

Minutes of the 1st Special Meeting of
the Traffic and Transport Committee (2018-2019) of
the Tuen Mun District Council

Date: 9 February 2018 (Friday)

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Venue: Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC) Conference Room

<u>Present</u>		<u>Time of Arrival</u>	<u>Time of Departure</u>
Mr SO Shiu-shing (Chairman)	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr YIP Man-pan (Vice-chairman)	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr LEUNG Kin-man, BBS, MH, JP	TMDC Chairman	9:37 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr LEE Hung-sham, Lothar, BBS, MH	TMDC Vice-chairman	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr KWU Hon-keung	TMDC Member	9:36 a.m.	11:00 a.m.
Mr TO Sheck-yuen, MH	TMDC Member	9:34 a.m.	10:47 a.m.
Mr CHU Yiu-wah	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	12:33 p.m.
Mr NG Koon-hung	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	11:15 a.m.
Mr CHAN Yau-hoi, BBS, MH, JP	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms HO Hang-mui	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr LAM Chung-hoi	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr TSUI Fan, MH	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms CHING Chi-hung	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms LUNG Shui-hing, MH	TMDC Member	11:24 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr CHAN Man-wah, MH	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	12:33 p.m.
Mr CHEUNG Hang-fai	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Ms CHU Shun-nga, Beatrice	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr TSANG Hin-hong	TMDC Member	9:57 a.m.	12:19 p.m.
Ms SO Ka-man	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr MO Shing-fung	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Mr KAM Man-fung	TMDC Member	10:20 a.m.	12:22 p.m.
Mr YEUNG Chi-hang	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr YAN Siu-nam	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr TAM Chun-yin	TMDC Member	9:30 a.m.	12:23 p.m.
Mr CHAN Wai-ming	Co-opted Member	9:30 a.m.	9:48 a.m.
Mr James CHAN	Co-opted Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr IP Pak-wing	Co-opted Member	9:30 a.m.	End of meeting
Mr TSANG Tak-lung, Sam (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council) 2, Tuen Mun District Office, Home Affairs Department		

By Invitation

Mr CHEUNG Cheuk-wai, Jeffrey	Senior Transport Officer/Bus/New Territories West, Transport Department
Ms WONG Wing-chow, Cherry	Transport Officer/Bus/New Territories West, Transport Department
Mr Godwin SO	General Manager - Corporate Planning & Business Development, The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
Mr Patrick PANG	General Manager - Kowloon Bay Depots & Lai Chi Kok Depots, The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
Mr TANG Ching-kit	Senior Officer, Planning & Development, The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
Mr LAI Ka-long	Senior Operations Support Officer, Long Win Bus Company Limited

In Attendance

Mr MOK Ka-sing, Mark	Senior Transport Officer/Tuen Mun 1, Transport Department
Ms TSE Sau-ching, Cammy	Senior Transport Officer/Tuen Mun 2, Transport Department
Mr TAM Kwok-leung	Administrative Assistant/Lands (Acting), (District Lands Office, Tuen Mun), Lands Department
Mr WONG Lap-pun	Station Sergeant, District Traffic Team (Tuen Mun), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr TSZE Chi-ho	Assistant Manager (Operations), Long Win Bus Company Limited
Mr Brian LAM	Assistant Operations Manager, Citybus Limited
Mr Kelvin YEUNG	Assistant Manager (Operations), The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
Miss CHAN Hoi-ting, Gillian	Assistant District Officer (Tuen Mun)2, Home Affairs Department

Absent with Apologies

Ms KONG Fung-yi	TMDC Member
Ms WONG Lai-sheung, Catherine	TMDC Member
Mr CHAN Manwell, Leo	TMDC Member

I. Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcome all present to the 1st special meeting of the Traffic and Transport Committee (“TTC”) (2018-2019) to further deal with the Bus Route Planning Programme 2018-2019 of Tuen Mun District and the business left over from the 2nd meeting (TTC Papers No. 5/2018 and 7/2018).

2. The Chairman reminded Members that Members who were aware of their personal interests in any matters discussed at the meeting should declare the interests before the discussion. The Chairman would, in accordance with Order 39(12) of the Tuen Mun District Council (“TMDC”) Standing Orders, decide whether the Members who had declared interests might speak or vote on the matters, might remain at the meeting as observers, or should withdraw from the meeting. All cases of declaration of interests would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

II. Absence from Meeting

3. The Secretariat had received applications from Ms KONG Fung-yi and Mr Leo CHAN for leave of absence.

[Post-meeting note: As the above Members had not submitted medical certificates within two working days after the meeting, the TTC could not give consent to their leave for absence in accordance with Order 42 (1) of the Standing Orders.]

III. Matters Arising

**(A) Bus Route Planning Programme 2018-2019 of Tuen Mun District
(TTC Paper No. 3/2018)**

4. The Chairman welcomed Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG, Senior Transport Officer/Bus/New Territories West, and Ms Cherry WONG, Transport Officer/Bus/New Territories West, of the Transport Department (“TD”); Mr Godwin SO, General Manager - Corporate Planning & Business Development, Mr Patrick PANG, General Manager - Kowloon Bay Depots & Lai Chi Kok Depots, Mr Kelvin YEUNG, Assistant Manager (Operations), and Mr TANG Ching-kit, Senior Officer, Planning & Development, of The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited (“KMB”); Mr TSZE Chi-ho, Assistant Manager (Operations), and Mr LAI Ka-long, Senior Operations Support Officer, of Long Win Bus Company Limited (“LWB”), and Mr Brian LAM, Assistant Operations Manager of Citybus Limited (“Citybus”), to the meeting.

