F, Sha Tin Government Offices

<u>Present</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Time of joining the meeting</u>	<u>Time of leaving the meeting</u>
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael (Chairman)	DC Member	2:30 pm	7:22 pm
Mr LAI Tsz-yan (Vice-Chairman)	”	3:24 pm	7:22 pm
Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	DC Chairman	2:30 pm	7:22 pm
Mr WONG Hok-lai, George	DC Vice-Chairman	4:32 pm	5:29 pm
Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	DC Member	2:30 pm	3:46 pm
Mr CHAN Nok-hang	”	2:30 pm	6:11 pm
Mr CHAN Pui-ming	”	2:30 pm	7:22 pm
Mr CHAN Wan-tung	”	2:39 pm	6:57 pm
Mr CHENG Chung-hang	”	2:49 pm	7:19 pm
Mr CHENG Tsuk-man	”	2:51 pm	4:38 pm
Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa	”	2:30 pm	7:22 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong	”	3:03 pm	3:39 pm
Mr CHOW Hiu-laam, Felix	”	2:30 pm	6:51 pm
Mr CHUNG Lai-him, Johnny	”	2:30 pm	7:16 pm
Mr HUI Lap-san	”	2:30 pm	7:22 pm
Mr HUI Yui-yu	”	2:30 pm	3:22 pm
Dr LAM Kong-kwan	”	2:45 pm	5:33 pm
Mr LI Chi-wang, Raymond	”	2:39 pm	6:57 pm
Mr LI Sai-hung	”	2:46 pm	7:07 pm
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	”	2:30 pm	7:22 pm
Mr LIAO Pak-hong, Ricardo	”	2:30 pm	6:55 pm
Mr LO Tak-ming	”	2:30 pm	3:40 pm
Mr LO Yuet-chau	”	2:30 pm	6:57 pm
Ms LUK Tsz-tung	”	2:30 pm	7:22 pm
Mr MAK Tsz-kin	”	2:30 pm	7:22 pm
Mr MAK Yun-pui, Chris	”	2:51 pm	4:38 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung	”	2:30 pm	6:11 pm
Ms NG Ting-lam	”	2:55 pm	5:30 pm
Mr SHEK William	”	2:30 pm	5:03 pm
Mr SIN Cheuk-nam	”	2:30 pm	7:11 pm
Mr TING Tsz-yuen	”	2:30 pm	7:03 pm
Ms TSANG So-lai	”	2:51 pm	6:30 pm
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	”	2:30 pm	6:52 pm
Mr WONG Ho-fung	”	2:30 pm	5:54 pm
Ms WONG Man-huen	”	2:30 pm	7:12 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun	”	2:30 pm	6:54 pm
Mr YEUNG Sze-kin	”	3:05 pm	6:53 pm
Mr YIP Wing	”	2:30 pm	4:10 pm

<u>Present</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Time of joining the meeting</u>	<u>Time of leaving the meeting</u>
Ms CHEUNG Lam-yee, Alison (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council) 4/	Sha Tin District Office	
<u>In Attendance</u>			
Mr LAM Fong-tat, James	Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin)1		
Mr HO Kin-nam, David	Senior Executive Officer (District Council) (Atg)/		
	Sha Tin District Office		
Mr CHAN Yau-yau, Leo	Senior Transport Officer/ Ma On Shan/ Transport Department		
Ms TSANG Hing-kwan, Natalie	Senior Transport Officer/ Shatin/ Transport Department		
Mr POON Wing-hong	Senior Engineer/ Sha Tin 1/ Transport Department		
Mr LO Hoi-wing, Jeff	Engineer/ Sha Tin 3/ Transport Department		
Mr YIU Ka-lap, Caleb	Engineer/ Bicycle Parking/ Transport Department		
Mr SUEN Kwok-chuen	Housing Manager/ Tai Po, North & Shatin 4/ Housing Department		
Ms CHU Kam-seung	Administrative Assistant/ Lands (Atg)/		
	District Lands Office, Sha Tin		
<u>In Attendance by Invitation</u>			
Mr TAM Chun-hei	Manager-Public Affairs/		
	The Kowloon Motor Bus Co. (1933) Ltd.		
Mr CHAN Chung-yi	Officer/ Planning and Development/		
	The Kowloon Motor Bus Co. (1933) Ltd.		
Mr Rob LIU	Division Manager-Operations (NTE)/		
	The Kowloon Motor Bus Co. (1933) Ltd.		
Ms WU Ka-lai	Public Affairs Officer/		
	New World First Bus Services Limited and Citybus Limited		
Mr Simon WONG	Planning and Scheduling Manager/		
	New World First Bus Services Limited and Citybus Limited		
Mr Dennis YIP	Assistant Planning and Scheduling Officer/		
	New World First Bus Services Limited and Citybus Limited		
Ms CHU Lai-yee, Rachel	Senior Transport Officer/ Bus/ New Territories East 1/		
	Transport Department		
Mr YUEN Kin-hang, Tom	Transport Officer/ Bus/ New Territories East 1/		
	Transport Department		
Mr YEUNG Chau-fat	Civil Engineer 3/ Housing Department		
Ms WONG Yuen-yan, Bella	Civil Engineer 31/ Housing Department		
<u>Absent</u>			
Mr LUI Kai-wing	DC Member	(Application for leave of absence received)	
Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS	"	(")	
Mr SHAM Tsz-kit, Jimmy	"	(")	
Mr TSANG Kit	"	(")	

Action

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives of government departments and organisations to the meeting.

Application for Leave of Absence

2. The Chairman said that the Sha Tin District Council Secretariat (Secretariat) had received applications for leave of absence in writing from the following Members:

Mr LUI Kai-wing	Sickness
Mr MOK Kam-kwai	Official commitment
Mr TSANG Kit	”
Mr Jimmy SHAM	Other reasons

3. The Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) approved the applications for leave of absence from Members above.

4. Mr David HO, Senior Executive Officer (District Council) (Atg) of the Sha Tin District Office (STDO) said the Secretariat had noted the applications for leave of absence from Members.

5. Mr CHAN Pui-ming would like to know the reason why the Secretariat noted the applications for leave of absence from Members.

6. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to clarify Members’ applications for leave of absence.

7. Mr David HO cited Order 52 (1) of the “Sha Tin District Council Standing Orders” (Standing Orders) to explain Members’ applications for leave of absence from committee meetings.

8. Mr TING Tsz-yuen said that the TTC had approved the above Members’ applications for leave of absence. He would like clarification from the Secretariat as to whether the decision was in accordance with the Standing Orders.

9. The Chairman pointed out that Mr Jimmy SHAM had completed the Notice of Absence from Committee Meetings attached to the Standing Orders, on which “other reasons” had been selected as the reason for his absence. The TTC’s approval for the application for leave was in compliance with the Standing Orders.

Matters Arising of the Special Meeting Held on 2 February 2021

Sha Tin District Bus Route Programme 2020-2021 – Follow-up on Other Routes and Sha Tin District Bus Route Programme 2021-2022
(Paper No. TT 2/2021)

10. The Chairman proposed to adjust the agenda for a comprehensive discussion on “Sha Tin District Bus Route Programme 2020-2021 – Follow-up on Other Routes” and “Sha Tin District Bus Route Programme 2021-2022”, and asked Members whether they agreed to the proposal.

11. Members unanimously endorsed the above proposal.

12. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he proposed to discuss the bus routes operated by the New World First Bus Services Limited (NWFB) and Citybus Limited (Citybus) before discussing the bus routes operated by The Kowloon Motor Bus Co. (1933) Ltd (KMB); and

- (b) he requested the department to provide up-to-date information on the following bus routes: two franchised bus routes of Citybus from Fo Tan and Tai Wai to Sai Wan Ho (Tai On Street) respectively, and the franchised bus route of KMB from Pak Shek Kok to Wan Chai.

13. The responses from Ms Rachel CHU, Senior Transport Officer/Bus/New Territories East of the Transport Department (TD) were summarised below:

- (a) having reviewed the proposals of the operators of bus services, the Department had selected Citybus (franchise for Hong Kong Island and cross-harbour bus network) to operate two routes from Fo Tan and Tai Wai to Sai Wan Ho (Tai On Street) respectively, and KMB to operate the route from Pak Shek Kok to Wan Chai; and
- (b) the Department was following up with the above two bus companies on the operational details. Service details of the new routes would be announced later.

14. Mr Simon WONG, Planning and Scheduling Manager of the NWFB and Citybus and Ms Rachel CHU briefly introduced the content of the paper.

15. The views of Mr Ricardo LIAO were summarised below:

- (a) he said that residents in the Siu Lek Yuen had expected Route No. 682B to be upgraded to a full-day service, and he would like to know when the arrangement would be implemented; and
- (b) he proposed to extend the Route No. 682B from Kwong Sin Street to Kwong Yuen Bus Terminus to facilitate residents in the Kwong Hong and Kwong Yuen and alleviate the traffic pressure on Kwong Sin Street.

16. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) he said that cross-harbour transport services were lacking around Ning Tai Road, and the enhancement of Route No. 682A was considered to be convenient for residents. Taking into account the journey time of the route, he proposed to advance the service hours by 10 minutes, that was, from 7 am to 8:10 pm, to meet the passengers' demand for work;
- (b) he said that the population of Ma On Shan would increase rapidly, and suggested that the bus companies provide more full-day cross-harbour bus services via Ning Tai Road to meet the demand; and
- (c) he said that some residents had reflected the long journey time of some cross-harbour trips within the district. He advised the bus companies to make reference to the arrangement of Route No. 680B from Chevalier Garden to Yan On Estate via Hang Fai Street, thereby improving bus services in areas far away from MTR Stations.

