

中西區區議會的信頭

檔 號：C&WDO 102/10
電 話：2852 3477
傳真號碼：2542 2696
電子郵址：cwdcl@had.gcn.gov.hk

香港中環統一碼頭道 38 號
海港政府大樓 11 樓

傳真信件（傳真號碼：2121 0420）

香港中環昃臣道 8 號
立法會大樓
交通事務委員會秘書
（請交歐詠琴女士辦理）

歐女士：

立法會交通事務委員會
邀請各界就七號幹線提出意見

主席日前收到貴會交通事務委員會來函，邀請中西區區議會就政府當局有關七號幹線堅尼地城至香港仔段的最新建議提出意見，並邀請區議會派出代表出席交通事務委員會在二〇〇一年九月二十一日舉行的特別會議，現謹作出回覆。

中西區區議會一直關注七號幹線發展，區議會屬下交運會亦剛於七月十九日的會議討論了「七號幹線」一項議題，現隨信附上有關會議紀錄，以供貴會交通事務委員考慮。另外，個別議員亦有就有關事項提出補充意見，現亦附上有關補充意見，以供參閱。有關區議會代表出席貴會交通事務委員會會議的名單，請參閱夾附名單。

中西區區議會秘書

（黃栢豪代行）

夾會議紀錄、補充意見及出席名單

二〇〇一年八月十五日

第 5 項：七號幹線（連附件）

（中西區交運會文件第 32/2001 號）

（下午 2 時 49 分至 3 時 50 分）

路政署麥惠培先生向委員簡介文件內容。麥先生表示，根據最近推行的主要道路工程項目檢討機制，政府完成了七號幹線工程項目的檢討，結果發現政府只須於 2010 年或之前興建一條介乎堅尼地城及薄扶林道的雙程雙線連接路，以舒緩上述兩地之間多個重要交界處的交通，避免交通流量達致飽和而造成薄扶林道擠塞。

2. 政府部門代表回應委員如下：

- (a) 路政署麥惠培先生在回應黃哲民先生、陳捷貴先生及甘乃威先生時表示，政府推行主要道路工程項目檢討機制的目的，是希望以有限的資源，在適當的時候完成有真正需要的項目，以滿足交通需求。對於七號幹線而言，政府發現現階段並無明顯需要興建由薄扶林道至香港仔之間的連接路段。運輸署蘇欽達先生在補充時表示，上述機制利用了土地用途等有關資料，就個別主要道路項目進行全港性的策略檢討。對於七號幹線而言，檢討結果顯示，即使政府以雙程雙線行車的模式興建擬建的連接路，有關路段在 2011 年的行車量／容量比率只是 0.5；至 2016 年的比率亦只是 0.6，因此政府毋須以雙程三線的模式興建道路。
- (b) 蘇欽達先生在回應陳捷貴先生時表示，主要道路工程項目檢討為一策略性的檢討，因此它主要是從全港的交通運輸角度出發。政府稍後會就所有有關交界處，包括薄扶林道／域多利道交界處，進行更詳細的交通評估，以進行適當的檢討及改善措施。
- (c) 路政署沙雅倫先生在回應甘乃威先生時表示，明白委員對七號幹線計劃一改再改的不滿情緒。沙先生指出，政府確實曾於 1998

年答允完成七號幹線研究報告後向委員介紹研究結果，而有關研究亦已於 2000 年 8 月完成，但由於政府期後亦完成了西區發展策略研究，爲了避免混淆公眾人士，政府最後並無向委員介紹有關七號幹線的研究報告。由於在 1998 年至 2000 年這兩年間，南區的人口及交通流量預測發生了變化，導致最近的研究結果顯示一條雙程雙線的連接路已足以應付交通需要。此外，很多學者及綠色團體都向政府提供了意見，表示不希望政府在地面興建沿岸路線，以免影響環保及優美的風景。政府經考慮後，爲了避免破壞風景，決定考慮以隧道形式興建沙灣至鋼線灣的一段連接路。因此，政府需要額外撥款，以進行新的顧問研究。沙先生重申，七號幹線的規模縮減並非因爲西區填海的問題。由於填海的範圍大減，很多人士都希望以隧道形式興建七號幹線，而這些意見亦會影響工程所涵蓋的範圍。