5. The Chairman said the programme could be broken down into the following

parts as per TTC Paper No. 3/2018:

- (a) Proposal to re-route KMB Route No. 66X;
- (b) Proposal for the 7:50 a.m. departure of KMB Route No. 252B to operate via So Kwun Wat Road;
- (c) Proposal to provide an additional Route No. 252X special departure;
- (d) Proposal to extend KMB Route No. 261 to Fanling;
- (e) Proposal to launch KMB Route No. 261X plying between Tuen Mun Town Centre and Fanling (Cheung Wah);
- (f) Proposal to launch KMB Route No. 263C plying between Tuen Mun Station and Tai Po Centre;
- (g) Proposal to launch KMB Route No. M61 - a mid-sized single-deck bus service plying between So Kwun Wat Road and Tuen Mun Road Bus-Bus Interchange (“TMR BBI”);
- (h) Proposal to launch the new long-haul bus service - KMB Route No. P960;
- (i) Proposal to launch Citybus Route No. P962 operating from Central (Exchange Square) to Tuen Mun (Wu King Road); and
- (j) Proposal to provide additional KMB Route No. N260 special departures.

6. For higher efficiency, the Chairman suggested the TD’s representatives be invited to give a brief introduction to the programme first, following which Members would be invited to comment on the above 10 parts in sequence, and then Members might express their views on other individual bus routes as usual. Members had no comments on the above arrangements.

7. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD introduced the contents of the programme as follows, and he said that Members were welcome to make comments and the TD and bus companies would respond to Members’ comments and enquiries:

- (i) When working out the Bus Route Planning Programme (“BRPP”) for Tuen Mun, the department would take into account a number of factors, such as

the public's demand for bus services, the impacts of bus services on road capacity and the environment, community development, population growth and the entire bus route network, to ensure that resources were used effectively and suitable public transport services were provided for areas with genuine needs;

- (ii) There were three major types of service adjustments in the BRPP: the first type involved the introduction or launch of bus services, which included (a) the proposal to launch KMB Route No. 261X plying between Tuen Mun Town Centre and Fanling (Cheung Wah), (b) the proposal to launch KMB Route No. 263C plying between Tuen Mun Station and Tai Po Centre, (c) the proposal to launch the mid-sized single-deck service KMB Route No. M61 plying between So Kwun Wat Road and TMR BBI, and (d) the proposal to launch the new long-haul bus service KMB Route No. P960 plying between Wan Chai and Po Tin;
- (iii) The second type involved the provision of more special departures, which included (a) the proposal to provide an additional KMB Route No. 252X special departure operating from So Kwun Wat Road to Lam Tin Station (b) the proposal to provide additional overnight KMB Route No. N260 special departures operating from Mei Foo to Sam Shing Estate via So Kwun Wat Road, and (c) the proposal to launch Citybus Route No. P962 operating from Central (Exchange Square) to Tuen Mun (Wu King Road) in afternoon peak hours;
- (iv) The third type involved the enhancements of existing services including (a) Route 267X plying between Siu Hong and Lam Tin, (b) Route No. B3 plying between Tuen Mun Pier and Shenzhen Bay Port, (c) Route No. A33 plying between Yuet Wu Villa and the airport, (d) Route No. 261B special departures operating from So Kwun Wat to Kowloon Station, and (e) Route No. 962B plying between Causeway Bay and Chi Lok Fa Yuen; and
- (v) The fourth type involved adjustments to existing routes, which included (a) the proposal to re-route the Olympic-bound journey of KMB Route No. 66X via Yen Chow Street, Lai Chi Kok Road and Shanghai Street to save journey time, and (b) the proposal for the 7:50 a.m. departure of KMB Route No. 252B to operate from Handsome Court to Kowloon South via So Kwun Wat Road.

8. The Chairman invited Members to discuss the 10 parts of the programme in sequence.

Proposal to re-route KMB Route No. 66X

9. Members made the first round of comments as follows:

- (i) A Member said many residents took KMB Route No. 66X to the areas of Cheung Sha Wan and Nathan Road for work and entertainment, so they would be inconvenienced if the route was diverted via Shanghai Street. Moreover, he opposed the proposal because the department had never consulted residents in Shan King Estate about the proposed adjustments;
- (ii) A Member noted that while the paper proposed adjustments to the route of the forward journey of Route No. 66X, the existing route of its return journey remained unchanged. Worrying that confusion would arise, he did not agree to the proposal;
- (iii) A Member said the paper proposed the central Mong Kok stops of the return journey of Route No. 66X be kept, showing that there was a need among residents for transport to the area. Moreover, the department pointed out that the number of passengers affected by the re-routing would account for 38% of the total number of passengers. Given such a large number of passengers, he opposed the proposal; and
- (iv) A Member said the TD had cancelled the bus services of Route No. 66 three years before, but had not strengthened other bus services in the area as yet. He suspected that the department intended to cut the bus services of Routes No. 57 and 66X in phases. As the department proposed to carry out the re-routing proposal for Route No. 66X in the first quarter of next year, he requested the department to undertake a full consultation within the year and reconsider the proposal concerned.

10. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD said the paper proposed Route No. 66X be diverted from Cheung Sha Wan Road to Lai Chi Kok Road, and since the two roads were not far away from each other, and Yen Chow Street was close to the areas of Dragon Centre and Apliu Street, so it was believed that Tuen Mun residents would find it more convenient to go out for shopping. The department knew that some passengers used to take this route to Cheung Sha Wan Road or Nathan Road, and

currently there were many choices of bus routes running via Cheung Sha Wan Road or Nathan Road available at TMR BBI. Therefore, the proposal could not only shorten the journey time of Route No. 66X but ease the burden on Cheung Sha Wan Road and strengthen the network of transport between Tuen Mun on one side and Sham Shui Po and Lai Chi Kok Road on the other. It was noteworthy that a serious traffic accident had happened in the previous year at the junction of Yen Chow Street and Cheung Sha Wan Road, and as a matter of fact, the area of Cheung Sha Wan Road had relatively high traffic; therefore, members of the community there had suggested the rationalisation of bus routes operating via Cheung Sha Wan Road to ease the traffic burden on that road section.

