

優化灣仔、銅鑼灣及鄰近地區海濱的研究
Harbour-Front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas
 詳細規劃階段 Detailed Planning Stage
 簡報會 Briefing (23.6.2007)
 小組討論 Group Discussion

組號 Group No: 1

領組 Facilitator: Dr. Sujata Govada

助理 Helper: Elizabeth Lo

Group members:

Name	Organization
Peter Cheek	Maunsell
Alan Bradley	Public Observer
C Y Wong	HYD
Conrad Ng	
Peter Leung	MTRCL
Leung Ka On	PLPD
Loh Yiu Chung	IE Aust.
John Leigh	S.E.K.S/HK Regional Heliport
Johnny Chan	A.E.S
Phyllis Li	PlanD
Connie Lam	Hong Kong Arts Centre
Regina	
Raymond Chan	QCPS
Paul Zimmermann	DHKHD
Nicholas Brooke	PPS
Inge Strompf-Jepsen	RHKYC
Sally Wong	
K.K. Lau	TD
S.K. Lam	CEDD
Margaret Brooke	PPS
Sam Hui	EDLB

1 您認為建議發展大綱圖及相關分區計劃大綱圖的修訂建議能反映建立共識階段時所達成的共識或大多數公眾的觀點？

Do you think the proposals illustrated in the RODP and the proposed amendments to relevant OZPs reflect the consensus reached or majority public views on the Concept Plan expressed at the Realization Stage?

- There were quite a few members that had attended the previous public engagement exercises and there were some members who attended the public briefing for the first time.
- The Group members generally agreed that the views of the public were incorporated in the RODP, especially members that had attended previous workshops and charrettes.
- However, some members had the following concerns regarding the RODP with members expressing different views;
 1. The increase in traffic congestion and resultant air and noise pollution as a result of the CWB, Road P2 and the proposed slip roads.
 2. The increase in surface road footprint along the harbourfront and its impact on sterilizing the surrounding land uses.
 3. The lack of proper land water interface to support marine uses thereby resulting in a less vibrant and attractive harbourfront.
 4. The need for more experiential and quality pedestrian connections with additional north-south linkages from the hinterland and east-west mobility along the continuous waterfront promenade.
 5. The need for proper management and scope for flexibility and change during implementation of the CWB and related harbourfront enhancement including temporary measures to enable people to enjoy the harbourfront even before the completion of the CWB.

2 在設計及落實建議初段，您認為有些什麼事項要特別留意呢？

What issues do you think are of critical importance and have to be addressed in the early stages of design and implementation?

- Some members felt that traffic congestion in Wan Chai and Causeway Bay areas could increase as a result of the CWB, P2 and the related slip roads thereby increasing the noise and air pollution especially near North Point when the CWB joins the IEC a concern expressed by residents of the area. To this a government official emphasized that the number of slip roads were fewer than before and that the traffic will be taken away from the districts as a result of the slip roads to which some members did not agree.
- Some members felt that the CWB was conceived to reduce traffic congestion, but

might in turn result in more traffic generation as a result of the surface and various slip roads proposed. Surface road footprint should be minimized as far as possible to improve pedestrian experience and connectivity thereby improving the vibrancy and attractiveness of the harbourfront. One member suggested that perhaps there should be an independent audit to convince the public that this would not be the case, while government representatives felt this was already done earlier through the Transport Expert Panel. However some members felt that that current RODP should also be reviewed by an expert panel as well.

