



長春社 since 1968

The Conservancy Association

會址：香港九龍吳松街 191-197 號突破中心 9 樓

Add.: 9/F., Breakthrough Centre, Woosung Street, Kowloon, Hong Kong

電話 Tel.: (852)2728 6781 傳真 Fax.: (852) 2728 5538

Comments on Pedestrian Plan for Causeway Bay  
The Conservancy Association  
28 August 2004

Having carefully scrutinized the consultation documents on the captioned subject issued by the Planning Department, HKSARG, the Conservancy Association (CA) has the following the views:

Overall

1. CA strongly supports choosing Causeway Bay area as a Pedestrian Plan Area (PPA) and Pedestrian Priority Zone (PPZ), not only for the tourist or the shoppers but the residents and other users. We agree to the current proposed boundary of the PPZ but the boundary should be extended whenever possible.
2. The concept of PPA should be extended to other areas wherever appropriate.

Existing problems

3. CA recognizes that the current problems in the Causeway Bay PPZ are: (a) too heavy pedestrian flows especially in the day time of public holidays; (b) too heavy vehicular traffic flows and (c) too bad air quality. Consequently, there are many pedestrian related traffic accidents and pedestrian finds it both very difficulty and uncomfortable, especially in much polluted days, to walk from one point to another.
4. Vehicle certainly is the main threat to the pedestrian using the area because (a) they generate traffic accidents and (b) they generate polluted air and noise. For that, vehicle access to the PPZ should be restricted whenever possible.

Strategy approaches

5. The fundamental principle of the PPZ is to provide a save and good environment to the pedestrian using the PPZ and thus pedestrian should prior priority in designing the PPZ.
6. There are two board approaches to create rooms for the providing safe and good pedestrian environment: (a) to create more spaces through digging tunnels or erecting elevated walkways and (b) to resume the road spaces through restricting the vehicle access to the PPZ. These two approaches are not mutual exclusive but supplementary. However, as approach (a) involves spending huge public expenses, approach (b) should always be the preferred option.
7. The options generated from these strategy approaches should be assessed by a proper public engagement process; a cost-benefit analysis on all the generated options should be provided by the authority to enhance public engagement.
8. The cost-benefit analysis should take into account the impacts of pedestrian safety as well as air and noise quality of various options.

## Options

9. There are many options apart from building tunnels that can be considered; for example, (a) restricting vehicular access to create rooms for pedestrian walkway widening; and (b) constructing covered elevated walkways to link up buildings. For the purpose of providing a cleaner environment, the restriction to vehicular access can be linked to the cleanliness of the vehicle. Government should consider making the PPZ an air quality control zone and all vehicles accessing the zone has to comply at least EURO-III emission standard. Else, for easy administration, any vehicles manufactured before 1999 is not allowed to get into the zone.
10. When the restriction of vehicle access is in place and the air quality improved, dispersion of dirty air is not a consideration, more covered elevated walkways can be considered.
11. The problems of tunnel options must be taken into account including (a) the huge financial investment required; (b) the running and maintenance costs; (c) the extra energy consumed to light and ventilate and (d) the fire hazard.
12. The PTI at Caroline Hill Road is an extremely difficult location because the current connectivity to the site is no good; As such, it will require building connecting roads or widening existing roads around that site, resulting in more problems.
13. CA supports the full time pedestrianization scheme at Kai Chiu Road and all other street level pedestrian priority schemes.
14. CA recognizes that the most crucial component of this PPZ proposal involves constructing an underground pedestrian cum retail link across Hennessy Road. CA would like to see the cost benefit analysis of this link compared to other street level/ elevated options as stated in paras 7 to 11 above. However, CA supports to close the car-park of Hennessy Centre so as to restrict vehicle access to the PPZ.
15. CA believes that with the restriction of vehicular access to the PPZ, the traffic can be calmed and Hennessy Road can be narrowed to four lanes; as such, more convenient surface crossings can be in place.

\*\*\*