11. Mr Kelvin YEUNG of KMB said Route No. 66X called at a total of four stops on its journey from Cheung Sha Wan and Olympic, and there would be five stops after the re-routing, so residents would find it very convenient to go to Sham Shui Po or Mong Kok. If residents needed to go to the areas of central Mong Kok, Fa Yuen Street or Langham Place, they might consider alighting at the Bute Street or Mong Kok Market stop. Thus, residents were still able to reach their original destinations after the re-routing. Furthermore, there were many bus routes operating via Cheung Sha Wan Road and Nathan Road, with routes from Tuen Mun alone accounting for seven of them, namely Routes No. 52X, 58X, 59X, 60X, 63X, 66X and 67X. As the journey of Route No. 66X was sometimes delayed by traffic congestion on Cheung Sha Wan Road, Nathan Road and Argyle Street, the re-routing could not only stabilise its overall service frequency, but ease the traffic burden on the busy road sections and help stabilise the service frequency of other routes. In addition, it was more difficult to adjust the other routes mentioned above without further complicating their routes.

12. Members made the second round of comments as follows:

- (i) A Member opined that the TD was very biased in working out the BRPPs for various districts, as direct bus routes to Causeway Bay were available in most of the other districts, whereas only routes to Wan Chai or Admiralty were provided in Tuen Mun. Besides, given that there were seven routes from Tuen Mun running via Nathan Road, he did not understand why the department chose Route No. 66X for route adjustment;
- (ii) A Member said the TD had cancelled Route No. 66, which had operated via Tai Hing and Shan King, on the grounds of insufficient population in earlier years, and the re-routing of Route No. 66X would cause inconvenience to

residents who worked in Cheung Sha Wan and went to Mong Kok East Railway Station. Therefore, he objected to the proposal again;

- (iii) A Member did not agree to the cancellation of the Mong Kok Police Station stop, which was the destination of many passengers of Route No. 66X. Moreover, he found it unacceptable for KMB to say in its response that passengers might go to their original destinations on foot after the re-routing of Route No. 66X. He also did not agree to KMB simply using the route adjustments to Route No. 66X as a means to ease traffic on busy road sections; and
- (iv) A Member had reservations about the captioned proposal. As KMB had pointed out that there were seven bus routes from Tuen Mun running via Nathan Road, KMB should choose other routes for route adjustment by, for example, considering adjustments to some routes that ran a number of places in Tuen Mun. Moreover, as there were not many buses of Route No. 66X and the TD had scrapped Route No. 66 in earlier years, it was believed that Route No. 66X would not pose a heavy burden on busy road sections. Therefore, the Member urged the TD and KMB to revise the proposal.

13. The Chairman said the TTC had previously opposed the TD launching the services of Citybus Routes No. 962C and 962E, but Citybus had earlier issued a press release on the official implementation of the services despite the fact that the TD had not obtained the consent of the TTC. As similar cases had happened for many times before, he requested the TD and the bus company to listen earnestly to the views of Members and consider the re-routing proposal for Route No. 66X with caution. If the department finally decided to implement the proposal, it must notify the TTC again.

Proposal for the 7:50 a.m. departure of KMB Route No. 252B to operate via So Kwun Wat Road

14. A Member said public transport services in the So Kwun Wat area had no merit at all, so she welcomed the department's efforts to strengthen bus services in that area. However, if Route No. 252B ran via So Kwun Wat, passengers would spend much more time on the journey from Handsome Court to Aegean Coast. She requested that the TD should not cause much inconvenience to existing passengers when addressing demand in So Kwun Wat, nor should it borrow some scheduled buses from other routes to satisfy demand in So Kwun Wat in the long run.

Moreover, a new housing estate in the area would be occupied by residents in March this year, so it was not desirable for the captioned proposal to be implemented as late as the fourth quarter of this year.

15. A Member said there was no doubt that bus services in So Kwun Wat should be enhanced to cope with population growth, but Route No. 252B would run along a highly circuitous route after taking a detour through So Kwun Wat and its existing passengers might be upset. As the paper also proposed the launch of Route No. M61 plying between So Kwun Wat and TMR BBI, he suggested the bus company consider introducing discounts on changes from Route No. M61 to other bus routes while keeping the original routing of Route No. 252B unchanged. He stressed that the department should not cause other problems to Route No. 252B for the sake of answering transport demand in So Kwun Wat, otherwise the loss outweighed the gain. For this reason, he requested the department to reconsider the proposal concerned.

16. The Chairman said that it took at least 20 minutes for bus routes to run via Sham Tseng and the TMDC could hardly propose adjustments to the bus routes concerned on its own in future; moreover, the existing Route No. 962B already operated via Sham Tseng. For these reasons, generally he would not agree to other bus routes from Tuen Mun such as Route No. 962C or 962E operating via Sham Tseng. For Route No. 252B, he would like the TD and the bus company to consider the actual circumstances of districts, in the hope that the adjustment would not cause inconvenience to the public.

17. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD said the 7:50 a.m. departure of Route No. 252B still had spare carrying capacity and was presumably able to meet new demand in So Kwun Wat. Yet, the department noted Members' concern that the journey time of Route No. 252B would increase after it ran via the So Kwun Wat area. The department would study this with the bus company and explore whether it was possible to implement the proposal earlier.

Proposal to provide an additional Route No. 252X special departure

18. As the matter was related to TTC Paper No. 7/2018 titled "Request for Strengthening Service of KMB Route No. 252X", the TTC agreed that they be discussed together.

19. A proposer of TTC Paper No. 7/2018 was glad that the bus company would

provide an additional Route No. 252X departure at 7:15 a.m. operating from So Kwun Wat Road to Lam Tin Station, but Tuen Mun Road was often congested, so residents hoped the special departure could operate earlier at 7:00 a.m. Besides, as the population of that area kept growing, the TD should consider operating more special departures in the morning and providing the return trip service. In addition, the bus company should implement the proposal as early as possible and it would be a bit too late to put it into operation in the first quarter of next year.

20. While agreeing to the TD increasing public transport services in the district, a Member remarked that the department should provide more than merely special forward trip services. Moreover, Route No. 252X operating to Lam Tin Station would depart separately from Handsome Court and So Kwun Wat Road; therefore, if the department increased the corresponding return trip service in the future, different numbers should be assigned to the two routes to avoid confusion.