- Some members felt that review of current road design standards was needed as they seem to be more favourable to automobile traffic and less favourable for pedestrian movement. To this one, government official did say the alignment of the road P2 and the slip roads could be looked into to ensure maximum pedestrian connectivity and minimum sterilization and other negative land use impacts.
- Regarding land water interface, it was felt that the RODP should offer more opportunities for marine and related land use. Some members felt that harbourfront enhancement is an “Overriding Public Need” more so than building new roads. Opportunities to increase vibrancy and attractiveness of the harbourfront through boat moorings, floating villages and finger piers should be included in the RODP. To which one government official expressed that at this stage that it was not proven as an overriding public need and therefore it was difficult to include as there might be legal challenges as a result and further delay the process, some members felt that these should be included in the RODP and put to the “Overriding Public Needs Test”.
- One member expressed a concern with the re-provisioned coach parking near the Arts Centre and had doubts about how the landscaped deck would provide for proper pedestrian connectivity to the harbourfront as a lot of the land near the Arts Centre Extension will be sterilized by the new surface and slip roads proposed.
- Several members agreed that there should be more north-south at grade pedestrian connections that are shaded with trees to enhance the pedestrian experience and draw people from the hinterland to the harbourfront.
- Several members also felt mobility along the waterfront promenade should be enhanced with shaded footpaths, bike paths, trolley buses etc with ample pedestrian amenities.
- Most members felt that the waterfront promenade should create a lot of interest with diverse activities and interesting nodes so that it could draw people from the hinterland to the harbourfront, to this, government officials said that all the above concerns related to detailed design will be taken into account during the next stage.
- Members also agreed that the implementation of the harbourfront enhancement should be fast tracked to include temporary uses for people along the harbourfront,

similar to the pets park in Wan Chai with improved pedestrian accessibility so that people can access and begin to enjoy the harbourfront.

- One member expressed that the future Exhibition Station connection would provide more pedestrian accessibility and should also have mixed uses rather than just GIC uses, to which government officials reiterated that there would be leisure and recreational uses and related commercial uses would be considered as well.
- Some members also felt that management was critical during implementation and that there should be flexibility with built in scope for change to ensure the development of a vibrant and attractive harbourfront.

3 公眾怎樣才能繼續參與落實履行這些大綱圖呢？

How should the public be continually engaged in the implementation of the plans?

- The group members largely agreed that the HER project was unprecedented in engaging the public right from the beginning and should continue to do so in the following stages of detailed design and implementation of the CWB and related short term and long term harbourfront enhancement.
- The public should be engaged throughout the implementation process by organizing workshops, focus group meetings with the residents and various stake holders.
- The area should be divided into specific zones and related stakeholders and residents should be engaged with the help and assistance of the District Councils to ensure wider public engagement during the next stages of the process.

Other Views Expressed By Members

- One member opined that the new OZP should come under a fresh gazette rather than as a continuation of the old process, to which a few other members agreed. Government officials stated that this would be difficult as the current process had to be completed under the statutory process.
- Some members felt that the Golden Bauhinia Square should be re-provisioned to the front of the government headquarters as it would be more appropriate in Central harbourfront within the Tamar site .

Group Presentation Concerns

- Some group members felt that the verbal part of the group presentation did not satisfactorily reflect the views communicated in the group discussion. The facilitator was requested to refer to the written part of the presentation materials in preparing the discussion report.

優化灣仔、銅鑼灣及鄰近地區海濱的研究
Harbour-Front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas
 詳細規劃階段 Detailed Planning Stage
 簡報會 Briefing (23.6.2007)
 小組討論 Group Discussion

組號 Group No: 2

領組 Facilitator: 孫知用

助理 Helper: 陳榮傑

Group members:

Name	Organization
張凱偉	香港電台第二台政壇新秀
曹永強	
姚展	地下鐵路有限公司
羅昭寧	維多利中心
呂德成	香港中文大學
王東亮	星島日報
方志山	恒隆地產代理有限公司
劉國霖	香港遊艇會
陳婷婷	
林芷芳	
李振輝	
鄧志偉	
蔣朕剛	CSHK
尹萬良	路政署
謝景鉅	
胡信源	茂盛(亞洲)工程顧問有限公司
錢家紹	其士富居物業管理有限公司
湯錦波	維多利中心
陳慶明	工程界社促會
霍志偉	
姜廣榮	九廣鐵路有限公司
唐子樑	香港區域直昇機場工作小組
陳本標	土木工程拓展署

1 您認為建議發展大綱圖及相關分區計劃大綱圖的修訂建議能反映建立共識階段時所達成的共識或大多數公眾的觀點？

Do you think the proposals illustrated in the RODP and the proposed amendments to relevant OZPs reflect the consensus reached or majority public views on the Concept Plan expressed at the Realization Stage?

- 大致上同意現在的建議符合公眾的意見和觀點已達到共識，對於中環灣仔繞道的需要及走線沒有進一步的意見

2 在設計及落實建議初段，您認為有些什麼事項要特別留意呢？

What issues do you think are of critical importance and have to be addressed in the early stages of design and implementation?

