

Appendix I1
Minutes for Focus Group Meetings with Professionals
and Academics

東區走廊下之行人板道研究
第一階段社區參與
焦點小組會議 - 專業及學術機構

日期: 17.2.2016

時間: 下午 6 時 30 分

地點: 禮頓山社區會堂

出席人士:

Ir Philip Chiu	Association of Engineering Professionals in Society Ltd.
Mr. Kan Kwan	HASSELL
Mr. Freddie Hai	Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr. Jacky Cheung	Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ms. Heidi Chang	Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr. Kenneth To	Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr. Alvin Kan	Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr. Ben MacLeod	Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr. Paul Zimmerman	Society for Protection of the Harbour

土木工程拓展署

麥志標先生	Mr. MAK Chi-biu	總工程師
林振德先生	Mr. LAM Chun Tak	高級工程師

顧問

程亮先生	Mr. Peter Cheek	艾奕康有限公司
陸榮傑先生	Mr. Charles Luk	艾奕康有限公司
黃健民先生	Mr. Simon Wong	艾奕康有限公司
何小芳女士	Ms. Betty Ho	建港規劃顧問有限公司 (會議主持)
王雲豪先生	Mr. Andy Wong	建港規劃顧問有限公司 (會議記錄)

意見摘要：

Mr. Paul Zimmerman

- He requested for better drawings to illustrate the locations and the increased amount of shadowed area due to the provision of boardwalk.
- He opined that if the provision of boardwalk was on the southern side of the IEC, the additional impact was none because the water area behind the IEC was already inaccessible.
- He requested more information justifying the reclamation for the provision of dolphins from technical perspective.
- He opined that right of access to the waterfront was the public right recognized around the world. Providing right of access to the waterfront was the most important overriding public need. It will add value to the harbour.
- He was concerned about the level of the boardwalk which would limit the public access to the waterfront.
- He opined that the boardwalk would be widened to the southward side as long as the changes would not further affect the harbour. The proposed minimal design of 5m width boardwalk unnecessarily restricted the uses of waterfront and right of access. The provision of cycle track to the southern side of the boardwalk would not affect additional water area.
- He suggested that design improvements of the boardwalk should be made to maximize the use. More access points between land and boardwalk should be provided to allow more people to use it. The boardwalk would be wider so that it could be shared with different users. The gradient of the boardwalk should be minimized to make it convenient to use for children and people with disabilities.

Mr. Freddie Hai

- 他認為構想圖顯示東廊下的行人板道冰冷，應提供更多綠化及種植。
- 他認為不要再糾纏「覆蓋海面」是否屬於填海的定義，如有人挑戰有關定義，應請法庭盡快澄清。由於每個人的需要不同，很難去證明是否有「凌駕性公眾需要」，故此不應因可能出現的法律問題而阻礙發展。

Mr. Kenneth To

- 他詢問研究會否在橋底進行空氣質素評估，關注會否對單車活動的影響。
- 他同意 Mr. Paul Zimmerman 意見，如認同有需要提供板道，便不應計較是否符合最小填海面積而限制行人板道面積及可進行的活動，應盡力令發展符合我們的需要。

- 他絕對贊成提供單車徑，認為是次研究為唯一的機會在港島北提供有關設施。
- 他關注到單車徑的斜度問題帶來的安全問題，希望能妥善處理。
- 他關注到現時研究範圍西面東廊下的水域有船隻收集垃圾，詢問會如何處理。
- 他認為釣魚人士不會在指定地點釣魚，所以提供一個釣魚平台並不足夠，建議在向內海或其他位置提供更多釣魚平台。
- 他認為行人板道可帶來的經濟效益頗為牽強。但在環境方面可進一步鼓勵步行及單車活動，從而減少使用炭排放的交通工具，長遠對環境方面有正面影響。

Mr. Alvin Kan

- 從城市規劃角度，他絕對贊成提供單車徑建議，應趁此機會盡量提供有關設施。
- 他認為不應限制行人板道的闊度，可在不同位置加闊以提供座位、小食亭，及園景美化。
- 他認為西面的板道高度為主水平基準以上 5.5 米，已覆蓋水面，建議採用無欄杆設計，讓行人進一步貼近水面。
- 他建議深化園景設計，在東廊橋頂及柱身加入垂直攀藤植物。

黃健民先生回應

- 同意提供更多綠化及種植，亦會考慮在東廊橋柱進行綠化工程。
- 同意現時對「覆蓋海面」是否屬於填海未有清晰定義，如有人挑戰有關定義，會由法庭裁決。
- He clarified the amount of boardwalk area sheltered by the IEC and affected area.

Mr. Paul Zimmerman

- He reiterated that the use of affected area was already restricted by the IEC. The provision of boardwalk only changed the type of boats / vessels accessing the affected area. It would not further reduce the effective use of the affected area. He considered that the provision of boardwalk would allow more public use of the water. It would increase the public right of access to the waterfront.