(d) 麥惠培先生在回應陳財喜先生、陳特楚先生及田北俊議員時表示，當局向立法會及委員會提交有關七號幹線最新進展的文件內容相同，並不存在立法會所掌握的資料較委員會詳盡的問題。其實，當局已將最重要的路段／交界處的數據列出。雖然如此，麥先生表示可透過適當渠道向委員提供其他有關數據。麥先生在回應主席及甘乃威先生時表示，會考慮將於 2000 年 8 月完成的研究報告提交委員參考，並以書面作覆，但他重申，很多在該份報告研究所得的資料都對政府下一步的工程檢討有很大的幫助。運輸署蘇欽達先生在補充時表示，文件已經列出建議興建路段的有關數據。爲了避免誤導委員，當局並無將所有有關數據於文件列出。雖然如此，若委員提出要求，當局樂意於會後提供委員欲知悉的數據。蘇先生重申，當局在文件中向委員提供的數據與向立法會所提交的完全一樣。

(e) 麥惠培先生在回應黎國雄先生時表示，七號幹線的興建與否並非取決於數碼港的發展。

律政署

- (f) 麥惠培先生在回應主席及陳特楚先生時表示，當局提交文件的主要目的是希望委員備悉有關資料，並向政府提供寶貴意見。
- (g) 蘇欽達先生在回應主席、陳財喜先生、黎國雄先生及陳特楚先生時表示，主要道路工程項目檢討機制所研究的主要為策略性的交通預測，所覆蓋範圍包括整個香港，至於由 1998 年至現時對未來交通需求所作出的預測有所差異，主要是因應香港發展規劃改變，例如：土地用途改變，人口及汽車增長預測下降，貨櫃碼頭延遲興建等等。有關檢討將會每年進行一次。而將來接往香港仔路段之需要亦會在檢討之列，並會考慮預留將堅尼地城至鋼線灣的路段伸延至香港仔所需的接駁。政府建議先興建由堅尼地城至鋼線灣的路段，是因為政府留意到，薄扶林道的關鍵路段會於 2011 年之前飽和，而由薄扶林道至香港仔的道路則仍可應付交通需要，但這並不代表政府將來不會興建由薄扶林道至香港仔的路段。
- (h) 蘇欽達先生在回應主席及楊少銓先生時表示可於會後提供現時香港仔隧道的交通流量數字，以及政府最近就七號幹線進行的檢討與上次研究報告中，使政府改變交通流量預測的主要變更。

3. 委員發表意見如下：

- (a) 黃哲民先生批評政府在七號幹線的計劃上朝令夕改，做法令人訝異。黃先生表示，雖然他支持政府以隧道形式興建道路，以達致保護海岸線的目的，但政府應對如何改善薄扶林道至香港仔的交通備有長遠計劃。
- (b) 陳捷貴先生認為政府以隧道或低於地面的道路方式興建道路的做法能符合環保要求，是值得肯定，但他認為當局在興建道路的時候，必須留意日後連接路與薄扶林道的接駁安排，以確保交界