17. The views of Mr Chris MAK were summarised below:

- (a) at the request of the Ma On Shan Traffic Concern Group (Concern Group), he conveyed the residents' views to the bus companies and the TD. The Concern Group's survey showed that more than 90% of the respondents supported the enhancement of Route No. 682A during morning peak hours. They considered that Route No. 682A could provide residents around A Kung Kok and Ning Tai Road with direct services to the Eastern District; a few objectors argued that Route No. 682 could provide a better diversion effect during morning peak hours;
- (b) he pointed out that the general respondents supported the addition of special services departing from Wan Chai to Route No. 980X and Route No. 981P, but did not agree to the reallocation of resources from Route No. 681 and Route No. 680;
- (c) he advised the Department and the bus companies to enhance the services of Route Nos. 682A, 682P and 682X, and to increase the frequency of Route No. 682 departing from Shek Mun Estate during morning peak hours in order to further divert the residents from Ma On Shan and Shek Mun Estate for work;
- (d) he said that Route No. 980X was well received by the public within the district, so he proposed to upgrade it to a full-day service;
- (e) he pointed out that the bus companies might raise fares in view of the economic downturn in Hong Kong in recent years, and he hoped that the bus companies would refrain from raising fares; and
- (f) he hoped that the bus companies would deal with the interchange concessions as soon as possible, with a view to achieving cross-company cooperation.

18. The views of Mr WONG Ho-fung were summarised below:

- (a) he would like to know the progress of changing bus terminus of Route No. 985 to Tai Wai; and
- (b) he said that the Department had not announced the information on the new bus routes from Sha Tin District to Eastern District. However, as far as he knew, the route would pass through Mei Chung Court and Mei Lam Estate. He suggested that the route could also travel through Mei Tin Estate to facilitate residents who would go to Eastern District for work.

19. Mr CHING Cheung-ying proposed that Route No. 985B departing from Tin Sam Village be changed to depart from Sun Tin Wai Estate during morning peak hours to serve residents of Sun Tin Wai Estate, Chun Shek Estate, Sun Tin Village and Sun Chui Estate. He pointed out that there was a high demand for that route, so he wanted to know the reason why the NWFB and Citybus failed to comply, and asked the TD to follow it up.

20. The views of Mr Felix CHOW were summarised below:

- (a) he would like to know the views of the NWFB and Citybus on the proposed extension of the morning services of Route No. 798A to University Station by the Sai Kung District Council;
- (b) he would like to know whether there were pick-up and drop-off points in Central and Western District after the new bus route from Fo Tan to Sai Wan Ho passed Western Harbour Crossing (WHC); and
- (c) he said that the tender for the new bus route from Hong Sing Garden to Tai Po Industrial Area was yet to be finalized. He would like to know the timetable for implementing this route.

21. The views of Mr Wilson LI were summarised below:

- (a) he said that some residents were opposed to the cancellation of the special trips of Route No. 682 via Ning Tai Road. Although according to the figures provided by the NWFB and Citybus, the number of passengers affected was small, he hoped that the bus companies would take into account the views of the residents concerned;
- (b) he pointed out that Route No. 980X was well received by residents of Wu Kai Sha and was often full during peak hours. The residents hoped that the frequency of this route could be increased greatly and full-day service could be available on Saturdays and Sundays; and
- (c) he pointed out that some residents were opposed to the reduction in the frequency of Route No. 680X, particularly the trip at 7:05 pm. He hoped that the bus companies would avoid reallocating resources from Route Nos. 680X and 681 to Route No. 980X, and suggested that Route No. 681 could be re-routed via Wu Kai Sha to serve the residents in that area.

22. The views of Ms TSANG So-lai were summarised as follows:

- (a) she said that the population of Ma On Shan kept increasing and buildings had been completed successively in the vicinity of Wu Kai Sha, so she hoped that Route No. 980X could be upgraded to provide full-day service to meet the cross-harbour demand of local residents; and
- (b) she would like to know the progress of the new bus routes from Ma On Shan to Tseung Kwan O.

23. The views of Mr Johnny CHUNG were summarised below:

- (a) in his opinion, reallocating resources from Route Nos. 680X and 681 to Route Nos. 980X and 981P would not only make the public's waiting time longer, but also undermine the overall bus service from Causeway Bay to Ma On Shan; and

- (b) he pointed out that the last scheduled departure of Route No. 980X at 6:39 pm was too early. He suggested that the last departure of Route No. 980X should be delayed in the short term and an additional bus route from Central and Sheung Wan to Ma On Shan should be provided in the long run.

24. Mr NG Kam-hung said he had advised the bus companies and the Department to divert Route No. 985 via Wan Chai for several times, but the Department had rejected the proposal on the ground of heavy traffic in this district. However, two bus routes between Ma On Shan and Wan Chai had been added to this bus route programme. He said that the Department did not formulate the plan to support the development of Tai Wai. Besides, he would like to know the reasons why the Department did not adjust Route No. 985.

25. Mr LO Yuet-chau supported the arrangement of upgrading Route No. 682B to a full-day service and asked when the arrangement would be implemented.

26. Mr HUI Lap-san said that the bus route from Ma On Shan to Hong Sing Garden should have been put into service in 2020. However, as far as he knew, the tender for the bus route had not yet been completed. He would like to know the progress of the matter.

27. Mr Billy CHAN would like to know when the return trip of Route No. 982X would be changed to depart from Causeway Bay or Wan Chai, and to know the progress of relevant arrangements.

28. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that after the diversion of Route Nos. 682 and 682A, the residents around Ning Tai Road might choose Route No. 682 with a higher frequency, due to the long journey of Route No. 682A. As a result, the diversion arrangement could not play its role. In view of the traffic condition of the Tate's Cairn Tunnel (TCT), he proposed to advance the service hours of Route Nos. 682 and 682A by 10 minutes to divert passengers travelling from Ma On Shan to Eastern District;
- (b) he said that under this bus route programme, it was proposed to modify the routeing of Route No. 682B to meet the demand of residents in the vicinity of Belair Gardens for their return journey from Eastern District to Sha Tin District. However, the Department did not do any arrangement in respect of the departure. He advised the Department to follow up on the matter;
- (c) he pointed out that the routeing of Route Nos. 980X and 981P was unsatisfactory because the congestion between Lung Wo Road and Connaught Road during the afternoon peak hours might lead to a longer journey. He suggested that the route could be diverted via Gloucester Road, Pedder Street, Harcourt Road Flyover, Pedder Street Underpass to Jubilee Street, and considered the traffic in Pedder Street Underpass to be smoother. At the same time, he hoped that the Department would provide relevant data about the estimated journey time for discussion; and

- (d) he thought that it would take about 100 minutes to travel from Sheung Wan to Ma On Shan by Route No. 681P due to the congestion in Eastern Harbour Crossing (EHC). As the journey of bus routes via WHC was indeed shorter, he thought it was attractive and advised the Department to follow up this route correspondingly.

29. Mr LAI Tsz-yan thought that it was unreasonable for Route No. 682B to travel via Belair Gardens only on its return trips to Shui Chuen O, while the same adjustment did not apply to the trips to Hong Kong Island. He advised that the buses heading for Hong Kong Island should also travel via Belair Gardens. Besides, the resources of Route No. 682D could be reallocated to benefit other passengers.

30. The responses from Ms Rachel CHU were summarised below:

- (a) she noted Members' suggestions on the route extension, proposed routings and increase of frequency, etc. The Department would continue to monitor the service level of all routes and make timely adjustments based on the changes in the demand and number of passengers;
- (b) regarding the objection to the cancellation of the special buses of Route No. 682 via Ning Tai Road, she pointed out that the current journey time of this route was nearly two hours, making it less attractive to passengers. At the same time, residents of Ma On Shan also had other more direct choices. For example, passengers of Ma On Shan Town Centre could take Route No. 682P which was more faster, while those in the vicinity of Sai Sha Road, Ning Tai Road and Chevalier Gardens could take Route No. 682A which was more direct. In view of optimising the use of bus resources, the Department therefore proposed to reallocate resources to Route No. 682A to enhance its services;
- (c) in response to Members' views on allocating resources from Route Nos. 681 and 680X to Route Nos. 980X and 981P, she said that during the afternoon peak hours, passengers could take Route Nos. 680 and 681 in the vicinity of Wan Chai and Causeway Bay, while Route Nos. 980X and 981P were available in Admiralty and Central District. The purpose of the special trips under the proposed programme was to provide convenient return service from Wan Chai to Ma On Shan in the evening for passengers currently taking Route Nos. 980X or 981P in the morning, which was expected to meet the return demand of passengers at Wan Chai, and avoid overlapping with the services of other routes at the same time. Taking into account that the highest patronage of Route Nos. 680X and 681 from 5 pm to 7 pm was about 40% and 60% respectively, the impact on passengers was expected to be relatively minor. Some passengers of this route might also take special trips of Routes No. 980X and 981P. The Department had noted Members' views on the time of some buses and would discuss with the bus companies whether slight adjustment was required based on the demand of patronage;
- (d) she pointed out that five franchised bus operators had submitted fare increase applications to the government between 2018 and 2019. In view of the uncertainties arising from the COVID-19 pandemic, the

government had put the price increase issue on ice for the time being. In view of the impact of the outbreak on franchised bus operators, the government had introduced a series of relief measures under several rounds of the Anti-epidemic Fund. With the gradual completion of these relief measures by the end of 2020, the financial position of individual franchised bus operators was severe in the face of declining revenue and rising operating costs. To maintain the financial sustainability and safety of the bus companies, the applications were approved by the Department after careful consideration of the relevant factors; and

- (e) the Department was preparing new routes including the one between Wu Kai Sha and Hong Sing Garden, and would report to the relevant District Councils in due course.