21. A Member said he had visited Aegean Coast to observe the boarding situation of Route No. 252X and knew that this route was quite popular with residents. The TD and the bus company might consider scheduling the special departure for 7:45 a.m. While population along Castle Peak Road kept growing, the TD just marginally increased special departure services each year, which could hardly match new demand in the area, so the department should consider expanding the special departure into a whole-day service. Besides, a member of the Tsuen Wan District Council (“TWDC”) whose constituency, though within Tsuen Wan District, was geographically located between Tuen Mun and Tsuen Wan had told him that there was a certain demand for bus services from Tuen Mun to urban districts among residents in the constituency, so the TWDC member hoped the TTC of the TMDC could give consideration to the view.

22. The Chairman said he did not agree to bus routes from Tuen Mun operating via Sham Tseng, which took at least 20 minutes to run through. Besides, population in the So Kwun Wat area would increase progressively, so the TD should consider the development of the area as a whole.

23. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD said the provision of the additional special departure of Route No. 252X served to meet the new demand created by community development in So Kwun Wat, and the special departure in morning peak hours served to answer the relatively intense transport demand in morning commuting hours, whereas passengers might make good use of interchange networks to go to

their destinations in non-peak hours. Regarding Members' proposals to provide the return trip service of the route and expand it into a whole-day service, the current patronage of the Route No. 252X return trip was about 40%, and the department would pay attention to the demand and review the service arrangements in due course.

24. Mr Kelvin YEUNG of KMB said workers made their return journeys at scattered time, so KMB had to select the departure time of the return trip carefully to satisfy their demand as far as possible, and the current patronage of the Route No. 252X return trip was about 40%. KMB welcomed Members' and community members' ideas on the departure time of the Route No. 252X special departure, and it would review with the TD the arrangements for the numbers of the routes.

Proposal to extend KMB Route No. 261 to Fanling

Proposal to launch KMB Route No. 261X plying between Tuen Mun Town Centre and Fanling (Cheung Wah)

25. As the above two matters were related to each other, the TTC agreed that they be discussed together.

26. Members made comments as follows:

- (i) While expressing support for the proposals, a Member said passengers often complained that due to the frequent lost trips of Route No. 261, sometimes they had to wait nearly 30 minutes for a bus. Besides, many residents would be moving from Sheung Shui to Tuen Mun amid the upcoming occupation of Yan Tin Estate, so it was expected that the demand for bus services between Sheung Shui and Tuen Mun would rise significantly in the future. In response to the route extension, KMB had added three buses to the resources for the operation of Route No. 261, but the Member suggested KMB further provide one to two buses to run this route. Besides, Route No. 261X had a shorter travelling distance but higher fare than Route No. 261, so she would like the bus company to review the fare level of the former route;
- (ii) A Member welcomed the captioned proposals and requested KMB to ensure that the stability of service frequency would not be affected after the route extension. Moreover, if resources permitted, the bus company should consider increasing the service frequency of Route No. 261X or expanding it into a whole-day service;

- (iii) A Member said he had fought for a Route No. 261 that operated via Lam Tei, Nai Wai, Chung Uk Tsuen and Hung Shui Kiu, and then run towards Sheung Shui via Hung Tin Road, but the TD refused on the grounds that the proposal would result in a very long travelling distance. Subsequently, the TD had arranged the launch of a total of three departures of Route No. 261P from Tsing Lun Road, and in view of the upcoming occupation of Yan Tin Estate, the TD should consider expanding Route No. 261P into a whole-day service. Besides, he suggested consideration be given to operating both Routes No. 261 and 261X via the Tsing Lun Road roundabout for the convenience of residents in Siu Hong Court and Yan Tin Estate. Moreover, it was not unusual for Route No. 261 to have delays since the route called at many stops;
- (iv) A Member agreed that Route No. 261 be extended to Fanling and suggested that its service frequency be increased to every 15 to 20 minutes. Besides, KMB should consider providing more bus resources to run this route;
- (v) A Member agreed that Route No. 261 be extended to Fanling as transport between Tuen Mun and North District was currently in demand. He also agreed with the operation of two departures of Route No. 261X each in morning and afternoon peak hours on a trial basis, and hoped the TD could review the route in due course and consider expanding it into a whole-day service. Regarding the routing of Route No. 261X, while it was acceptable for the route to depart from Tuen Mun Town Centre, more ideal results would be achieved if it departed from Tuen Mun Pier, Sam Shing or Goodview Garden instead, as more Tuen Mun residents could be benefited. Furthermore, he urged the TD to study the synergy between Routes No. 261 and 261X to avoid an overlapping source of passengers from the two routes. In addition, he asked why the TD and the bus company proposed Route No. 261X running via some frequently-congested locations in Yuen Long, such as the Pok Oi junction;
- (vi) A Member said research revealed that almost half of residents in Yan Tin Estate came from Tai Po and North District, so it was anticipated that the demand for Route No. 261 would keep growing in the future. Trips of the existing Route No. 261 were sometimes missing, so he requested that the 15 to 20 minute headway be maintained after the service was extended to

Fanling;

- (vii) Opining that Routes No. 261 and 261X overlapped with each other, a Member suggested the latter route be extended to Tai Po; and
- (viii) A Member expressed support for the setting up of a stop of the Route No. 261 series at the Tsing Lun Road roundabout, and called for enhancements to the service standard of Route No. 261P.

27. The Chairman said X routes were express routes and their fares were therefore generally higher.

28. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD said that if the proposals for Routes No. 261 and 261X could be implemented, the department would monitor the overall services, patronage and travel patterns of Routes No. 261, 261P and 261X, and adjust their service frequency in accordance with the actual demand for these routes to ensure the effective use of bus resources.