Mr. Peter Cheek 回應

- He clarified that the digest aimed to present the amount of decked area for the boardwalk above the sea. He agreed that the decked area do not increase the amount of affected area, but it would further restrict smaller boats / vessels

accessing the affected area.

黃健民先生回應

- He agreed to explore more access points to the boardwalk.
- 他表示稍後會進行空氣質素影響研究。
- 他補充行人板道的西面會考慮提供開合橋的設計，在有需要、緊急或維修時讓船隻通過，如收集垃圾。
- 他表示會考慮公眾意見建議合適的釣魚平台位置。
- 他同意會在經濟方面深化研究。在環境方面，他同意短期未必會顯著減低碳排放量，但長遠有助改善空氣質素。
- 他表示會考慮在不增加受影響水域的情況下，在現時東廊的橋墩加闊板道。
- 他表示會研究提供攀藤植物。

Ms. Heidi Chang

- She opined that, apart from vertical vegetation, trees must be provided along the boardwalk.
- She considered that the elevated section of the boardwalk to the east was close to the IEC. She was concerned about the impact of noise and air quality on the cyclists and walkers. She would like to compare the difference of these impacts at elevated section (12.5mPD) and low level section (5.5mPD) of the boardwalk.

Mr. Kan Kwan

- 他認為現時行人板道的建議比較保守，只是改善北角地區的連接。他建議行人板道應更有創意，可參考外國例子，美化環境，鼓勵進行不同活動，如利用東廊內海進行跳水活動，成為新景點，吸引遊客，帶動經濟。

Mr. Alvin Kan

- 他認為問卷會令公眾有錯覺，以為提供單車徑會額外增加覆蓋海面面積而帶來壞處。他認為加闊行人板道正是釋放一些原本不能使用的海港空間，對市民會帶來好處。
- 他建議行人板道的西面可進行放模型船活動。他亦建議可提供浮橋加強行人板道的南北連接。

Mr. Jacky Cheung

- 他認為如果靠向內陸走線的效果並不理想的話，加闊的板道走線應要貼近東區走廊的邊緣。
- 他同意要提供更多與行人板道的連接位置。他亦建議提供不同活動，如街頭表演、假日市場，令海濱更熱鬧。

Mr. Ben MacLeod

- He was concerned about the limited access to the boardwalk. He suggested to explore more connection points, such as near ICAC Headquarters Building.
- He was also concerned about the elevated section at the eastern side of the boardwalk. He suggested to negotiate with respective pier operators on the access right to the piers so that it could be levelled down.
- He also agreed that more activities should be provided along the boardwalk, e.g. food and beverage.

Ir Philip Chiu

- 他指出香港人期待行人板道已久。提供行人板道可鼓勵跑步及健身等運動。
- 他認為行人板道仍在初步設計階段，可考慮加入燈光設計，及提供座位。

Mr. Freddie Hai

- 他詢問升高行人板道原因是否讓車輛進入有關碼頭位置。如屬擁有權問題，可與有關機構及部門協商。如屬操作上問題，建議加閘分隔人車，讓行人板道可以在較低水平高度興建。

麥志標先生回應

- 他解釋升高行人板道最主要原因是讓消防船隻進出。早前已與消防處商討行人板道及消防碼頭共用的可行性，但消防處表示在緊急時難以控制人流出入，會影響消防處的服務承諾。他表示會繼續與消防處商討。
- 現時柯達大廈及嘉華國際中心的地契註明業主有碼頭使用權利，是否可以收回有關權利需要進一步商討。
- 他指出升高行人板道設計可擴闊景觀，遠眺對岸，效果未必不理想。

黃健民先生回應

- 他表示會聽取有關美化行人板道的意見，在下一階段再諮詢有關設計方案。
- 他表示會進一步研究增加行人板道南北方向的連接位置。由於涉及私人地段，會與有關屋苑商討。
- 至於增加覆蓋面積以提供多元化活動，則需要理據支持其有凌駕性需要。亦要考慮現時結構的負荷承載力。

Rundown for Focus Group Meetings

6:15 – 6:30pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Registration
6:30 – 6:40pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcoming Remarks and Study Background
6:40 – 6:45pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduction of Programme Rundown
6:45 – 7:00pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Report on Progress of the Study and Preliminary Proposal
7:00 – 8:20pm	Discussion on: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Boardwalk Proposal;• Implication of PHO;• Impact of additional facilities on the extent of reclamation;• Any other methods to demonstrate –<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) overriding public needs;2) minimum extent of reclamation;3) any alternatives to reclamation.
8:20 – 8:30pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concluding Remarks & Vote of Thanks



Focus Group Meeting No. 1

Rundown for Focus Group Meetings