31. The responses from Mr Simon WONG were summarised below:

- (a) he considered it advisable to advance the last departure time of Route No. 682A by 10 minutes. After reviewing the data about the journey time, NWFB and Citybus would study to make appropriate adjustments to cater for the traffic situation and passengers' demand;
- (b) he pointed out that passengers could take the more efficient Route No. 682P from Ma On Shan Town Centre to the Eastern District, which resulted in the low patronage of Route No. 682 in the road section from Lee On to Sunshine City, with an average of only one passenger getting on the bus at that section. Therefore, relevant arrangements had been made;
- (c) in terms of upgrading Route No. 682B to a full-day service, the patronage of the last bus departing from Shui Chuen O during the morning service hours was only about 10 percent, and the patronage of routes from Chai Wan to Shui Chuen O in the afternoon was less than 20 percent. In view of its low utilization rate, the existing service arrangement of Route No. 682B would be maintained. The NWFB and Citybus would make corresponding adjustment according to the change in patronage;
- (d) he noted Members' proposal to extend Route No. 682B to the Kwong Yuen Bus Terminus. The NWFB and Citybus would conduct a detailed assessment on the impact on journey time and patronage;
- (e) he noted Members' proposal to adjust Route Nos. 682B and 682D. The NWFB and Citybus would discuss the relevant matters with Members after the meeting;
- (f) he said that special evening buses from Admiralty to Sha Tin via Wan Chai for Route Nos. 980X and 981P would be added. It would take 16 to 20 minutes from Admiralty Stop (East) to Li Po Chun Chambers in Sheung Wan, similar to other bus routes to Wan Chai via Central and Sheung Wan. It was believed that this route could provide reliable service to passengers;

- (g) in terms of Members' concern about reallocating resources from Route Nos. 680X and 681, he pointed out that most of the passengers of Route No. 680X boarded between Sheung Wan and Wan Chai. He thought that with the addition of the Wan Chai special trips, passengers of that section could take the new Route No. 980X. At the same time, he said that as the patronage of Route No. 681 to Ma On Shan during evening peak hours was only about 50%, the NWFB and Citybus hoped to make better use of the resources through resources reallocation;
- (h) in terms of the proposal on evening return service of Route No. 985 and the change of first en-route stop of Route No. 982X, the NWFB and Citybus would consider and happy to discuss with the TD whether to implement the proposed arrangement on alternative routes via WHC to New Territories East according to the operation of the special buses of Route Nos. 980X and 981 at Wan Chai;
- (i) the NWFB and Citybus had an open attitude to the proposal to provide special bus trips at Sun Tin Wai for Route No. 985B. He pointed out that this route was going to use a 12.8-metre-long bus to meet the demand. Whether the road conditions at Sun Tin Wai could accommodate the bus service would be considered before the relevant arrangements;
- (j) the NWFB and Citybus noted and would actively consider the proposal to extend Route No. 798A to the University Station;
- (k) the NWFB and Citybus would review the service area of the new bus route between Fo Tan and Sai Wan Ho (Tai On Street) in the light of the patronage of the route upon its commissioning; and
- (l) the NWFB and Citybus noted Members' proposals to increase the frequency, adjust the coverage and extend the service hours of other routes, and they would conduct further study on it.

32. Ms WU Ka-lai, Public Affairs Officer of the NWFB and Citybus said that the NWFB and Citybus had adjusted its fares only twice in the past 12 years, which was lower than the inflation rate of the consumer price index over the same period. In the face of various challenges and the impact of the outbreak, the operational pressure of the NWFB and Citybus had raised gradually. They hoped that the TTC and the public could understand.

33. Mr CHAN Chung-yi, Officer (Planning & Development) of the KMB said that the KMB would be happy to review the widening of service coverage of the cross-harbour routes and would adjust the frequency in line with the TD's guide.

34. Mr TAM Chun-hei, Manager-Public Affairs of the KMB said that the fares of Long Win Bus Company Limited (LWB) remained unchanged and KMB's fare increase rate was lower than that of other bus companies. He said KMB would continue to keep costs under control to strike a balance.

35. Mr NG Kam-hung would like to know the reasons why the bus companies would not reallocate resources to Route No. 985 until additional resources were available for other bus routes. He also wanted to know whether there was no need to increase the frequency of Route Nos. 985 and 985B.

36. The views of Mr Ricardo LIAO were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that there were more bus resources for travelling to and from Hong Kong Island in Ma On Shan, but less bus services for travelling back to Siu Lek Yuen, and he requested the bus companies to upgrade Route No. 682B to provide full-day service; and
- (b) he pointed out that as the current stop of Route No. 682B at Kwong Sin Street was not convenient for Kwong Yuen Estate residents, they would take Route No. 82X to the TCT to interchange with other bus routes, resulting in a seemingly insufficient patronage of Route No. 682B. He believed that there would be sufficient patronage if the route was extended to the Kwong Yuen Bus Terminus and invited the bus company to visit the area to learn more about residents' modes of transport.

37. Mr LO Yuet-chau said that the NWFB and Citybus' reply at the meeting that Route No. 682B would not be upgraded to provide full-day service was inconsistent with the statement in the document.

38. The views of Mr Chris MAK were summarised below:

- (a) he hoped that the KMB and the NWFB and Citybus would respond to the question whether "Inter-company interchange concessions" would be implemented; and
- (b) he considered that the bus companies and the TD should take into account the heavy life burden and economic pressure faced by the public and avoid fare increases.

39. Mr Felix CHOW said that there was no cross-harbour bus service to Hong Kong Island in Fo Tan. There were a number of middle-class housing estates in the district, and many residents had to travel across the harbour for work. He asked the bus companies and the TD to consider arranging special buses, that is, providing cross-harbour bus services at Lok King Street, Fo Tan.

40. Mr CHAN Pui-ming advised the bus companies to apply fare subsidy from the government. He said the current "Railway First" policy was not ideal. He pointed out that the MTR often received subsidies or had a competitive advantage. The incident penalty mechanism could also be resolved through fare concessions, whereas the bus companies did not receive the same subsidy. He suggested that the fines should be used to subsidise other public service operators. He hoped that the Department and relevant departments would consider the proposal.

41. The views of Mr Wilson LI were summarised below:

- (a) he thought that the implementation of bus routes between Tseung Kwan O and Wu Kai Sha was slow, and he hoped that the Department would implement the routes as soon as possible; and
- (b) he pointed out that the existing bus services in Ma On Shan could not cope with the population growth in Wu Kai Sha. He requested the bus companies to enhance the bus services in Ma On Shan, including upgrading Route No. 980X to provide full-day service at weekdays and providing service on weekends, to improve the traffic between Wu Kai Sha and Whitehead.

42. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) regarding the routings of Route Nos. 980X and 981P, he considered that the existing programme could only cover the area around Wan Chai and could not address Members' concerns about the demand in the Causeway Bay. He pointed out that travelling via the WHC would be more efficient than via the EHC, and suggested that the route could be diverted to Jubilee Street via the Harcourt Road Flyover and Pedder Street Underpass to shorten the journey time for residents;
- (b) in response to the demand of residents in the vicinity of Mei Tin Estate and Mei Lam Estate, he proposed to shorten the journey by introducing a special bus trip with similar routings to Route No. 182X at Admiralty or other suitable locations, via the Hung Hom Cross-Harbour Tunnel and avoiding the Whitfield Road; and
- (c) he said that he would provide assistance if the NWFB and Citybus wished to discuss views with Members after the meeting.

43. The responses from Mr Simon WONG were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the NWFB and Citybus would consider the proposal applying the routing of Route No. 182X at Tai Wai; and
- (b) he pointed out that the patronage of Route No. 682B was rather low except part of its services and peak periods in the morning and afternoon. The patronage was not sufficient to support full-day services.

44. The responses from Ms Rachel CHU were summarised below:

- (a) the Department noted Members' proposals on Route Nos. 985, 682B and other routes, and would closely monitor their passengers' demand and patronage, as well as review the service level with the bus companies in a timely manner;
- (b) she pointed out that the Route Nos. 980X and 981P were proposed to depart from Admiralty Stop (East) and returned to Ma On Shan via Wan Chai, which mainly aimed at meeting the demand of passengers returning

to Ma On Shan via Wan Chai, and avoiding overlapping with the service areas of other existing routes;

- (c) the Department was actively preparing for the two new bus routes between Wu Kai Sha and Tseung Kwan O and would report to the District Council in due course;
- (d) she pointed out that maintaining the financial sustainability of the franchised bus operators was important for providing stable and quality bus services. In order to improve the financial position of bus companies, apart from facilitating their continued operation through the approval of fare increases, the government would also assist and encourage bus operators to adopt a multi-pronged approach to increase revenue and reduce expenditure, including rationalising bus routes and increasing non-fare collection revenue and so on; and
- (e) with a view to alleviate the public's fare burdens, the government had introduced measures previously, including temporarily relax the monthly transport expenditure level of the Public Transport Fare Subsidy Scheme (Scheme) from HK\$400 to HK\$200 from 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021. In view of the pressure on the public arising from the adjustment of public transport fares, the government had decided to extend the above special measures for another six months to 31 December 2021. The limit amount of monthly subsidy under the Scheme would be temporarily increased from HK\$400 to HK\$500 during the period from 1 April 2021 to 31 December 2021. In addition, beneficiaries who could take the public transport at a fare of HK\$2 per trip under the Government Public Transport Fare Concession Scheme for the Elderly and Eligible Persons with Disabilities, would not be affected by the fare increase.