29. Mr Kelvin YEUNG of KMB said the existing KMB Route No. 261 was often delayed due to traffic congestion in North District, so KMB had planned to provide three more buses to run the route with a view to stabilising the overall service frequency while extending the route. Besides, KMB kept an open mind about the routing of Route No. 261X in Tuen Mun, and Members were welcome to offer ideas. KMB would also pay close attention to the development of Yan Tin Estate and adjust the service standard of Route No. 261P when appropriate.

30. The Chairman would like the TD and the bus company to consider adding a detour through Yan Tin Estate to Route No. 261X. Besides, he asked the TD to answer whether it would consider extending Route No. 261X beyond its terminus to Tai Po.

31. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD said it was proposed in the BRPP for the current year that Route No. 263C be launched to ply between Tuen Mun Station and Tai Po Centre and passengers might change buses for Tai Po at Shing Mun Tunnels Bus Interchange.

32. A Member once again asked why Route No. 261X ran via Yuen Long.

33. Mr Kelvin YEUNG of KMB responded that the only existing bus service connecting Yuen Long and Tuen Mun was Route No. 68A, which ran along Castle Peak Road, so KMB was inclined to provide a more convenient route to Yuen Long.

34. Members made the second round of comments as follows:

(i) A Member did not agree to Route No. 261X running via Yuen Long, arguing that this would overlap with the services of the Light Rail and that buses of X routes should take the most direct route to their destinations. If KMB fretted about insufficient patronage, the company might consider moving the terminus of the route to Sam Shing and adding a detour through Chi Lok Fa Yuen to its Sheung Shui-bound journey;

(ii) A Member remarked that Route No. 261X would defeat its purpose as an express route if it ran via the often-congested Pok Oi roundabout;

(iii) In view of the overlapping catchment areas of minibus Route No. 44 and bus Route No. 261, a Member suggested Route No. 261 depart from TMR BBI instead and operate to Sheung Shui via Chi Lok Fa Yuen. Yet, understanding that it was very difficult to adjust the route, he therefore suggested the bus company consider offering discounts on changes from Route No. 52X or 53 to Route No. 261 at Sam Shing to provide residents along Castle Peak Road with convenient transport to Sheung Shui; and

(iv) A Member suggested Route No. 261X depart from So Kwun Wat instead and then run to North District directly after operating via Castle Peak Road.

35. The Chairman said he had submitted a discussion paper proposing Route No. 261 depart from TMR BBI instead. He further said traffic conditions at the Pok Oi roundabout were acceptable, and Route No. 261X needed to run via Yuen Long for sufficient patronage; otherwise its service would not be sustainable.

36. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD said that if the proposals could be implemented, the department would review the service arrangements in due course.

37. The Chairman said it would be too late if adjustments were made only after the services came into operation.

38. A Member said the TD should respect the TMDC and give serious

consideration to Members' views.

39. The Chairman said the TTC supported the launch of Route No. 261X, but its route was subject to discussion. He would like the TD to study Members' views and make reports in due course.

40. A Member said the TTC agreed to the launch of Route No. 261X but did not agree to the route running via Yuen Long, whereas its routing in Tuen Mun was subject to discussion. As the paper proposed the route be put into operation in the second quarter of this year, he hoped the Chairman would clearly express the TTC's standpoint to the TD.

41. The Chairman said he had requested the TD to consider the TTC's views and make reports to the TTC before implementing the services.

Proposal to launch KMB Route No. 263C plying between Tuen Mun Station and Tai Po Centre

42. Members made comment and enquiries as follows:

- (i) A Member welcomed the department's proposal as he had fought for the launch of a bus service plying between Tuen Mun and Tai Po on holidays for more than 10 years. However, the paper proposed launching a service of only one departure per weekday at 7:15 a.m., which was believed to be unable to meet the needs of residents who went to Tai Po for work and entertainment. Therefore, he requested the department to expand this route into a whole-day service. He also requested the TD to consult with the TMDC before uploading the contents of the paper to the Internet;
- (ii) A Member suggested the TD and the bus company consider increasing the number of the departures to three each morning and afternoon to answer the demand of residents who commuted to Tai Po. Besides, she requested that the route be extended to terminate at Tai Po Industrial Estate;
- (iii) A Member believed that a bus with a carrying capacity of about 200 people could not satisfy the demand of residents who commuted to Tai Po, as Tuen Mun had a population of more than 500 000. The Member therefore requested the bus company to increase the service frequency in accordance with actual patronage and, in the long run, expand the route into a whole-day service; and

(iv) A Member asked the TD whether it would earnestly consider Members' views and, if it would not, he would leave the meeting to show dissatisfaction.

43. The Chairman reminded the TD not to upload papers not yet discussed by the TTC to its website.

44. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD said the department was gathering the opinions of the local community on the BRPP and wished to consult with councillors through the TMDC. He added that as a matter of fact, there had been finalised BRPPs that were different from the originally proposed ones. Besides, in early January this year, the TD had, through the TMDC Secretariat, sent the contents of the BRPP for the current year to the TTC for perusal and after that, it had uploaded the BRPP to the TD's official website for public reference on 8 January.

45. Members made the second round of comments as follows:

(i) A Member once again suggested that Route No. 261X be extended to terminate at Tai Po, and hoped the TD would make further reports to the TTC before the BRPP implementation;

(ii) A Member said launching the bus service of one departure to Tai Po was barely better than none at all, and hardly could this fully address the demand of residents who commuted to New Territories East. Moreover, he requested the bus company to lower the fare on this route and suggested the TD consider arranging several Tai Po-bound buses at TMR BBI for passengers to change buses in peak hours;

(iii) A Member welcomed the department's proposal as the Working Group on Tuen Mun External Traffic had been fighting for the launch of bus services from Tuen Mun to Tai Po. But in his view, launching the service of only one departure was just a drop in the bucket, which could hardly satisfy the demand of residents who commuted to and from Tai Po. Moreover, he suggested that when launching new routes, the TD should focus resources on TMR BBI so that residents would find it convenient to change buses and bus companies could lower fares accordingly;

(iv) While expressing support for the launch of the service, a Member suggested

the TD enhance its frequency in accordance with actual demand and, in the long run, expand the route into a whole-day service. Regarding the proposal that the route should depart from TMR BBI, he noted that there had been another route operating directly from TMR BBI to Kowloon East, but due to insufficient patronage, it had to depart from Lung Mun Oasis instead, so Members should learn from the lesson and review the route only after it was officially in service for a while;

- (v) A Member requested the expansion of the route into a whole-day service. If the bus company fretted that patronage would be insufficient after the whole-day service was provided, it might adjust the service frequency accordingly;
- (vi) A Member suggested Route No. 263C depart from TMR BBI instead and run within Tuen Mun, and then proceed directly to Route 9 to omit Shing Mun Tunnel, where traffic congestion was relatively heavy; and
- (vii) A Member requested the TD to operate the service on holidays and increase its frequency.