處的行車安全。

- (c) 甘乃威先生表示，政府曾於 1998 年向區議會介紹七號幹線，當時路政署表示以雙程三線的模式興建七號幹線最為合適，但在短短三年間，政府便改變了看法。甘先生認為，在政府準備放寬薄扶林道的地積比率之際，除非政府能提供合理的解釋，否則立法會便不應批撥 2,500 萬元進行建議中的新工程檢討及初步設計顧問研究；但若有關檢討及研究不影響介乎薄扶林道至香港仔路段的興建，則甘先生不反對有關撥款，並希望政府在進行顧問研究的同時加入以隧道方式興建整個項目，以及興建西區至南區鐵路的可行性研究。此外，甘先生要求政府向委員會提交於 2000 年 8 月完成的研究報告結果。
- (d) 陳財喜先生認為，當局有必要向委員提供更充足的數據，使委員可以決定是否支持政府修改七號幹線的規模及起訖點的建議，但他同時支持政府以隧道形式興建有關道路，認為這有助環保。此外，陳先生表示，基礎建設有助刺激現時低迷的經濟，並對政府暫緩興建連接薄扶林及香港仔的連接路的做法存疑。他認為政府應預早考慮在南區有實際交通需要時才修築道路所需要的時間，以免影響日後南區及中西區的交通。
- (e) 黎國雄先生表示，南區現今發展步伐緩慢，正是因為香港仔隧道及薄扶林道經常擠塞，阻礙了南區的發展。黎先生認為，若政府欲於未來二、三十年發展南區，包括香港仔及鴨脷洲等地區，便應先積極興建道路。若政府純以商業角度出發，為數碼港提供道路網絡，而置南區的交通需求於不顧，這實屬可惜，市民亦難以接受。
- (f) 陳特楚先生認為，在欠缺詳盡數據的情況下，委員難以就文件作出討論。此外，陳先生同意黎國雄先生的意見，並以士美非路伸

延段的興建為例，表示由於政府欠缺長遠規劃，導致市民飽受一年多加建道路工程帶來的滋擾。他擔憂這樣的情況會因政府對南區交通欠缺長遠規劃而重演。

- (g) 田北俊議員同意很多委員的意見，認為文件的內容太簡單，難以就其內容發表意見。
- (h) 楊少銓先生希望政府能提供較充足的數據，並具體解釋政府改變計劃的客觀原因，否則便很難決定是否支持委員提出的動議。
- (i) 胡楚南先生認為，政府應向委員提交於 2000 年 8 月完成有關七號幹線的研究報告。此外，胡先生認為政府因應現時的經濟衰退情況而調整興建七號幹線的政策並不恰當，因為政府難以預計由現在至 2010 年十年間本港的經濟起伏。
- (j) 戴卓賢先生認為政府在興建薄扶林至香港仔連接路的問題上應採取未雨綢繆的態度，避免在交通情況惡化時才興建有關道路。

4. 經討論後，委員會通過以下由葉國謙議員、楊位款先生、黃哲民先生、李偉強先生、李萬權先生及袁照興先生提出的動議：

秘書

「中西區區議會交通及運輸委員會強烈要求政府恢復興建西區至香港仔整段七號幹線。」；

（楊少銓先生及石翠怡小姐棄權）

以及以下由甘乃威先生、何俊麒先生、梁耀祖先生、鄭麗瓊女士、阮品強先生、黎國雄先生及郭家麒先生提出的以下動議：

秘書

「(i) 政府應盡量以隧道方式興建七號幹線西區至南區段，以免破壞環境。」

(ii) 政府在研究七號幹線西區至南區段時，應同時研究興建西區至南區鐵路的可行性。

(iii) 反對政府在現階段只擬興建堅尼地城至薄扶林道的一段七號幹線，建議政府應盡快興建堅尼地城至香港仔的七號幹線，徹底改善西區往來南區的交通。」

(就上述第(iii)項動議，陳捷貴先生、田北俊議員及楊少銓先生棄權。)

此外，主席同意甘乃威先生及陳特楚先生的建議，將上述動議及討論內容提交立法會交通事務委員會參考。

Item 5: Route 7 (with enclosure)
(C&W TTC Paper No. 32/2001)
(2:49 - 3:50 p.m.)

Mr. W P MAK from the Highways Department (HyD) briefed Members on the Paper. Mr. MAK said that the Government had completed the review on the projects for Route 7 under the recently introduced Strategic Highway Project Review System. The review results indicated that there was only a need for a dual two-lane road link between Kennedy Town and Pok Fu Lam Road by 2010 to relieve the traffic pressure at a number of critical junctions between the two places, preventing saturation of the traffic flow which would cause congestion to Pok Fu Lam Road.