45. Ms Rachel CHU briefed on the bus route planning of KMB and LWB.

46. The views of Mr Chris MAK were summarised below:

- (a) he cited an opinion survey conducted by the Concern Group on different bus routes. Regarding Route No. 86C, there was general support among the respondents for moving the terminus of this route to Island Harbourview. At the same time, quite a number of people were against shortening the service hours of this route. There were also views that the route could travel via Ning Tai Road. Regarding Route No. 286C, there was general support among the respondents that the Sham Shui Po bound should travel via Kwai Chung Interchange to alleviate the problem of excessively long journey time in Kwong Cheung Street. However, some people were worried that they would not be able to go to the West Kowloon Reclamation in future. Regarding Route No. 86P, the respondents generally support the cancellation of the route and hoped that full-day bus services to and from Yuen Wo Road would be provided between Wu Kai Sha and Ma On Shan Town Centre besides Route No. 40X. In conclusion, respondents supported the Sha Tin District Bus Route Programme 2020-2021;

- (b) he proposed to retain the service of Route No. 86C during the morning peak hours and introduce an additional service via Ning Tai Road at Lee On and Island Harbourview during morning and afternoon peak hours respectively. If the service was satisfactory, the route should be gradually re-routed via Ning Tai Road for the convenience of residents in the vicinity;
- (c) he proposed that Route No. 286C should remain the routing via Kwong Cheung Street to facilitate passengers travelling to West Kowloon for work. As there was no direct bus service to Ma On Shan at Cheung Sha Wan Road near Golden Computer Arcade and Pei Ho Street after the change of terminus of Route No. 86C, he advised the KMB to consider re-routing Route No. 286C to the above area or changing the terminus location, and he objected the routing of Route No. 286C via Belair Gardens;
- (d) he proposed to resume the morning trips of Route No. 87D which skipped A Kung Kok Street, and pointed out that it would not be appropriate for the KMB to cancel the express service of Route No. 87D on the ground of the operation of Route No. 287D. He proposed to enhance the service of Route No. 281X to facilitate residents of A Kung Kok Street to go to Yau Tsim Mong District. At the same time, as Route No. 87D could only save about three minutes by skipping A Kung Kok Street, he advised that the morning trips departing from Ma On Shan Town Centre should travel through A Kung Kok Street; and
- (e) he pointed out that after the commissioning of Tuen Ma Line (TML), it was more convenient to travel from Ma On Shan to Diamond Hill than before, resulting in a drop in patronage of Route No. 286M. However, KMB had yet to put forward a bus route rationalisation programme. He advised the KMB to make route adjustments in this regard, including studying the feasibility of extending the route to Tsz Wan Shan. He said that if the KMB had no intention of extending the routing of Route No. 286M, then they should consider introducing an additional service of Route No. 89C which did not travel via Shek Mun during non-peak hours so as to maintain the direct bus service from Ning Tai Road to TCT.

47. The views of Mr Felix CHOW were summarised below:

- (a) he proposed to resume the special service of Route No. A47X and expressed his opposition to the cancellation of the relevant bus services as he had learnt from the neighbouring hotels that a certain number of passengers had taken this route to the hotel before the outbreak;
- (b) he pointed out that the service of Route No. 43P, which did not travel via City One Shatin, was well received by passengers in the morning and sometimes reached full capacity. He therefore suggested that the KMB should increase its service at 5:45 to divert passengers;

- (c) he supported the programme in which a number of bus routes were routed via Hong Kong Science Park from other areas, with a view to implementing the relevant routes as soon as possible; and
- (d) he pointed out that the morning and afternoon routings of Route No. 88X were different, making passengers confused, and he suggested the KMB to step up publicity. At the same time, he said that more passengers would get off at Lam Tin during the evening trips, but it would take about 15 minutes more to reach Lam Tin after the diversion, which might make the route less attractive. He asked the KMB to provide the journey time of each stop after the route diversion so that passengers could understand the impacts. In addition, he proposed to install a cover at the new bus stop, Tsung Tau Ha Road Stop.

48. The views of Mr SIN Cheuk-nam were summarised below:

- (a) he would like to know where the first en-route stop after Tsing Sha Highway for Route No. 286C would be located after the route diversion; and
- (b) he would like to know where the en-route stops at Pei Ho Street would be relocated after the route diversion of Route No. 86C, or which stop would be used to replace the relevant service.

49. The views of Mr CHENG Tsuk-man were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the route between Ma On Shan and Tseung Kwan O had been under discussion for many years, and he expressed disappointment that the route had not been included in this route programme. He asked whether the Department and KMB had looked into the traffic demand of residents in Ma On Shan leaving for Tseung Kwan O;
- (b) he agreed to change the terminus of Route No. 86C to Island Harbourview as it would reduce the overlap between Route No. 86C and Route No. 286C; and
- (c) he said that residents had reported that Route No. 85X might reached full capacity during the afternoon peak hours between Hung Hom and Kowloon City. Many passengers could not board. He suggested that the Department and KMB follow it up.

50. The views of Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that the fare and routing of Route No. 81X was not attractive to residents of Mei Tin Estate. He suggested changing the route to turn west at Tonkin Street and travel via the West Kowloon Corridor to the Metropark Hotel Mongkok at Prince Edward, so as to maintain the patronage of this route, and retain the possibility of extending the route to Tsim Sha Tsui in future;

- (b) he pointed out that the journey of Route No. 281 from Sun Tin Wai to Tai Wai Stop was too short, and proposed to expand the circulation circle to cover the areas of “Mei Tin Estate, Mei Lam Estate, May Shing Court and Mei Chung Court” and Hin Keng Estate to enhance local traffic;
- (c) he pointed out that the routing of Route No. 281E was similar to that of Route No. 287D, but due to the severe traffic congestion on Argyle Street, he suggested that Route No. 281E should travel to Tsing Sha Highway along the Route No. 280X at Kowloon Central Post Office to reduce the journey time from Tsim Sha Tsui to Kwong Yuen;
- (d) he considered that Route No. 86C would not pass through the major areas of Tai Kok Tsui after route diversion, making it difficult to attract passengers to Tai Kok Tsui; and
- (e) he pointed out that Route No. 46X could not bear alone the patronage from Tai Wai to Shing Mun Tunnel (SMT) and there were frequent overflows. He proposed to follow up on the patronage of this route and introduce a new bus route from Tai Wai to SMT to divert the patronage of Route No. 46X.

51. The views of Mr Raymond LI were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that the problem of lost trips of Route Nos. 85X and 47X was serious. Some residents proposed to change Route No. 85X to depart from Wu Kai Sha. He requested the KMB to address the problem;
- (b) he proposed to retain Route No. 86P and pointed out that its low patronage was mainly due to the fact that it did not travel via Yuen Wo Road. He said that there were a number of schools near Yuen Wo Road. If the stop could be located in Yuen Wo Road, it could meet the demand of Ma On Shan residents for going to school in the morning and thus increase patronage;
- (c) he pointed out that Route No. 81S did not travel through Prince Edward after it was changed to Route No. 81X. KMB might consider that members of the public could take other routes to Prince Edward. However, they chose Route No. 81S because other routes were not the best choice. He advised KMB to follow it up;
- (d) he pointed out that the Kwun Tong District Council had not yet reached consensus on the routing of Route No. 88X, and considered that the TTC should not make a decision then. At the same time, he pointed out that the routing of Route No. 88X would easily cause confusion to passengers. He also thought that there was no need for the route to cover Yau Tong or Ping Tin. He advised the bus companies to reconsider the relevant design; and

- (e) he pointed out that while the Department had reduced the service of Route No. 86, they had not provided other means for members of the public to reach the same destination. He also believed that Route No. 286 would gradually replace Route No. 86, making it more difficult for Yuen Wo Road residents to get to Mei Foo. He proposed to improve the routing of Route No. 86 to avoid passing Shing Mun River twice, such as splitting it into two routes, route of Shing Mun River East and the other route of Shing Mun River West.

52. The views of Mr Johnny CHUNG were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that the Department and the bus companies had not taken measures to cope with the outbreak in a timely manner. When no students took buses, some school bus routes still operated as usual when the patronage had significantly dropped. He hoped that the Department would respond to similar situations as soon as possible and advised the Department and KMB could enhance communication with schools in order to make the best use of resources; and
- (b) he pointed out that the first departure of Route No. 86C at 8 am was too late for passengers who were going to work. He suggested the first departure time be advanced to 7:00 am or 6:30 am and an en-route stop be set up at Tai Kok Tsui Road to attract passengers.

53. The views of Ms WONG Man-huen were summarised below:

- (a) she thought that the rationalisation of Route No. 86 and other route programmes had focused on Cheung Sha Wan and had ignored the traffic demand in Sham Shui Po. She requested KMB to provide specific data on the journey of Route Nos. 286 and 286C;
- (b) she pointed out that the first two trips of Route No. 86C departed at 8:00 am and 9:00 am respectively. The arrangement was not convenient for passengers going to work at HSBC Centre or Government Offices. Besides, the routeing of Route No. 86C was also inconvenient for passengers going to Tai Kok Tsui Sports Centre and restaurants; and
- (c) she pointed out that the fares of Route No. 281E had been increased by \$1 but the journey time had not been shortened. She thought that KMB should enhance its service quality before raising its fares.