46. Mr Kelvin YEUNG of KMB said the bus company would study with the TD the routing arrangements for Route No. 263C, its service frequency and the feasibility of launching holiday services. Besides, its fare level was determined in accordance with the scale of fares, but KMB would examine room for fare adjustment.

47. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD said the department would review with the bus company the routing arrangements for the proposed route and its service frequency. Moreover, as many passengers currently took Route No. 263 to Shing Mun Tunnels Bus Interchange to change buses for Tai Po, Routes No. 263C and 263 ran along the same route in Tuen Mun in order to achieve synergy. Franchised bus companies determined fares in accordance with the scale of fares, and the current full fare on Route No. 263 was \$14.8.

Proposal to launch KMB Route No. M61 - a mid-sized single-deck bus service plying between So Kwun Wat Road and TMR BBI

48. As this matter was related to the TTC Paper No. 5/2018 titled “Strong Request for Strengthening Transport Service in Vicinity of The Bloomsway, NAPA,

Tsing Ying Road and So Kwun Wat Road”, the TTC agreed that they be discussed together.

49. A proposer of TTC Paper No. 5/2018 was glad to see that transport services in the So Kwun Wat area were talked at length in the BRPP for the current year, but most of the new bus services had only one or two departures, which could hardly satisfy the actual demand of residents; moreover, in the paper no transport arrangements were made in response to the upcoming occupation of The Bloomsway. Besides, she opined that it was a bit too late for this route to come into service only in the fourth quarter of this year or the first quarter of next year. In addition, she enquired whether the bus company would offer interchange discounts on Route No. M61.

50. A Member welcomed the proposal, but worried that the department had launched a number of services in So Kwun Wat in the current year, there might be insufficient patronage on Route No. M61 and its catchment area might have to be expanded in the long run. Besides, he asked KMB why the terminus was sited at the lower level of TMR BBI and how a mid-sized single-deck bus was different from an existing mid-sized bus.

51. A Member worried that calling this route M61 would cause confusion among passengers since a previous bus route was called U61 and an existing route was called 61M.

52. Mr Kelvin YEUNG of KMB said it was proposed in the Public Transport Strategy Study released by the government in the previous year that mid-sized single-deck bus services be provided on a trial basis in less densely populated areas in New Territories, so KMB was inclined to provide feeder services from the increasingly populated So Kwun Wat to TMR BBI. It took time for KMB to arrange the purchase of mid-sized single-deck buses since they were new models. Yet, KMB would consider using other single-deck buses to operate the service. Besides, the terminus of the route was sited at the lower level of TMR BBI because it was a more suitable terminus location. As for interchange discounts, passengers were only required to make up fare differences for changes from Route No. M61 to other routes at TMR BBI.

53. A Member once again expressed worry about insufficient patronage on Route No. M61 because there were many bus services in So Kwun Wat during peak

hours.

54. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD said that with a larger carrying capacity than a minibus but a shorter vehicle length than existing single-deck buses, mid-sized single-deck buses were intended to serve less densely populated areas. The department would review its actual demand and discuss with the bus company whether the service could be put into operation at an earlier time to dovetail the occupation of the new housing estate in that area.

55. A Member suggested the bus company consider allowing passengers of Route No. M61 to enjoy interchange discounts at the Kar Wo Lei Tsuen stop and, once again, requested KMB to consider renumbering the route.

56. The Chairman said M routes were mostly destined for MTR stations, and interchange discounts were already offered to passengers of Route No. M61 at TMR BBI.

57. Mr Kelvin YEUNG of KMB said the bus company would consider offering interchange discounts at the Kar Wo Lei Tsuen stop and discuss with the TD the numbering arrangements for the route.

58. A Member said that while the BRPP for the current year proposed launching a number of services in So Kwun Wat, demand in Tsing Ying Road was not addressed at all and no corresponding transport facilities were planned for The Bloomsway, which would be occupied very soon.

59. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD said a bus stop was currently located on Castle Peak Road near Tsing Ying Road, and 17 minibus and bus routes were provided there. The department would examine changes in the existing demand. It would also actively discuss with the bus company the time for Route No. M61 to come into service.

60. A Member said The Bloomsway was located on an uphill road and very distant from the Cafeteria Beach stop. She enquired whether the TD would arrange corresponding public transport services for the housing estate.

61. Mr Mark MOK of the TD said The Bloomsway was not distant from Castle Peak Road, where different bus and minibus routes to various districts and Hong

Kong Island were available, and the department would make suitable adjustments in accordance with changes in its passenger volume. Moreover, the TD had agreed in principle to The Bloomsway launching a residents' coach service for short-distance connection with Tuen Mun Station. The department would continue to pay attention to the operation of public transport services in that area and its residents' coach service.

62. A Member said The Bloomsway was about 700 metres from Cafeteria Beach. She urged the TD to be considerate towards residents and arrange ideal transport facilities for them.

