

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Purpose and Objectives of Community Engagement	1
2 STAGE 1 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	2
2.1 General.....	2
3 SUMMARY OF MAJOR COMMENTS AND RESPONSES	3
3.1 General.....	3
3.2 Major Comments	4
4 CONCLUSION.....	6
5 WAY FORWARD.....	7

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Planning Department completed the Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study in 2012 and proposed a boardwalk of 2 kilometres underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) from Oil Street in North Point to Hoi Yu Street in Quarry Bay. Civil Engineering and Development Department commissioned the “Boardwalk underneath Island Eastern Corridor – Investigation” (the Study) in March 2015 to review its feasibility and demonstrate its compliance with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO).

1.1.2 Study process includes reviewing the recommendations and findings in the previous studies, reviewing the feasibility of the proposed boardwalk and developing a recommended scheme, demonstrating compliance of the proposed boardwalk with the PHO, assessing the environmental implications of the proposed boardwalk.

1.2 Purpose and Objectives of Community Engagement

1.2.1 As the proposed boardwalk may involve “reclamation” under the PHO, the Study adopts a step by step approach to demonstrate satisfaction of the overriding public need test.

Stage 1 Community Engagement (CE) aims to present the background and proposal of the boardwalk and collect public views regarding the boardwalk through the study website, roving exhibitions, community workshops and questionnaire survey to help establish an overriding public need of the boardwalk.

2 STAGE 1 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

2.1 General

2.1.1 A summary of the CE activities carried out are listed below:

Table 1– List of CE Activities

Date/Time	Activities	Location
Stage 1 CE Programme (1 Feb 2016 – 31 Mar 2016)		
1 Feb 2016	Stage 1 CE Kick-off Start of roving exhibition and questionnaire survey	
1 Feb 2016 to 24 Mar 2016	Roving Exhibitions	Please refer to the Stage 1 CE Report
1 Feb 2016	Consultation with the Planning, Works and Housing Committee of EDC	EDC conference room
17 Feb 2016 18:00 – 20:00	1st Focus Group Meeting (academic and professional institutions)	Leighton Hill Community Hall
21 Feb 2016 13:00 – 14:00 (site visit) 14:30 – 17:00 (workshop)	1st Community Workshop cum Site Visit	Causeway Bay Community Hall
25 Feb 2016 18:00 – 20:00	2nd Focus Group Meeting (concern groups: green groups, cyclist groups and harbour concern groups)	Leighton Hill Community Hall
29 Feb 2016	Consultation with the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island of HC	Heritage Discovery Centre
2 Mar 2016 19:30 – 21:00	Briefing Session organized by Eastern District Councillor Ting Kong Ho	Quarry Bay Community Centre
5 Mar 2016 13:00 – 14:00 (site visit) 14:30 – 17:00 (workshop)	2nd Community Workshop cum Site Visit	City Gallery
30 Mar 2016 16:00 - 17:30	HC boat trip site visit for the proposed boardwalk under IEC	Central to North Point on Victoria Harbour
30 Mar 2016 19:00 – 21:00	Briefing Session organized by Legislative Councillor Kwok Wai Keung	North Point Kaifong Association Chan Shu Kui Hall
31 Mar 2016	Completion of Stage 1 CE	

2.1.2 Details of other CE channels for enquiry, comment and opinion, project website and Facebook page, publicity materials, roving exhibitions, site visit and media coverage during Stage 1 CE is recorded in the Stage 1 CE Report.

3 SUMMARY OF MAJOR COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

3.1 General

3.1.1 During the Stage 1 CE, 1 306 completed questionnaires were received through a questionnaire survey (see Table 2 for Summary of Results of Questionnaire Survey). The public generally agree that there is a compelling and present overriding public need for the boardwalk in order to open up the North Point harbourfront to the public and provide a continuous connection along the Island East harbourfront.

Table 2– Summary of Results of Questionnaire Survey (1 306 completed questionnaires received)

Question	Yes		No		Don't Know / Insufficient Information		No Response	
	Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%
Q1 – Providing public access along Island East harbourfront	1193	91.3%	76	5.8%	18	1.4%	19	1.5%
Q2A – Promote public access to the harbourfront from Causeway Bay to Quarry Bay through a safe and secure access which is otherwise currently dissected and hindered by private lots, roads, utilities, jetties, as well as the IEC which is both a physical and visual barrier to the harbour along the Island East harbourfront	1064	81.5%	89	6.8%	85	6.5%	68	5.2%
Q2B – Provide a better walking environment than the current pedestrian options in Eastern District	1179	90.3%	37	2.8%	27	2.1%	63	4.8%
Q2C – Attract people to walk more along the harbourfront and encourage residents to spend more time in physical activities such as jogging, and thereby help adopt a healthier lifestyle	1189	91.0%	29	2.2%	24	1.8%	64	4.9%
Q2D – Enable new leisure activities in Eastern District through better access to the harbourfront	1174	89.9%	40	3.1%	28	2.1%	64	4.9%
Q2E – Enhance positive social interaction between Hong Kong residents	1086	83.2%	60	4.6%	95	7.3%	65	5.0%
Q2F – The boardwalk will increase people flow, thus help sustain and promote the prosperity of the local economy (e.g. food and beverage facilities and water-land interface activities) in the Eastern District and Hong Kong at large	977	74.8%	121	9.3%	142	10.9%	66	5.1%
Q2G – The boardwalk will attract people using it as an event venue	1071	82.0%	83	6.4%	84	6.4%	68	5.2%
Q2H – The boardwalk as an iconic structure would enhance the image of Hong Kong as a premier tourist destination	992	76.0%	147	11.3%	100	7.7%	67	5.1%
Q2I – The boardwalk will provide an	1075	82.3%	90	6.9%	74	5.7%	67	5.1%