2. The representatives from the Government departments responded to Members' questions and opinion as follows:

- (a) In response to the remarks of Mr. C M WONG, Mr. C K CHAN and Mr. N W KAM, Mr. W P MAK of HyD said that the purpose of introducing the Strategic Highway Project Review System was to complete the projects that were in genuine need at the appropriate time with limited resources, so as to meet the traffic needs. Regarding Route 7, the Government found that there would not be a clear need for constructing the section from Pok Fu Lam Road to Aberdeen at the present stage. Mr. Y T SO of the Transport Department (TD) added that under the Strategic Highway Project Review System, a territorial strategy review with respect to individual major highway projects was conducted by using relevant information such as the information on land uses. As regards Route 7, the review results showed that even if the proposed road link was built in a dual two-lane configuration, the volume/capacity ratios of the road section in question in 2011 and 2016 were only 0.5 and 0.6 respectively. Therefore, the road link would not be built in a dual three-lane configuration.
- (b) In response to Mr. C K CHAN's remarks, Mr. Y T SO stated that as the Strategic Highway Project Review was a strategic review, it was conducted mainly from a territorial traffic and transport perspective. Later more detailed

traffic assessments for all the relevant junctions, including the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road, would be made so that appropriate reviews and improvement measures could be carried out.

- (c) In response to Mr. N W KAM's remarks, Mr. Arun SHAH of HyD said that Members' dissatisfaction with the repeated amendments to the project of Route 7 was understood. Mr. SHAH pointed out that in 1998, the Government had indeed promised to introduce the study results of Route 7 to Members upon completion of the study report. The study was completed in August 2000. However, the study on the Western District Development Strategy was also completed afterwards. In order to avoid confusing the public, the Government did not introduce the study report of Route 7 to Members at last. Since there were changes in the population and traffic forecasts for the Southern District between 1998 and 2000, the results of the recent study indicated that a dual two-lane road link would be able to meet the traffic needs. In addition, many scholars and green organizations had put forward their opinion to the Government, stating that they did not want the section along the coastline to be built on the ground level so as to protect the environment as well as avoid damages to the beautiful landscape. After consideration, the Government decided to consider building the section from Sandy Bay to Telegraph Bay in tunnel form to avoid destroying the landscape. Hence, additional fund was required for commissioning a new consultancy study. Mr. SHAH reiterated that the reduction in the scale of Route 7 was not due to the Western reclamation. Since the area of reclamation was greatly reduced, many people hoped that Route 7 could be built in tunnel form. Such opinion might also affect the Government in deciding on the works coverage.
- (d) In response to the remarks of Mr. C H CHAN, Mr. T C CHAN and The Hon. James TIEN, Mr. W P MAK mentioned that the papers on the latest position of Route 7 submitted to LegCo and the Committee contained the same information. It was not true that the former had obtained more detailed information than the latter. In fact, the data relating to the major road sections/junctions were listed in the paper. Nevertheless, Mr. MAK indicated that he could provide the

HyD

Committee with data on other aspects via appropriate channels. In response to the remarks of the Chairman and Mr. N W KAM, Mr. MAK said that he would consider submitting the study report completed in August 2000 to the Committee for information and provide a written reply on that. He reiterated that much information contained in the study report was very helpful to the Government in carrying out works review further. Mr. Y T SO of TD added that the relevant data relating to the proposed road sections had already been listed in the paper. In order to avoid confusing the Committee, the department and bureau concerned did not list all the data in the paper, but they were glad to provide the data at Members' request. Mr. SO reiterated that data contained in the paper which was submitted to the Committee were exactly the same as those in the paper submitted to LegCo.