63. The Chairman would like the TD and the bus company to study the views.

Proposal to launch the new long-haul bus service - KMB Route No. P960

Proposal to launch Citybus Route No. P962 operating from Central (Exchange Square) to Tuen Mun (Wu King Road)

64. As the above two matters were related to each other, the TTC agreed that they be discussed together.

65. Members made comments and enquiries as follows:

(i) A Member welcomed the department's proposal to launch Route No. P960, but noted that although the route provided guaranteed seats, Wi-Fi service and USB charging hubs, its fare was \$31.2, much higher than the fares on Route No. 960, which was set at \$20.8, and residents' coaches. Moreover, she enquired whether the \$2 transport concession for the elderly and the disabled would apply to this route;

(ii) A Member expressed support for the launch of Route No. P960, but requested the bus company not to reduce the service of the existing Route No. 960. Moreover, she suggested Route No. P960 be extended to terminate at Causeway Bay or North Point to boost its price-performance ratio. Besides, she requested the bus company to consider lowering the fare and offering the \$2 transport concession for the elderly and the disabled;

(iii) A Member said the paper proposed Route No. 960 depart from Siu Hong between 6:50 a.m. and 8:30 a.m. and from Po Tin between 9:15 a.m. and 3:45 p.m. In view of the fact that no direct bus service to Wan Chai was available around Siu Hong, and that the nearby Yan Tin Estate would be

Action

occupied very soon and Route No. 960 already ran in the area of Kin Sang, the Member suggested all buses of Route No. P960 depart from Siu Hong, the fare be lowered, and the route be extended to terminate at Causeway Bay or Tin Hau;

- (iv) A Member said most residents welcomed the launch of this route and hoped the fare could be lowered to \$25 to \$26. Besides, she enquired whether USB charging hubs would be provided at all seats, whether there was any time limit on the Wi-Fi service, and how to handle cases where passengers became aware that all the seats were full only after paying the fare;
- (v) A Member said the fare on Route No. P960 should be adjusted downward to below \$30 and a stop should be provided on Shek Pai Tau Road to address needs in the Tai Hing area;
- (vi) A Member agreed that Route No. P960 should have a single terminus at Siu Hong to avoid confusion. Moreover, he suggested postponing the departure of the last return bus of Route No. P960 from Hong Kong Island until 1:00 a.m. and requested the bus company to lower the fare and consider including this route in the \$2 transport concession scheme for the elderly and the disabled;
- (vii) A Member said the guaranteed seats of Route No. P960 would better protect the safety of passengers, but it was not acceptable that the fare on Route No. P960 was almost 1.5-time higher than that on Route No. 960 but its journey time was just 10 minutes shorter than the latter route. He would like the TD to reconsider the routing of Route No. P960 by, for example, studying the provision of a stop near Tai Hing and omission of TMR BBI. Furthermore, he asked whether KMB would include Route No. P960 in its monthly pass programme and whether the launch of Route No. P960 would affect the existing service frequency of Route No. 960;
- (viii) A Member expressed support for the launch of two departures of Route No. P962 from Central and suggested the bus company finalise the related arrangements as soon as possible. Besides, Yan Tin Estate would be occupied very soon and, according to the results of a questionnaire survey, most residents hoped Route No. P960 would have a single terminus at Siu Hong, so she would like the TD and the bus company to take these factors

into account. Moreover, Route No. P960 was faster than Route No. 960 by merely 10 minutes and operated via often-congested road sections. She therefore wondered how the bus company would ensure the new route's operation punctuality;

- (ix) A Member suggested Route No. P960 run via Tsun Wen Road and a stop be set up there. The Member also suggested the numbers of unoccupied seats on Route No. P960 be displayed on KMB's mobile application and requested the bus company to reserve some seats for the disabled;
- (x) A Member suggested Route No. P960 omit TMR BBI and run to Hong Kong Island direct to save journey time, and be extended to Causeway Bay, Tin Hau or North Point. He urged the TD and KMB to reconsider its routing arrangements;
- (xi) A Member suggested Route No. P960 terminate at Siu Hong in that people would be confused if a bus route had different termini. Besides, he agreed that travelling efficiency would be boosted greatly if TMR BBI was omitted from the route. He also suggested KMB consider including this route in its monthly pass programme;
- (xii) A Member welcomed the launch of Route No. P962 and suggested the official implementation of the service be advanced to the third quarter of this year; and
- (xiii) A Member said many Members were concerned about the occupation of Yan Tin Estate, so she suggested the service depart directly from Yan Tin Estate and come into operation at an earlier date to match the progress of the occupation of the estate.

66. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD said it was proposed in the Public Transport Strategy Study released by the Government in the previous year that new long-haul bus services be launched to provide diversified choices of services for passengers, so Route No. P960 would be fitted with better service devices including more spacious seats, guaranteed seats, Wi-Fi service and USB charging hubs than ordinary bus routes, and accordingly, its operating costs would be higher than those of ordinary bus routes. For fare concessions, the half-fare concession for children aged under 12 and seniors aged above 65 would apply to Route No. P960, but the \$2 transport

concession for the elderly and the disabled would not. In fact, the \$2 transport concession served to encourage elderly people to use more public transport. Currently, elderly people could take Route No. 960 to Hong Kong Island, and the concession did not apply to airport and racecourse routes. For routing and service frequency arrangements, Route No. P960 was a brand new service featuring fewer stops and a more direct route, which served to carry passengers to destinations as quickly as possible. The department noted Members' views on its en-route and last stop; but for the question of whether the route would be extended to Causeway Bay, the department had to not only consider whether a suitable place was available in Causeway Bay for the stop, but also avoid impacts on the service stability of the route and on traffic on busy roads in the area concerned. Despite this, the department would explore with the bus company whether Route No. P960 could run via places closer to Causeway Bay. Furthermore, the launch of Route No. P960 would not lead to any reduction of the existing service of Route No. 960. In addition, Members' support for the service proposal for Route No. P962 was welcomed, and the department would consider the views with Citybus.