54. The views of Mr MAK Tsz-kin were summarised below:

- (a) he supported changing the terminus of Route No. 88X from Chun Yeung Estate to Ping Tin to a two-way terminus, which had resulted in a stable frequency. He would like to know the journey time of Route No. 88X at each stop under the arrangement of a two-way terminus;
- (b) he pointed out that the fare of Route No. 74X from Tai Po to Kwun Tong Ferry Pier was lower than that of Route No. 88X from Chun Yeung Estate to Ping Tin. Route No. 88X had a shorter journey distance but a higher

fare. It was considered that there was room for lowering the fare. At the same time, residents of Fo Tan had lost their direct bus routes to Kwun Tong due to the relevant changes. He hoped that the TD and KMB would consider fare adjustments;

- (c) he pointed out that some residents had reported frequent breakdowns of Route No. 88X. He wished to know the average age of the buses of the route and the mechanism for replacement and maintenance of KMB buses;
- (d) he pointed out that a lot of passengers returned to Fo Tan from Ping Tin or Yau Tong by Route No. 88X during peak hours in the afternoon, and he suggested that KMB should increase its frequency to every 15 minutes during that period; and
- (e) he requested KMB to consider setting up a special bus of Route No. 280X to provide services for residents of Chun Yeung Estate. He pointed out that KMB had to improve bus services in the area in a timely manner with the gradual occupation of Chun Yeung Estate.

55. The views of Ms LUK Tsz-tung were summarised below:

- (a) she thought that with the cancellation of the en-route stop of Route No. 43P at City One Shatin and the Heung Yee Kuk Building, commuters after work in the Shek Mun Industrial Area would rely on Route No. 43X for interchange at the SMT, and thus the patronage of the route would be greatly increased. She suggested adding a special bus service of Route No. 49X during the afternoon peak hours to divert commuters in the Industrial Area; and
- (b) she pointed out that as Route No. 86C did not pass the densely populated area in Tai Kok Tsui and the number of passengers getting on and off at Island Harbourview was small. Therefore, it was not recommended that the terminus of the route be located in Island Harbourview. In addition, KMB did not reduce the fares of Route No. 286C as an alternative route or shorten its journey. She therefore opposed the change of Route No. 86C.

56. The views of Mr Ricardo LIAO were summarised below:

- (a) he believed that it was not reasonable to reallocate buses of Route No. 86 to Route No. 286. Regarding the fare, he pointed out that the fare of Route No. 286 was \$1 more than that of Route No. 86 because it was travelling along Tsing Sha Highway. He thought that the fare was not reasonable because the Route No. 86 did not apply sectional fare as Route No. 86 did. Regarding the routeing, he pointed out that Route No. 286 would travel through traffic congestion black spots after leaving Tsing Sha Highway, including Sham Mong Road, Yen Chow Street and Castle Peak Road, which caused Route No. 86 with the lower fare to reach Sham Shui Po and Mei Foo faster than Route No. 286 with higher fare. Regarding the frequency, he said that the Department would like to coordinate Route

Nos. 286 and 86 to achieve synergy effect, but Route No. 86 was routed via the Prince of Wales Hospital (PWH), and then it would take wheelchair users 20 to 30 minutes to get to PWH. He said that the Department did not make a thorough consideration when formulating the route programme;

- (b) he requested to cancel the plan to change the departure of special trips of Route No. 49X from Sha Tin Town Centre to Shek Mun, and proposed to divert some buses departing from Kwong Yuen via Shek Mun instead of via Sha Tin Town Centre to maintain the same journey time; and
- (c) he considered it unreasonable to arrange Route No. 286 to provide full-day interchange service on Tsing Sha Highway. He proposed to reallocate resources to Route No. 240X and upgrade it to a full-day service, so as to make the best use of Tsing Sha Highway.

57. Mr CHAN Wan-tung pointed out that this route programme did not cover the traffic improvement arrangements in Hin Keng, and the Department should not reduce other public transport resources in the area due to the availability of railways. He asked the Department to respond to the requests of residents in Hin Keng, including upgrading Route No. 985 to a full-day service and setting up bus routes to Yau Tsim Mong and the airport respectively.

58. The views of Mr LO Yuet-chau were summarised below:

- (a) he would like to know why routeings of Route No. 286 and Route No. 286C were similar in Sham Shui Po. He said that Route No. 286C would face serious traffic congestion at Sham Shui Po. He was worried that Route No. 286 would have the same problem;
- (b) he pointed out that four additional buses would be required if the normal operation of Route No. 86 and Route No. 286 were to be maintained, as indicated in the paper. He would like to know the reason why the Department and the bus companies did not provide an additional Route No. 240X with full-day service on the Shing Mun River East;
- (c) he asked the Department and KMB to explain the fare of Route No. 286; and
- (d) he supported the routeings of two special trips of Route No. 281E, but pointed out that the route would face serious traffic congestion towards Mong Kok upon reaching the Kowloon Central Post Office, which failed to be an express route. He proposed to divert the route to Hoi Wang Road at Kowloon Central Post Office so as to minimise the possibility of congestion.

59. The views of Mr WAI Hing-cheung were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that some residents thought that the frequency of Route No. 48X was inadequate and not as good as that of Route No. 49X. Besides, no special bus service was provided. He hoped that KMB would

pay attention to this. He pointed out that as the stop of Route No. 48X in Sha Tin Town Centre was located in front of that of Route No. 49X, it was not able to stop when Route No. 49X was at the stopping point, and the pick-up/drop-off arrangement was not satisfactory. He suggested KMB to improve the situation;

- (b) he asked the Department to reconsider converting Route No. 82B into a circular route within the district to connect Sun Tin Wai, Tai Wai, the areas of “Mei Tin Estate, Mei Lam Estate, May Shing Court and Mei Chung Court”, Peak One and Tung Lo Wan Village; and
- (c) he thought that the original intention of Route No. E42C was to facilitate residents who worked in the vicinity of the airport. However, the route only operated from Monday to Friday, the need of residents who worked on weekends was ignored. He would like to know the reasons for the arrangement.

60. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) he proposed to introduce additional special buses via Ning Tai Road and Tsing Sha Highway during morning and afternoon peak hours; and
- (b) he pointed out that the journey was shortened after the terminus of Route No. 86C was relocated to Island Harbourview, but the journey time remained the same. Besides, the route would not travel via busy road section, and the design of the route was not in line with the development of West Kowloon. He therefore objected to this arrangement.

61. The views of Mr CHING Cheung-ying were summarised below:

- (a) he supported the operation of the circular route of Route No. 281 from Sun Tin Wai to Tai Wai, and proposed to increase the frequency to every 10 to 12 minutes;
- (b) he opined that the fare of Route No. 281 should not be higher than the current fare of Route No. 282, \$3.80, and it should be based on the fare of Route No. 282; and
- (c) he opined that the departure time of the last bus of Route No. 281 should tie in with the last train of MTR, and proposed to offer more interchange concessions to passengers of Route Nos. 281 and 282. He pointed out that there was only one trip in the morning and evening respectively for Route No. 281M, which could not meet the demand of the residents. He suggested that Route No. 281M provide services of about one hour during the morning and afternoon peak hours respectively.

62. Mr LAI Tsz-yan believed that resources should not be reallocated from Route No. 86C for carrying out the rationalisation plan, and pointed out that Route No. 286 failed to be an express route. He proposed to provide additional resources to the four additional buses of Route Nos. 86 and 286, and to provide an additional bus route to West Kowloon via the Shing Mun River West at Fo Tan. Besides, Route No. 86 could

be re-routed to Sham Shui Po via the Shing Mun River East, Tai Chung Kiu Road and the Lion Rock Tunnel (LRT).

63. The views of Mr WONG Ho-fung were summarised below:

- (a) he opined that the routeing of Route No. 81 was more direct than that of Route No. 81S, resulting in the low attraction of Route No. 81S. He suggested that the Department consider diverting Route No. 81S via Yau Ma Tei and Tsim Sha Tsui; and
- (b) he suggested increasing the frequency of Route No. 286X, especially services in the evening.

64. The views of Mr George WONG were summarised below:

- (a) he agreed with Mr WAI Hing-cheung's views on Route No. 82B. He opined that the current design of this route did not make the best use of the resources and proposed to extend its coverage; and
- (b) he opined that this Bus Route Programme had overlooked the demand of Mei Lam Estate. He suggested that the Department should consider the demands of local residents, including upgrading Route No. 985 to provide full-day service and improving cross-harbour bus services in the district.

65. Mr YEUNG Sze-kin agreed with Mr LAI Tsz-yan's proposal to split Route No. 86 into two routes, Shing Mun River East route and Shing Mun River West route. He said that the current programme could not resolve the problem of long journey within Sha Tin District. He hoped that the Department could understand the demand of Siu Lek Yuen residents to go to Lek Yuen Estate and Wo Che Estate. He suggested modifying the routeing of minibus Route No. 65A, going to Lek Yuen Estate and Wo Che Estate first and then proceeding to Sha Tin Town Hall.

66. The views of Mr NG Kam-hung were summarised below:

- (a) he would like to know the expected patronage of Route No. 81X and the purpose of the routeing design; and
- (b) he said that the demand of the residents in Hin Keng Estate had been ignored. He thought that the bus resources in the area should not be reduced due to the commissioning of the MTR Hin Keng Station. In addition, he pointed out that there was sufficient patronage of Route No. 985 to support the service enhancement and suggested that arrangements should be made by the Department. He asked the Department and KMB to reply to the reasons for the frequency reduction of Route No. 81S and the routeing via Tsing Sha Highway.