- (e) In response to Mr. K H LAI's remarks, Mr. W P MAK stated that the construction of Route 7 would not depend on the development of the Cyber Port.
- (f) In response to the remarks of the Chairman and Mr. T C CHAN, Mr. W Y MAK said that the major purpose in submitting the paper was to inform the Members on the information, and to invite them to provide their valuable opinion.
- (g) In response to the remarks of the Chairman, Mr. C H CHAN, Mr. K H LAI and Mr. T C CHAN, Mr. Y T SO said that the Strategic Highway Project Review System mainly focus on the strategic traffic forecasts for the whole Territory. From 1998 onwards, the results of the forecasts for future traffic demand varied from one to another mainly because of the changes in the planning for development in Hong Kong, such as changes in land uses, reduction in forecasted growth rate of population and vehicles, postponement of the construction of container terminal. The review would be conducted annually. In the future review, the Government would include the study on the need for the road section to be connected to Aberdeen, and consider the reservation of space for the building of road link at which the road section from Kennedy Town to Telegraph Bay would be extended to Aberdeen. The Government proposed the construction of the road section between Kennedy Town and Telegraph Bay first because it

was noticed that the traffic capacity of the critical road section of Pok Fu Lam Road would be saturated before 2011, while the road section between Pok Fu Lam Road and Aberdeen would still accommodate the traffic volume there. However, it did not mean that the Government would not construct the road section between Pok Fu Lam Road and Aberdeen in future.

TD

- (h) In response to the remarks of the Chairman and Mr. Albert YOUNG, Mr. Y T SO indicated that after the meeting, he could provide the latest data of the traffic flow along Aberdeen Tunnel and the information on the major changes leading to the modifications of traffic flow forecasts in the latest review and the previous study report on Route 7 conducted by the Government.

3. Members put forward their views as follows:

- (a) Mr. C M WONG criticized that, to his astonishment, the Government's policy on the planning for Route 7 was so inconsistent. Mr. WONG supported the Government to construct the road section in tunnel form to conserve the coastline, but he believed that the Government should map up a long-term plan for improving the traffic condition of the road section between Pok Fu Lam Road and Aberdeen.
- (b) Mr. C K CHAN considered that the construction of the road section in tunnel form or to below ground level could satisfy the requirements for environmental protection and was worth supporting. But he believed that when the road was under construction, the Government should pay attention to the future connection arrangement of the road link to Pok Fu Lam Road, so as to ensure the vehicular safety at the junction.
- (c) Mr. N W KAM pointed out that according to HyD representatives who had briefed the former Provisional District Board on Route 7 in 1998, it was the best for Route 7 to be constructed in a dual three-lane configuration. However, the Government changed its view shortly after three years. Mr. KAM said that since the Government prepared to relax the restrictions on the plot ratio on Pok Fu Lam

Road, LegCo should not allocate \$25M for the proposed new Engineering Review and the Preliminary Design consultancy study unless the Government could provide a reasonable explanation. However, Mr. KAM said that he did not object to the fund allocation provided that the aforesaid review and study would not affect the construction of the road section between Pok Fu Lam Road and Aberdeen. He also hoped that the consultancy study should include the items: the building of the entire project in tunnel form and the feasibility of the construction of rail between the Western District and Southern District. Moreover, Mr. KAM requested the Government to submit the findings of the study report completed in August 2000 to the Committee.

- (d) Mr. C H CHAN considered that Members should be provided with sufficient data so that they could decide whether or not to support the Government's proposed amendments on the scale and the starting location of Route 7. He supported the Government's proposal for building the road in tunnel form because it was of much help to environmental protection. Moreover, Mr. CHAN said that the construction of infrastructure would help to stimulate the existing poor economy, and he was in doubt about the Government's proposed postponement of the construction of road link between Pok Fu Lam Road and Aberdeen. He stated that before making an decision on building the road when there was a genuine traffic need in the Southern District, the Government should take consideration of the lead time for road construction, so that the traffic in the Southern District as well as the Central & Western District would not be affected.
- (e) Mr. K H LAI said that the development of the Southern District was slow because the constant traffic congestion along Aberdeen Tunnel and Pok Fu Lam hampered the development of the district. Mr. LAI considered that if the Government wanted to develop the Southern District, including Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau, in the next 20 to 30 years, it should adopt a proactive attitude in road construction. If the Government acted simply from a commercial viewpoint by only providing a road network for the Cyber Port and ignoring the traffic demand of the Southern District, it was inappropriate and unacceptable.