- 部分於第二階段後期所收集到的意見未有得到回應，希望於第三階段的報告中反映；
- 建議考慮遷移至銅鑼灣避風塘外防波堤北端的位置，以替代或補充擬議設於北角的通風大樓，以減免對北角海濱一帶的空氣影響；
- 未來北港島線/沙中線展覽站之上的用地，應否增設商業設施以吸引更多人流到海濱一帶；
- 擬議增設的隔音屏障，希望可伸延至北角城市花園一帶，以減低該處的交通噪音；
- 園景平台的設計需要考慮到對周邊景觀及環境所構成的影響

3 公眾怎樣才能繼續參與落實履行這些大綱圖呢？

How should the public be continually engaged in the implementation of the plans?

- 公眾人士希望可以繼續參與詳細設計及規劃階段的工作

優化灣仔、銅鑼灣及鄰近地區海濱的研究

Harbour-Front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas

詳細規劃階段 Detailed Planning Stage

簡報會 Briefing (23.6.2007)

小組討論 Group Discussion

組號 Group No: 3

領組 Facilitator: 黎倩君小姐 (Ms. Flora Lai) 助理 Helper: 盧星桓先生 (Mr. Lo Sing Wun)

Group members:

Name	Organization
區嘉曼小姐 (Ms. Carmen Au)	茂盛(亞洲)工程顧問有限公司
趙泳超先生 (Mr. Chiu Wing Chiu)	中西區居民
湯啓康先生 (Mr. Tong Kai Hong)	香港遊艇會
葉錫祺先生 (Mr. Yip Sek Ki)	路政署
李炳權先生 (Mr. Lee Ping Kuen)	工程界社促會
張群達先生 (Mr. Cheung Kwan Tar)	市民
尹萬年先生 (Mr. Wan Man Lin)	華曦大廈法團秘書
陳先生 (Mr. Chan)	龍虎山郊野公園晨運之友會
盧笑芳女士 (Mr. Lo Siu Fong)	第二街東祥大廈業主立案法團
陸耀忠先生 (Mr. John Loh)	土木工程師
吳先生 (Mr. W. K. Ng)	市民
余傑文先生 (Mr. K. M. Yu)	市民
鍾偉明先生 (Mr. Chung Wai Ming)	灣仔區居民
區大明先生 (Mr. Johnny Au)	城市花園立案法團
吳錦津先生 (Mr. Ng Kam Chun)	灣仔區議員
蔡首建先生 (Mr. Kenneth Tsoi)	維多利中心業主立案法團
麥黃小珍女士 (Ms. Sandra Mak)	香港區域直昇機場工作小組
吳惠明先生 (Mr. Patrick Ng)	工程界社促會
劉偉南先生 (Mr. William Lau)	佳景大廈立案法團主席

1 您認為建議發展大綱圖及相關分區計劃大綱圖的修訂建議能反映建立共識階段時所達成的共識或大多數公眾的觀點？

Do you think the proposals illustrated in the RODP and the proposed amendments to relevant OZPs reflect the consensus reached or majority public views on the Concept Plan expressed at the Realization Stage?

- 小組成員普遍同意該等圖則已反映上一階段的意見，但仍有事項需要留意(請參照下列第 2 條)。

2 在設計及落實建議初段，您認為有些什麼事項要特別留意呢？

What issues do you think are of critical importance and have to be addressed in the early stages of design and implementation?

- 敬記船廠的地盤不應填海以興建酒店，而應該改劃作休憩用地連貫海濱。
- 關注到未來的交通改善情況，認為應實行可持續運輸規劃及中環灣仔繞道專家小組的建議。
- 關注到中環灣仔繞道位於銅鑼灣避風塘東邊防波堤上的出風口，對周邊環境的影響。小組成員建議多加種植樹木，以改善空氣質量。
- 關注到中環灣仔繞道北角主幹道入口由汽車帶來的空氣及噪音污染問題，應設法改善。
- 關注到上一階段以「水」為主題的公園區應否蓋建。
- 關注到灣仔會議展覽中心廣場東北端直昇機坪將來可能造成噪音，影響灣仔北區鄰近的居民。

3 公眾怎樣才能繼續參與落實履行這些大綱圖呢？

How should the public be continually engaged in the implementation of the plans?