67. Mr Raymond LI said that the Department and KMB had not fully studied the alternative route via Tsing Sha Highway. He opined that some bus routes via the LRT could be rerouted via Tsing Sha Highway, which would not only relieve the pressure of the tunnel, but also increase the patronage. However, this route programme failed to make the best use of Tsing Sha Highway. Some routeings overlapped with the existing

ones and could not divert the traffic flow from the LRT. He requested that careful consideration should be given by the Department before the route diversion, and the route should not be diverted via Tsing Sha highway blindly.

68. The views of Mr Wilson LI were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that there were 15 buses of the Route Nos. 286C and 86C, which was inadequate to meet the demand. He hoped that KMB would allocate additional resources to the above routes. In addition, he said residents wanted Route No. 286C to be extended to the Wu Kai Sha Station Public Transport Interchange. It would also increase the patronage of this route and benefit both residents and KMB;
- (b) he opined that the demand for Route No. X89D was rising and there was sufficient patronage. He suggested that KMB should allocate more resources to attract more passengers for this route;
- (c) he pointed out that the patronage of Route No. 86P was low and its departure time was 7:45 am, which was not convenient for passengers going to work or school. He opined that the route could be re-routed via the Shing Mun River West to facilitate passengers to nearby schools, and suggested that the Department should consider improving the routeings and service time of Route Nos. 86P and 87E; and
- (d) he requested KMB to provide bus services to airport for Villa Athena residents, and proposed the extension of Route Nos. 85X, 86K, 87D and 681 to Wu Kai Sha. He hoped that KMB would improve bus services in Wu Kai Sha and Whitehead.

69. Mr SHEK William said that if Route No. 86 was to be split into two routes, Shing Mun River East route and Shing Mun River West route, the Department and KMB were required to provide an alternative route for passengers travelling from and to Yue Tin Court and Fortune City One at Sha Tin Stop.

70. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that the rationalisation programme of Route Nos. 286, 86, 286C and 86C, routeing of Route No. 88X and the diversion via WHC of some routes were controversial. He considered holding an additional special meeting in May to listen to the departments' replies to Members' views;
- (b) he believed that the routeing of Route No. 286 in Sha Tin District was desirable. However, the route detoured seriously in West Kowloon. He considered that the fare increase was not reasonable as the journey time could not be shortened for around 10 minutes as stated in the paper. He pointed out that sectional fare was not available for this route, which was not attractive to passengers. He suggested that the Department would adjust the route after taking into account the views of the TTC and Sham Shui Po District Council;

- (c) he pointed out that Mei Foo Station was an interchange connecting Tuen Mun, Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai. He suggested that the Department should add two en-route stops, Mei Foo Station and Jao Tsung-i Academy Stop, when they diverted Route No. 286C via Ching Cheung Road to Cheung Sha Wan Road, so as to take advantage of Mei Foo Station;
- (d) he objected that Route No. 86C terminated in Island Harbourview and pointed out that as the route would not pass through Tai Kok Tsui Road and the old area of Tai Kok Tsui, passengers would not take this route. He also said that the departure time of the first bus of this route from Lee On was 8:00 am and passengers going to school in Cornwall Street and Nam Cheong Street could not be served. He pointed out that there was no bus service connecting the Shing Mun River East, Jordan and West Kowloon in Sha Tin District. The TTC had put forward relevant improvement proposals to increase the patronage of the route. He opined that the current routing and frequency arrangement of Route No. 86C was unsatisfactory;
- (e) for Route No. 88X, he proposed that KMB should offer interchange concessions at the TCT to cover the fare difference; and
- (f) he opined that KMB could suspend the operation of Route No. 86P if it was not cost-effective, but the alternative transport services should be provided by the Department. Besides, he suggested that the route be replaced by minibus Route No. 810A.

71. The responses from Ms Rachel CHU were summarised below:

- (a) the Department noted Members' views on bus services of bus routes including Route Nos. 48X, 85X, 281, 985, A47X, E42C and bus services around Hin Keng. The Department would discuss improvement measures with the bus companies in a timely manner;
- (b) she pointed out that the new bus routes between Ma On Shan and Tseung Kwan O were in the preparatory stage and the Department would make further announcements in due course;
- (c) she pointed out that the patronage of Route No. 81S was low, with a passenger carrying rate of about 30% in the busiest hour. Therefore, she hoped that the proposed new route would strengthen the Tsing Sha Highway network and make the best use of bus resources. Passengers travelling from Tai Wai to Prince Edward Road were advised to take Route No. 81 or Route No. 81C;
- (d) the Department consulted the District Councils of all districts on the Bus Route Programme and would give consideration after consolidating the views of all districts. She pointed out that the two-way terminus of Route No. 88X had its advantages. To help passengers to identify their routes, KMB would arrange publicity programmes accordingly. The Department also noted Members' views on the frequency arrangement and fare, and would discuss it with KMB later;

- (e) she said that the patronage of Route No. 281M remained low. Most passengers of the route mainly travelled between Sun Tin Wai and Tai Wai Station. The planned additional Route No. 281 could provide more frequent but less costly bus services for those passengers;
- (f) the Department noted Members' views on introducing interchange concessions or extending service hours. The Department would discuss with KMB. Regarding the proposal to increase the frequency of Route No. 281M during peak hours, she said that the Department recommended to keep one trip of this route during morning and afternoon peak hours respectively, because the patronage between Tai Wai and Kowloon Tong of this route was low and the patronage was also concentrated in the morning and afternoon peak hours. Regarding the proposed extension of Route No. 281M to Hin Keng Estate, she pointed out that the routeing extension might affect the frequency. The sectional fares for Route No. 87B would also provide a fare concession for passengers travelling between Sun Tin Wai and Hin Keng;
- (g) regarding the proposed additional Route No. 281E, the transport network between Siu Lek Yuen and Tsing Sha Tunnel could be strengthened in order to provide more convenient services for passengers travelling to Siu Lek Yuen in Sha Tin from Tsim Sha Tsui, Jordan and Yau Ma Tei. In addition, it was also expected to divert the passengers who took Route No. 281A at Tsim Sha Tsui and Mong Kok, making room for passengers boarding at Prince Edward and Kowloon Tong;
- (h) she pointed out that the passenger carrying rate of Route No. 86P in the busiest hour before the outbreak of the pandemic was only about 12%. Therefore, the Department proposed to reallocate resources of this route to provide special bus services for Route No. X89D, serving passengers travelling from Nai Chung to Kwun Tong Ferry Pier via Lok Wo Sha during morning peak hours. The additional special bus services of Route No. X89D was proposed to travel through Lok Wo Sha for providing direct bus services to East Kowloon for passengers in the vicinity of Lok Wo Sha. Passengers of X89D could also take the proposed additional special trips, because those special trips would also travel through existing stops of Route No. X89D's regular trips, so as to further enhance the bus services to East Kowloon from Nai Chung and Ma On Shan. In addition, passengers may interchange with other bus routes at TCT Interchange to various districts by taking the above special buses;
- (i) she said that for passengers at Wong Nai Tau, City One Shatin, Tai Chung Kiu Road and Che Kung Miu Road, the additional Route No. 286 would provide them with interchange service at Tsing Sha Highway to reach Sham Shui Po and Cheung Sha Wan. This new route could provide a full-day service from Sha Tin to Tsing Sha Highway Interchange so as to improve the interchange network in Sha Tin. Regarding the proposal to upgrade Route No. 240X to provide full-day service, she said that Route No. 240X was mainly to cater for passengers' commuting demand. After reaching Lai Chi Kok and Mei Foo, the route would go directly to Kwai Fong and Kwai Hing instead of passing through Sham Shui Po or Cheung

Sha Wan, different from Route No. 286 in terms of nature of daily trips and route coverage. The Department noted Members' views on Route No. 240X and Route No. 286, and would closely monitor the demand and number of passengers, which would be reviewed together after collecting views from all districts;

- (j) in order to divert passengers and avoid overlapping with other routes, the Department proposed that Route No. 86C terminated at Island Harbourview. Taking into account that the current patronage of Route No. 86C during its busiest hour was only about 50%, the Department hoped to increase efficiency through various measures according to actual operation of this route, such as adjusting the frequency and service hours of the existing route. Passengers of Route No. 86C who were affected during morning peak hours could change to Route No. 286C or Route No. 286. The Department noted Members' views on the proposed routings of Route No. 286C at the Tai Kok Tsui, the service hours of Route No. 86C and the introduction of a special bus trip at Ning Tai Road; and
- (k) for controversial routes such as Route Nos. 86, 286, 86C and 286C, the Department would follow up after listening to the views of all districts. For some of the less controversial routes, the Department proposed to implement the programmes after consulting with all districts and integrating their views.