- (f) Mr. T C CHAN considered that the Members, who were in lack of detailed information, could hardly discuss the paper. Mr. CHAN agreed with Mr. K H LAI. Moreover, by taking the construction of Smithfield Extension as an example, he said that since the Government did not have a long-term planning, the members of the public suffered from the nuisance caused by addition road works for more than a year. He worried that a similar problem would occur again because the Government did not have a long-term planning for the traffic in the Southern District.
- (g) The Hon. James TIEN agreed with the view put forward by many Members that it was difficult for them to comment on the paper because the information therein was too brief.
- (h) Mr. Albert YOUNG hoped the Government could provide sufficient data and concrete explanation on its objective reasons for changing the programme, otherwise it was difficult for him to decide whether or not to support the motions put forward by the Members.
- (i) Mr. C N WU said that the Government should submit the study report on Route 7 completed in August 2000. Moreover, Mr. WU considered that it was inappropriate for the Government to adjust its policy on the construction of Route 7 according to the existing condition of economic concession because it was unable for the Government to predict the ups and downs of the economy of Hong Kong in the next 10 years until 2010.
- (j) Mr. Leslie Spencer TAI considered that the Government should adopt a preventive approach in dealing with the issue relating to the construction of the road link between Pok Fu Lam Road and Aberdeen, avoiding the construction of the road only when the traffic condition there was worsened.
4. After deliberation, the Committee passed the following motion moved by the Hon. K H IP, Mr. W F YEUNG, Mr. C M WONG, Mr. W K LEE, Mr. M K LI and

Mr. C H YUEN:

Secretary

"The C&W DC TTC strongly requests the Government to resume the construction of the entire Route 7 from the Western District to Aberdeen.";

(Mr. Albert YOUNG and Miss C Y SHEK abstained from voting)

and the following motions moved by Mr. N W KAM, Mr. Frederick HO, Mr. Henry LEUNG, Ms. L K CHENG, Mr. B K YUEN, Mr. K H LAI and Mr. K K KWOK:

Secretary

"(i) The Government should construct the section of Route 7 from the Western to Southern Districts in tunnel form as far as possible, so as to avoid destroying the environment.

(ii) In studying the section of Route 7 from the Western to Southern Districts, the Government should also examine the feasibility of constructing a rail linking the Western and Southern Districts.

(iii) It is objected that the Government only intends to build the section of Route 7 from Kennedy Town to Pok Fu Lam Road at the present stage. It is suggested that the Government should construct the Kennedy Town to Aberdeen section of Route 7 as soon as possible, so as to thoroughly improve the traffic between the Western and Southern Districts."

(Mr. C K CHAN, the Hon. James TIEN and Mr. Albert YOUNG abstained from voting on motion (iii))

In addition, the Chairman agreed to the proposal of Mr. N W KAM and Mr. T C CHAN that the above motions and content of discussion should be submitted to the Transport Panel of the Legislative Council for reference.

中西區區議會議員對七號幹線的最新建議提供的補充意見：

陳捷貴先生提出的意見：

本人贊同將計劃改為隧道或低於路面之行車路；本人亦不反對暫時通往薄扶林道，但一定要改善薄扶林道／域多利道之路口設計，避免經常發生之車禍。

Additional comment offered by the Central & Western District Councillor on the latest proposals regarding Route 7:

Comment offered by Mr. CHAN Chit-kwai:

I support switching over to the adoption of a tunnel alignment or a depressed road configuration below ground level. I have no objection to the construction of the road link up to Pok Fu Lam Road for the time being. However, the design of the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road must be improved to avoid the frequent occurrence of accidents.