Question	Yes		No		Don't Know / Insufficient Information		No Response	
	Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%
alternative route for pedestrians currently using the footpath along King's Road / Electric Road / Java Road which would relieve pedestrians from poor air quality and noise pollution en route								
Q2J – The boardwalk as an iconic structure will improve the visual quality and landscape character of the harbourfront in the district	1012	77.5%	106	8.1%	118	9.0%	70	5.4%
Q3A – Providing pedestrian walkway	1054	80.7%	93	7.1%	98	7.5%	61	4.7%
Q3B – Providing cycleway	923	70.7%	236	18.1%	95	7.3%	52	4.0%
Q3C – Providing viewing platforms	999	76.5%	160	12.3%	92	7.0%	55	4.2%
Q3D – Providing fishing platform	861	65.9%	271	20.8%	123	9.4%	51	3.9%
Q3E – Providing cycle rental kiosk	903	69.1%	249	19.1%	103	7.9%	51	3.9%
Q3F – Providing bicycle parking	865	66.2%	271	20.8%	111	8.5%	59	4.5%
Q3G – Providing food & beverage kiosks	995	76.2%	179	13.7%	78	6.0%	54	4.1%

3.2 Major Comments

- 3.2.1 There was strong public support for a continuous and easily accessible harbourfront. There were views that more access points to the boardwalk should be provided to encourage patronage. There were also views demanding for a wider boardwalk in order to maximize the use of the boardwalk and ensure proper and conflict-free enjoyment of the harbour by all user groups including both pedestrians and cyclists.
- 3.2.2 In addition to the pedestrian walkway as the core component of the boardwalk facilities, the majority welcomed the provision of cycle track, cycle rental kiosks, bicycle parking, viewing platforms, seating, food & beverage kiosks and fishing platform as meeting the needs of the community. Some participants also suggested that more landscaping and greening features could be incorporated to improve the visual quality and landscaping character of the harbourfront in the district.
- 3.2.3 Similar specific comments received for the proposed boardwalk include:
- The proposed boardwalk was suggested to be wider to form a pleasant walking environment for public enjoyment of the Harbour;
 - Proposed cycle track and fishing platform were suggested to be properly separated from walkway to ensure public safety;
 - More access points were suggested to be provided to the boardwalk;

- Landscaping, greening provisions to the boardwalk and decorative elements underneath the IEC were suggested to be incorporated to enhance the environment of proposed boardwalk;
- Control of construction cost and use of lump sum contract to avoid over-spending;
- Use of durable materials to minimize need for maintenance;
- Concerns about safety, security and management;
- Excessive restrictions on users' activities should be avoided;
- Provisions of toilets, first aid boxes, emergency phone boxes, guiding facilities for the blind, accessible facilities, seatings, workout equipment for the elderly, drinking fountains and night reflective facilities.

4 CONCLUSION

- 4.1.1 During the Stage 1 CE, the Study has engaged a wide spectrum of stakeholders, including the HC, the Planning, Works and Housing Committee of the EDC, academics and professional institutes, green groups, cyclist groups and harbour concern groups, as well as local residents. Questionnaire surveys were conducted and 1306 completed questionnaires were received.
- 4.1.2 It is recognised that the harbourfront from North Point to Quarry Bay is currently occupied by private lots, roads, utilities, jetties as well as the IEC, which have created both a physical and visual barrier to the harbour along the Island East harbourfront. There is strong public support for a continuous harbourfront in the area concerned in order to enable public enjoyment of the harbour. The public generally agree that there is a compelling and present overriding public need for the boardwalk in order to open up the North Point harbourfront to the public and provide a continuous connection along the Island East harbourfront.
- 4.1.3 It is generally accepted that there is a public need to provide easy access to the waterfront from the hinterland in this area. There are also views that more access points to the boardwalk should be provided to encourage patronage. The boardwalk would serve to increase public right of access to the harbourfront and also provide a better walking environment to and along the harbourfront.
- 4.1.4 There are views that a boardwalk of 7.5m as proposed would not be sufficient to meet the public need for a safe and interesting harbourfront connection. The public demanded for a wider boardwalk in order for their needs to be satisfied and to ensure proper and conflict-free enjoyment of the harbour by all user groups including both pedestrians and cyclists.
- 4.1.5 It is generally agreed that the boardwalk would encourage residents of the local community to adopt a healthy lifestyle by walking on the boardwalk or to making use of the ancillary facilities provided. In addition, most agree that the boardwalk would introduce new possible leisure activities to the Eastern District and also bring about creative uses of the space, including event organization, art display and even light installations. It could enhance positive social interactions among patrons.
- 4.1.6 Majority agrees that the boardwalk would increase pedestrian flow and hence bring in local business opportunities. Some propose to put on street performances and holiday markets on the boardwalk for vibrancy of our harbourfront areas.
- 4.1.7 Some participants also suggest that more landscaping and greening features could be incorporated to improve the visual quality and landscaping character of the harbourfront in this area.
- 4.1.8 In addition to being a pedestrian walkway as the core component of the boardwalk, the facilities proposed to be provided under the boardwalk scheme, namely the cycle track, cycle rental kiosks, bicycle parking, viewing platforms, seating, food & beverage kiosks and fishing platform, are primarily welcomed as meeting the needs of the community.

5 WAY FORWARD

- 5.1.1 Public views collected from CE1 have assisted to establish an overriding public need of the proposed boardwalk as required under the PHO. The comments and opinions received in the Stage 1 CE will be properly documented and it will form part of the cogent and convincing materials for demonstrating compliance with the PHO.

- 5.1.2 The comments on the design and facilities will be carefully studied and reviewed for the formulation of the recommended scheme for public discussion and comments under the Stage 2 CE of the Study.