72. The responses from Mr CHAN Chung-yi were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that the Sha Tin District Bus Route Programme 2021-2022 was to divert some of the routes originally routed via the LRT to Tsing Sha Highway, so as to alleviate congestion and provide faster service to passengers;
- (b) KMB noted Members' views on the special trips of Route No. 49X diverted via Shek Mun;
- (c) KMB noted Members' proposals on the routing of Route No. 81X and indicated that the routing of this route in Kowloon was determined with reference to Route No. 287X. KMB would consider the relevant proposal in detail;
- (d) KMB noted Members' proposals on the routing of Route No. 286 in Kowloon. He said that in order to strengthen the Tsing Sha network and shorten the journey time of this route, KMB opted to travel directly to Tsing Sha Highway at Tai Chung Kiu Road. The route would not stop at the en-route stops which were the same as those of Route No. 287X;
- (e) he pointed out that KMB would set up a stop at Mei Foo Station for Route No. 286C after passing Ching Cheung Road and Kwai Chung Road. KMB would shorten the journey time of Route No. 286C with reference to the routing of other routes without stopping at Lai Chi Kok Stop and arranging several en-route stops for passengers during peak hours;

- (f) he pointed out that to facilitate passengers travelling to Sham Shui Po during morning peak hours, KMB had fully reallocated the resources of Route No. 86C during peak hours to Route No. 286C, resulting in an increase of six trips of Route No. 286C during peak hours. KMB noted Members' views on service hours;
- (g) he pointed out that the low utilisation of Route No. 86P was due to the overlap of routeings of this route and the railway. Therefore, KMB proposed to reallocate its resources to Route No. X89D, which was in greater demand;
- (h) he pointed out that there were different routeings for Route No. 88X in the morning and in the afternoon. In addition, KMB predicted that few passengers would be affected by the two-way terminus arrangement. He said the proposal would widen the service area of the route and help KMB better understand the possibility of allocating resources to the route;
- (i) KMB noted Members' proposals on the routing of Route No. 281E in Kowloon, and would study them later. To reduce the number of passengers affected, KMB would consider adjusting the service hours of Route No. 281 with reference to the last departure time of Route No. 281M leaving from Kowloon Tong. KMB also noted Members' proposals on the integration and extension of Route Nos. 281 and 82B. KMB would make adjustments according to the passengers' travel mode; and
- (j) he pointed out that passengers taking the special bus of Route No. A47X mainly boarded near Chong San Road and its utilisation at the University Station was low. In addition, travelling through the University Station would make the journey five to seven minutes longer. KMB noted Members' views and would review the relevant programme.

73. Mr LO Yuet-chau said that the Department indicated that Route No. 286 mainly provided full-day services to the Tsing Sha Highway Interchange. He wanted to know what chance there was of changing the stop after getting into the Sham Shui Po District along the Tsing Sha Highway, and whether the arrangements needed to be discussed with the Sham Shui Po District Council by the Department before implementation.

74. The responses from Ms Rachel CHU were summarised below:

- (a) regarding KMB's reference on the stops of Route No. 286 in the reply, the bus stop arrangements would be decided according to the actual traffic conditions and feasibility after the implementation of the programme; and
- (b) she pointed out that Route No. 286 could provide passengers with routeings to Tsing Sha Highway Interchange, so as to further expand the interchange network. Having noted Members' views on the routeings of this route in Kowloon. The Department would review the routings with bus companies after taking the views from all districts into consideration.

75. Ms WONG Man-huen believed that designing bus routes for the purpose of strengthening the interchange network of Tsing Sha Highway was putting the cart before

the horse, and pointed out that the cost of the relevant changes would be passed on to consumers. She hoped that the Department would make good use of tunnels while maintaining the existing advantages of bus services.

76. The views of Mr CHEUNG Hing-wa were summarised below:

- (a) he was puzzled by the fact that Route No. 286 did not stop at the en-route stops overlapping with Route No. 287X. He considered that such an arrangement could not serve the residents in the vicinity of Tai Wai and Jat Min Chuen. In addition, he thought that the benefit of the route via Tsing Sha Highway was not significant and hoped that the Department could consider the arrangement concerned; and
- (b) once again, he advised the Department to consider setting the terminus of Route No. 86C at places other than Island Harbourview, such as Park Avenue or the Olympic Station, and expressed his objection to the existing route arrangement.

77. Mr LAI Tsz-yan said that when developing the interchange network on Tsing Sha Highway, the Department had put the cart before the horse by requiring passengers to change their travel mode to accommodate their arrangements which had even resulted in the fare increase. He pointed out that the proposed routeing of Route No. 286 was more time-consuming than the existing one travelling to Sham Shui Po via the LRT. He said that the issue of Route No. 86 was the uneven distribution of resources within Sha Tin District, rather than the routeing design of the section in Sham Shui Po. He hoped that the Department would look into the traffic demand in Sha Tin again and reconsider the arrangements for travelling to Cheung Sha Wan via Tsing Sha Highway.

78. The views of Mr Wilson LI were summarised below:

- (a) he asked the Department to arrange for the extension of the terminus of Route No. 286C to Wu Kai Sha as soon as possible, and would like to know the exact implementation time; and
- (b) he requested the Department to improve the service of Route No. 86P to enhance its competitiveness and avoid its cancellation in the future.

79. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the Department had been required to ask KMB to provide the estimated journey time of some bus routes before the meeting, but KMB had not yet provided the information. He requested KMB to complete the design of the en-route stop of Route No. 286 within two weeks and provide the information about the journey time; and
- (b) he proposed to convene an additional special meeting of the TTC in May to listen to the briefing by KMB on the estimated journey time of some bus routes. After taking into account the views of other District Councils, follow-up discussion on controversial routes and full commissioning of Tuen Ma Line could proceed.

80. The responses from Ms Rachel CHU were summarised below:

- (a) the Department noted Members' views on all bus routes and fares. The Department would review the relevant matters with the bus companies; and
- (b) if necessary, the Department would be pleased to follow up on the routes concerned by the Committee at the special meeting. As for the remaining bus route programmes discussed, the Department would implement them in accordance with the established procedures after consulting other relevant District Councils and collating their views.

81. The responses from Mr CHAN Chung-yi were summarised below:

- (a) he said that the terminus of Route No. 286 needed to be finalised after the discussion with the TD. KMB would discuss with the Department how to further explain to Members the information about the estimated journey time of Route No. 286; and
- (b) he considered that the proposed extension of Route No. 286C to Wu Kai Sha would help improve the public transport services in the district. KMB would discuss with the Department when it would be implemented.

82. The Chairman asked whether Members agreed to address the provisional motions moved by Mr MAK Tsz-kin, Mr LAI Tsz-yan, Mr CHING Cheung-ying and Mr Wilson LI respectively.

83. Members agreed to discuss the provisional motions moved by Mr MAK Tsz-kin, Mr LAI Tsz-yan, Mr CHING Cheung-ying and Mr Wilson LI.

84. Mr MAK Tsz-kin moved the following provisional motion:

“Background:

With the gradual intake of Chun Yeung Estate, Yuk Wo Court, Choi Wo Court, and private housing estate The Arles in Fo Tan, resources of public buses have become scarce in the area and unable to meet the demands made by members of the public for bus services. Thus, the Traffic and Transport Committee of the Sha Tin District Council:

1. demands that the Transport Department and bus companies provide additional bus routes by special bus services running from Lok King Street in Fo Tan to Central, Admiralty and Wan Chai via Tsing Sha Highway and Western Harbour Crossing during morning peak hours;
2. demands expeditious confirmation of Airbus Route No. A46 running from Royal Ascot to the airport;
3. requests special services of Route No. 280X during peak hours for residents of Chun Yeung Estate in response to the traffic conditions in the district;

4. requests that a study on overnight transport services covering the vicinity of Lok King Street, the industrial area in Fo Tan, Chun Yeung Estate and Sui Wo Court be conducted and confirmed expeditiously.”

Mr Felix CHOW seconded the motion.

85. The Chairman asked the Members whether they endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 84.

86. Members unanimously endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 84.

87. Mr LAI Tsz-yan moved the following provisional motion:

“The Traffic and Transport Committee of the Sha Tin District Council requests the Transport Department and the Kowloon Motor Bus to allocate resources for the introduction of bus routes running from Fo Tan to Sham Shui Po and Cheung Sha Wan to serve residents of Lek Yuen, Wo Che and Sha Tin Town Centre, and to adjust the alignment of Route No. 86 to operate via Tai Chung Kiu Road and bus stops at Belair Gardens, Garden Rivera, Jat Min Chuen etc. with a view to shortening journey time in the Sha Tin District and avoiding overlap of resources.”

Mr YEUNG Sze-kin, Mr Ricardo LIAO, Mr Raymond LI, Mr Felix CHOW and Mr MAK Tsz-kin seconded the motion.

88. The Chairman asked the Members whether they endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 87.

89. Members unanimously endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 87.

90. Mr CHING Cheung-ying moved the following provisional motion:

“Provisional Motion:

It is welcomed that the Transport Department (TD) has proposed to operate Circular Route No. 281 (between Sun Tin Wai Estate and Tai Wai Station) in response to residents’ demand. Nonetheless, the TD is asked to seriously consider improvement to the following issues.

The Traffic and Transport Committee of the Sha Tin District Council hereby moves that:

1. the service frequency of the proposed Route No. 281 be enhanced to every 10-12 minutes;
2. the fare not be higher than \$3.8, the current fare of Route No. 282;
3. the operation time of the last bus be in line with that of the last train;
4. a broader interchange discount arrangement, simultaneously for Route No. 282, be offered to passengers;

5. about an hour of service of Route No. 281M be provided in addition to its peak-hour services in the morning and the evening.”

Mr CHAN Nok-hang seconded the motion.

91. The Chairman asked the Members whether they endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 90.

92. Members unanimously endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 90.

93. Mr Wilson LI moved the following provisional motion:

“Background

The Traffic and Transport Committee of the Sha Tin District Council passed a provisional motion unanimously at the meeting on 18 February, which strongly demanded that the Transport Department (TD) immediately improve public transport services of Wu Kai Sha and Whitehead. However, the TD and the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited have proposed to cancel Route No. 86P in Sha Tin District Bus Route Programme 2021-2022 without any compensation plans, completely neglecting the needs of the residents!