67. Mr Godwin SO of KMB said the Transport and Housing Bureau required that the monthly pass programmes of KMB should achieve three objectives: to provide real concessions for the public, to be sustainable, and to ensure no impacts on passengers not using the monthly passes. KMB would officially launch a monthly pass later, which would be up for review within about half to one year. As it was proposed that Route No. P960 come into operation in the fourth quarter of this year and KMB would later make financial estimates based on operation data on the monthly pass, so it was too early to consider whether this route would be included in the monthly pass programme. Besides, KMB was glad to extend the route beyond the terminus to Causeway Bay, and Moreton Terrace, Tin Hau and North Point could all be considered for the terminus.

68. Mr Kelvin YEUNG of KMB said Routes No. 960 and P960 would be operated separately and independently. KMB would study with the TD the routing of Route No. P960 in Tuen Mun, and KMB kept an open mind towards the extension of this route to Causeway Bay or North Point. Besides, it took time for KMB to purchase new vehicles since Route No. P960 was a brand new service, and after the process was complete, KMB would put the service into operation as soon as possible. KMB would also examine whether the numbers of unoccupied seats on Route No. P960 be displayed on the mobile application.

69. A Member said that if Route No. P960 did not operate via Tsun Wen Road or Shek Pai Tau Road, he would stand against the launch of the service.

70. A Member urged the TD to consider giving green light to the extension of Route No. P960 to Causeway Bay.

71. A Member once again asked if USB charging hubs would be provided at all seats of Route No. 960, if there was any time limit on the Wi-Fi service, and how to handle cases where passengers became aware that all the seats were full only after paying the fare.

72. Mr Kelvin YEUNG of KMB said that while two daily sessions of 15-minute Wi-Fi service were currently provided on some buses, KMB would explore the feasibility of providing unlimited Wi-Fi service on Route No. P960, and a USB charging hub would be provided at each seat on the route. Furthermore, KMB was studying the use of the mobile application to show the numbers of unoccupied seats, but trials were still underway. Further information would be provided if there was any news.

73. The Chairman said drivers of Route No. P960 should do headcounts of passengers on board.

74. A Member requested the setting up of at least one stop of Route No. P960 at Shek Pai Tau Road, Tai Hing Sports Centre, Toi Shan Primary School and the telephone exchange; otherwise, he would oppose the proposal.

75. A Member suggested the TD consider including Route No. P960 in the \$2 transport concession for the elderly and the disabled, arranging for the route to depart from Yan Tin Estate instead, and extending the route beyond its terminus to Causeway Bay. Besides, she requested KMB to study the use of the mobile application to show the numbers of unoccupied seats and the provision of the advance seat-booking service for passengers.

76. A Member suggested the drivers count the numbers of passengers on board and show the numbers at prominent positions in compartments. Another Member suggested a light be installed on each seat for identification.

77. The Chairman would like the TD and the bus company to consider

Members' views.

Proposal to provide additional KMB Route No. N260 special departures

78. A Member suggested another number be assigned to the captioned route because the special departures took a different route from the existing ones.

79. While welcoming the launch of the service, a Member said that she had not yet received residents' opinions on its departure time, and that if she received any opinions from residents, she would pass them on to the TD.

80. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD said the proposed departure time for the two special departures were tentative and the department would examine with the bus company if any adjustments were needed. In addition, the department would see whether the route number was appropriate.

Other bus routes

81. A Member was glad that Route No. A33 would depart from Yuet Wu Villa instead. The Member suggested its departure time be changed from the current 15 minutes to 45 minutes past each hour, and the departure time of its return trips be changed from 45 minutes to 15 minutes past each hour. If LWB was unable to arrange an increase in the service frequency in the near future, it should first adjust the departure time as mentioned above.

82. Mr TSZE Chi-ho of LWB said the bus company was inclined to maintain generally the same service time for Route No. A33's journey along Castle Peak Road after the route was extended to depart from Yuet Wu Villa; therefore, it arranged for this route to depart from Yuet Wu Villa at 15 minutes past each hour. Moreover, if the patronage met the guidelines for service frequency enhancements, LWB would increase the service frequency of Route No. A33 to every 30 minutes. LWB would consider the feasibility of adjustments to its departure time in the light of Members' views.

83. Another Member said LWB should increase the service frequency of Route No. A33 to every 30 minutes as soon as possible.

84. The Chairman would like the TD and the bus company to consider the views of the above Members.

Action

85. A Member suggested two departures at 7:50 a.m. and 8:10 a.m. should be added to Route No. 261B, and the return trip service be launched. He also suggested the catchment area of Route No. M61 be extended to Tuen Mun Pier, and its service frequency of every 20 to 30 minutes be maintained. He further suggested Route No. P962 be extended to terminate at Yuet Wu Villa.

86. A Member said the TD should increase the service frequency of Routes No. 67M and 67X in view of the occupation of Yan Tin Estate.

87. The Chairman would like the TD to study the above suggestions.

88. A Member said the paper proposed that if the patronage of Route No. B3 met the guidelines for bus service enhancements, the bus company would deploy buses to increase its service frequency. She would like the TD to explain the details.

89. Mr Jeffrey CHEUNG of the TD said that while expecting the patronage of the route to grow, the department would make arrangements with the bus company based on actual circumstances.

90. A Member remarked that Citybus had focused too much on Routes No. B3M and B3X before. Opining that the bus company should enhance services that could benefit local residents more, he requested a higher service frequency of Route No. B3.

91. A Member welcomed a higher service frequency of Route No. B3. Besides, he noted that a passenger had lost property on Route No. B3, but Citybus delivered all lost property to the terminus at Shenzhen Bay for temporary storage, making it inconvenient for the passenger to collect it instantly.

92. The Chairman asked Citybus to pay attention to the above matter.

93. A Member said she had repeatedly requested a higher service frequency of Route No. B3, and she was dissatisfied with the department's approach of basing its consideration of whether to adjust the service frequency on actual circumstances.

94. The Chairman concluded by asking the TD and the bus company to study Members' views.

IV. Any Other Business and Date of Next Meeting

95. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:47 p.m. The next meeting would be held at 9:30 a.m. on 16 March 2018 (Friday).

Tuen Mun District Council Secretariat

Date: 27 February 2018

File Ref: HAD TMDC/13/25/TTC/18