- 應該建立大型及詳細的模型，具體地顯示海濱的未來景況，方便公眾明白。而模型應長期放置在政府物業，如入境大樓及政府總部等。
- 政府應訂立準則處理及回應公眾對是項研究的意見，而且需要更透明的規劃過程。
- 應為規劃活動多作宣傳。
- 政府應更主動諮詢市民。

優化灣仔、銅鑼灣及鄰近地區海濱的研究
Harbour-Front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas
 詳細規劃階段 Detailed Planning Stage
 簡報會 Briefing (23.6.2007)
 小組討論 Group Discussion

組號 Group No: 4

領組 Facilitator: Jacinda Chow

助理 Helper: William Chan

Group members:

Name	Organization
Yau Joseph 邱若瑟	Scott Wilson
Norman Leung 梁顯蓬	HyD
Christina Lau 劉寶玉	CEDD
Chan Pui Man 陳珮文	
Andy Yau 邱伯衡	TD
Lam Chak Yen 林澤仁	Private
Tai Kwok Man 戴國文	Private Company (Cayley)
Huang Men Bun 黃文彬	HKIE
Lau Chi Yeung 劉子洋	
Wong Sai Kit 黃世傑	Harbour Heights (Management) Limited
Wong Keung Yiu 黃強耀	維多利中心
Li Chi Keung 李自強	維多利中心
Anny Tang	
Chan Karen	
Eric Ho 何偉強	HKPF
Shum Choi Sang 岑才生	銅鑼灣街坊會
Andrew Keung 姜鎮昌	HKIE
吳福東	
李漢蘇	
盧偉傑	
陳帶	
馮志慧	Planning Department
Andrew Cheung	Hong Kong Regional Heliport Working Group
Mabel Lam 林美寶	
Arron Kwok 郭偉強	Eastern District Council Vice President (Assistant)
Tam Man Ip 譚文業	民建聯 DAB
Eric Ma 馬紹祥先生	茂盛(亞洲)工程顧問有限公司

1 您認為建議發展大綱圖及相關分區計劃大綱圖的修訂建議能反映建立共識階段時所達成的共識或大多數公眾的觀點？

Do you think the proposals illustrated in the RODP and the proposed amendments to relevant OZPs reflect the consensus reached or majority public views on the Concept Plan expressed at the Realization Stage?

- 基本反映以往共識及大部份方向，但須注意一些事項。這些事項將於第二條問題的部份中詳述。

2 在設計及落實建議初段，您認為有些什麼事項要特別留意呢？

What issues do you think are of critical importance and have to be addressed in the early stages of design and implementation?

- 銅鑼灣避風塘雨水渠被非法接駁，為避風塘帶來污染，需加強有關執法管理。
- 擬建之中環灣仔繞道通風大樓 / 排氣口位置需盡量遠離民居，以減少對周邊環境的影響
- 建議將中環灣仔繞道東端之隔音屏障伸延至城市花園，以助解決當地污染問題。
- 根據 Hong Kong Regional Heliport Working Group 的問卷調查所得，於 800 多個受訪者中，近七成支持興建商用直昇機坪，可見社會對商用直昇機坪的需求甚殷。但擬建於會展附近之直昇機坪泊位只有二個，而且需被政府部門優先採用，因此實際可供商用之泊位不足。當局需考慮提供更多商用直昇機坪泊位。
- 在本階段建議中，銅鑼灣區海濱與內陸之行人連接仍然不足，尤其於敬記船廠(可能的天后廟新址)及午炮的位置。可配合維多利亞公園未來的重建計劃，改善該區的行人連接。
- 於銅鑼灣近敬記船廠位置的海濱長廊需繞過發電廠，不夠連貫。
- 建議將天后廟船停泊於敬記船廠海旁，方便遊人參觀，並發展為旅遊景點。

3 公眾怎樣才能繼續參與落實履行這些大綱圖呢？

How should the public be continually engaged in the implementation of the plans?

- 透過區議會加強對公眾參與活動的宣傳。
- 巡迴展覽，宣傳單張等。