Motion

The Committee strongly demands that the TD immediately improve the public transport services in the vicinity of Wu Kai Sha and Whitehead, in particular the pressing need for services of Wu Kai Sha and Whitehead from and to Sha Tin Town Centre. The Committee demands that whole-day bus and minibus services of Wu Kai Sha and Whitehead be provided expeditiously for the residents' convenience.”

Mr Michael YUNG seconded the motion.

94. The Chairman asked the Members whether they endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 93.

95. Members unanimously endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 93.

Proposed Route Adjustments Regarding Route No. 286M
(Paper No. TT 80/2020)

96. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that following the partial commissioning of Tuen Ma Line, the patronage of some bus routes, including Route No. 286M, had decreased due to the impact of the 20% fare concession of MTR, the epidemic and the lost trips of KMB;
- (b) he pointed out that as there was no full-day cross-harbour bus route around Ning Tai Road, residents had to rely on Route No. 286M to the TCT for cross-harbour buses. He, together with some Members of Wong

Tai Sin District Council, proposed the extension of Route No. 286M to Tsz Wan Shan. However, the Department replied that residents of Ma On Shan could take other existing routes to Tsz Wan Shan;

- (c) as there were no bus routes connecting Ma On Shan and Tsz Wan Shan then, quite a number of passengers in the districts would interchange at Diamond Hill Stop for bus services at the TCT according to the Wong Tai Sin District Council. Therefore, he opined that the relevant proposal could benefit the residents of Ma On Shan and Tsz Wan Shan; and
- (d) he would like to know whether the Department and KMB had estimated the journey time and the progress of the relevant study for the proposal.

97. The responses from Mr Leo CHAN, Senior Transport Officer (Ma On Shan) of the TD were summarised below:

- (a) in adjusting or providing additional bus services, the Department would take into account various factors, including the current level of transport services, expected passenger demand, traffic load and resource utilisation and so on. Given the limited road and transport resources in Hong Kong, the Department encouraged the public to make use of the existing transport services and optimise the use of resources to avoid overlap of public transport services, thereby enhancing the operational efficiency of public services;
- (b) he pointed out that residents of Ma On Shan could travel to Tsz Wan Shan via the existing public transport network, including taking Route No. 89C and interchanging with Route No. 3M, taking Route No. 286M or Tuen Ma Line to Diamond Hill for interchanging with minibuses. Residents of Tsz Wan Shan could also take Route No. 3M to Lung Cheung Road for interchanging with various bus routes to all districts in Sha Tin. There were also interchange concessions to facilitate passengers; and
- (c) the Department understood Members' concerns about Route No. 286M. However, for the above reasons, the Department had reservations about the proposed extension of the route to Tsz Wan Shan. The Department would continue to keep in view the changes in patronage and passengers' travel mode, so as to enhance the operational efficiency of the bus network through meeting the overall demand.

98. Mr CHAN Chung-yi said that KMB had noted Members' views on the improvement of Route No. 286M and would discuss with the Department how to improve the service level of the route.

99. The views of Mr CHENG Chung-hang were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that residents of Ma On Shan and Tsz Wan Shan had to make multiple interchanges before they could travel between the two districts. Moreover, he opined that the interchange services at the TCT Interchange were inadequate. If the service of TCT Interchange could achieve the same level of that of the SMT Interchange, the traffic

problems in Ma On Shan would be greatly reduced; and

- (b) he would like to know the Department's concerns about the proposed extension of Route No. 286M to Tsz Wan Shan, and pointed out that the route was the primary means of helping residents around Ning Tai Road go to Hong Kong Island. Any reduction of the route would cause inconvenience to residents in the district. He hoped that the Department would help to enhance the competitiveness of the route so that it could continue to operate.

100. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) he hoped that statistics on interchange at Diamond Hill Stop and the TCT would be provided by the Department to understand the transport demand of passengers; and
- (b) he pointed out that at the meeting of the Wong Tai Sin District Council, a representative of the TD welcomed the extension of Route No. 286M to Tsz Wan Shan (North) Bus Terminus. He asked how the Department would handle different views expressed by the Regional Offices of TD in Wong Tai Sin District and Sha Tin District. He considered that the proposed diversion of Route No. 286M was a consensus between the Sha Tin District and Wong Tai Sin District but was not accepted by the Department. He wanted to know the criteria for bus route adjustment.

101. Mr Leo CHAN said that according to the Department's on-site investigation at the TCT Interchange of Route No. 286M, the average passenger carrying rate of the route was about 20% when arriving at the TCT Interchange during the morning peak hours on weekdays, while the average passenger carrying rate of this route was about 15% when leaving the TCT Interchange, that was, about 50% of the passengers interchanged with other routes at the TCT Interchange.

102. Mr CHAN Chung-yi said that the estimated journey time of Route No. 286M and the interchange data of the TCT would be forwarded to the Department after the meeting.

103. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he opined that KMB had not prepared sufficient data on patronage and journey time. He requested KMB to provide the relevant information within 14 days; and
- (b) he pointed out that residents in the vicinity of Ning Tai Road continued to use the less convenient transport services before the bus stop at Kam Chun Court was in service. He said that Ma On Shan developed the town centre first and the waterfront later, resulting in a concentration of transport resources in the town centre. Residents in the vicinity of Ning Tai Road were also unable to take the MTR conveniently. He said KMB should take the initiative to enhance its services to increase its competitiveness.

Question to be Raised by Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael on the Transport Condition of Various Road Sections in the Sha Tin District
(Paper No. TT 54/2020)

104. The Chairman welcomed representatives of District Lands Office/Shah Tin, Housing Department (HD) and TD to the meeting.

105. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he pointed out that five years after the completion of Yan On Estate Phase 2 and Kam Chun Court, the design flow/capacity ratio (DFC) at the roundabout outside Yan On Estate and the roundabout at the junction of Ma On Shan Road and Hang Hong Street would reach 0.89 and 0.83 respectively, as indicated in the paper, which showed that improvement works needed to be carried out at the above locations. He would like to know the follow-up actions taken by the HD on the facilities concerned;
- (b) he pointed out that the vehicle/capacity ratio of southbound road of A Kung Kok Street was 1.18, indicating that this area was congested. He would like to know how the HD would deal with the worsened traffic congestion at A Kung Kok Street due to the increase in pedestrian flow, after the completion of Kam Chun Court and Yan On Estate Phase 2;
- (c) in terms of the reply to Question 2(d) on the paper, he would like to know which departments had failed to provide the traffic survey information and the channels through which the relevant information could be obtained; and
- (d) he pointed out that the TD had suspended the works of the cover for the pedestrian walkway of the University Station after conducting the study on the patronage and pedestrian flow distribution at the Chak Cheung Street roundabout and the University Station. He would like to know the progress of the works.

106. The views of Mr CHAN Pui-ming were summarised below:

- (a) he was aware of the TD's plan to refurbish the Ma Liu Shui public transport interchange and Chak Cheung Street roundabout. He would like to know the preliminary concept of the plan; and
- (b) he pointed out that the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had conducted a Traffic Impact Assessment for the feasibility study on eight sites for housing development in Ma On Shan and provided recommendations on the saturation of road junction. However, he was of the view that the traffic improvement works could not improve the congestion situation there, and pointed out that the TD had not been rigorous in approving the Traffic Impact Assessment Report. Regarding the above works, he would like to know the TD's plans to improve the traffic problems in Ma On Shan, in addition to the recommendations made by the CEDD in the assessment report.

107. Ms Bella WONG, Civil Engineer (31) of the HD said that the HD had assessed the traffic impact of the two roundabouts proposed by the Chairman. The assessment result indicated that no improvement works were required. The Department could forward the report to the Chairman after the meeting.

108. The responses from Mr Jeff LO, Engineer (Sha Tin) 3 of the TD were summarised below:

- (a) the Department opined that the vehicle/capacity ratio of the southbound road of A Kung Kok Street was at a manageable level. In view of the heavy traffic in A Kung Kok Street during morning peak hours, the Department had implemented traffic improvement measures in late 2020, including adjusting the traffic lights at the junction of Hang Tak Street towards A Kung Kok Street and A Kung Kok Street near Sha Tin Hospital. The traffic conditions at A Kung Kok Street had been improved; and
- (b) he pointed out that the traffic condition of the relevant projects was monitored mainly by reference to data collected by other departments or organisations, but the relevant departments and organisations did not agree to release the relevant data, hence the Department was unable to provide all the data in the paper.

109. Mr Caleb YIU, Engineer/Bicycle Parking of the TD said the Department was conducting a study to improve the University Station Public Transport Interchange. As the improvement plan might change the design of the cover of the pedestrian link, the Department had suspended the works and would review whether the original design would still be used upon completion of the study.

110. The views of the Chairman were summarised below:

- (a) he requested the HD to provide the Traffic Impact Assessment Report of the HD's development projects in Question 2(e); and
- (b) he asked the TD and the Secretariat to liaise with the relevant departments on how to obtain the Traffic Impact Assessment Report for the remaining works in Question 2(e).

111. Mr Jeff LO said that a list would be provided for the Secretariat to liaise with relevant departments to provide the Traffic Impact Assessment Report.

112. Ms Bella WONG agreed to provide the relevant report to the Chairman for reference.

Date of Next Meeting

113. The next meeting was scheduled to be held at 10:00 am on 20 April (Tuesday) at the STDO Conference Room 441.

114. The meeting was adjourned at 7:22 pm.

Sha Tin District Council Secretariat
STDC 13/15/45

August 2021