

共享維港海傍設計體驗參與計劃

Enjoying by Designing Central Harbourfront –
A Community Participation Programme using
the Partnership Experiential Community Participation Model

1. Purpose

- 1.1. In response to the information paper ‘Harbour and Waterfront Plan Review’ (Paper No. 5/2004) presented by the Planning Department on the first meeting of HEC on 6 May 2004, this paper aims to propose a community participation programme by using a partnership model to engage the public in designing for a betterment of the precious harbour and waterfront around the Central Outlying Ferry Piers area.

2. Scope

- 2.1. The scope of this programme is limited to the process of the planning exercise, excluding subsequent construction and maintenance works.
- 2.2. The physical boundary concerned in this paper includes the open area of the existing waterfront along the Central Outlying Ferry Piers Nos.1-7, and including the roof tops of these piers.

3. The original Community Engagement Programme proposed in Paper No.5/2004

- 3.1. It is encouraging that the Planning Department put emphasis on engaging the community through “a platform for community groups to participate through multilateral dialogues and activities ...through a package of events ranging from public forum, exhibitions, and focus group meetings.”

- 3.2. And as part of the plan to enhance the harbourfront, the Planning Department will identify quick enhancement projects to bring about environmental improvement and enhanced public enjoyment, of which the Central Outlying Ferry Pier is one of the selected locations.
- 3.3. But there are still rooms for improvement for the engagement programme proposed by the Planning Department. The major limitation of the programme lies on the fact that it is a traditional top-down approach starting from expert study to information delivery and then consultation on limited number of options. It is in fact a consultation rather than participation by the public. Alternative views and disagreements, and thus grievances, cannot be effectively absorbed and be considered by using this traditional model of consultation.
- 3.4. The characteristics of the traditional Consultative Model are: advisory, static, controlled, prescriptive, orchestrated, directive, fixed or rigid, company accountability, methodological, and linear. While the relative advantages of a Participatory Model are: non-directive, empowering, uncertain, evolving, innovative, shared, dynamic, mutual accountability, flexible, spontaneous, creative, and participatory.¹

4. The Partnership Experiential Community Participation Model

- 4.1. It is a participation model based on the Social Learning Theory and Experiential Learning.
- 4.2. The basic tenets of Social Learning Theory are: knowledge, modeling, practice, feedback and corrective practice, reinforcement, and transformation to daily practice. Experiential Learning emphasizes on input (knowledge and skill), experience (learning by doing), reflection (skill and attitude transformation), re-doing, and consolidation (of internalized attitude and skill).
- 4.3. Another special feature of this participation model focuses on the nature of target participants. It emphasizes on multi-stakeholder partnership, because throughout the process different ideas and views can be exchanged and

¹ Roberts, R. (2003). 'Involving the public.' In Becker, H.A. and Vanclay, F. (Eds.) *The International Handbook of Social Impact Assessment: Conceptual and Methodological Advances*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

stimulated so as to strive for a final option that is built on consensus rather than coercion of power.

- 4.4. Participation is another significant characteristic of this model, in that it provides ample opportunities for the participants to be involved right at the beginning, even when the concept is still at its embryonic stage. This helps to embed public opinion in the engagement mechanism which means that the public is a genuine stakeholder rather than just subjects for consultation. This sense of ownership by the public in turn contributes to the legitimacy of the whole project. It is less likely that the option thus chosen will face strong objection from the public, as their voices have already been absorbed and considered throughout the process.

5. Mechanism of the Partnership Experiential Community Participation Model

5.1. Objectives:

- 5.1.1. To illustrate the operation and effectiveness of the Model by using a small scale planning issue of the Outlying Ferry Piers area as an exemplar.
- 5.1.2. To identify a 'consensus' design for the enhancement of harbourfront areas through multi-stakeholder participation.
- 5.1.3. To evaluate and suggest the feasibility of applying the Partnership Experiential Community Participation Model in other planning issues.

5.2. Suggested Institutional Setup:

- 5.2.1. A multi-stakeholder Task Group in a partnership format should be formed to take charge of this participation programme. Potential partners may include HEC, the Central & Western District Council, the Islands District Council, CE@H, relevant government departments, ferry operators, bus operators, or the business sector.
- 5.2.2. Secretariat support should be provided by the secretariat of HEC.
- 5.2.3. Funding be provided by HEC and/or other partners.

5.3. **Suggested Target Participants of the participation programme:**

5.3.1. **General public:**

- (a) who are not direct users; and
- (b) users, i.e. those who use the facilities, in this case, the Central Outlying Ferry Piers (e.g. commuters of ferries to the islands on weekends);

5.3.2. **Facilitators/ Resource persons:**

- (a) Professionals in relevant fields of planning, architecture, engineering, landscape, tourism, transport and logistic etc.;
- (b) Representatives from the Central & Western District Council and the Islands District Council; and
- (c) Government department officials

5.4. **Suggested Formats of the Participation Programme:**

- 5.4.1. Workshops (for knowledge acquisition);
- 5.4.2. Charettes /Experiential Design (for idea and principle generation);
- 5.4.3. Design Competition (for concrete designs by professionals);
- 5.4.4. Public Vote with Exhibitions (for indication of public’s preference for the design entries);
- 5.4.5. Experiential Vote (for indication of users’ preferences through mock run of “Enjoying Harbourfront Programmes”); and
- 5.4.6. Decision on winning design (selection from the design entries).

5.5. **Suggested Stages of Participation:**

5.5.1. As this model employs a bottom-up approach and involves various types of participants, there are seven stages of participation with those mentioned in Section 5.3.2 as facilitators:

Stage	Theme	Major Participants
1	Workshops (background knowledge)	Recruited public (intensive involvement required)
2	Experiential Design	ditto
3	Partnership Design Competition	Professionals (each team should be in partnership with some of the participants in Stage 1)
4	Exhibition / Public Vote	General public
5	Preliminary Decision	Task Group
6	Experiential Vote/Mock Programme	Recruited public
7	Final decision on competition	Task Group

6. Suggested Programme Means

6.1. **Scope:** Participatory design of the Central Outlying Ferry Piers area.

6.2. **Targets:** as described in 4.1, aiming at 100 (Stage 1 & 2), 500 (Stage 4) and 5,000 (Stage 5).

6.3. **Programmes:**

Stage	Means	No. of Participants
1	Workshops: information giving, on-site observation, photo & video-taking by participants.	100
2	Charettes (Experiential Design): participants will be divided into 5 groups, using experience from on-site observation and model of the Piers area to suggest 5 initial design options (general ideas and principles).	5 groups (20 each)
3	Design Competition: professionals who enter into the competition will be drawn randomly into the 5 groups and to work out a design based on the initial ideas generated from the participants (these ideas can still be changed throughout the <i>Communicative Dialogue Process</i> within the group).	5+
4	Public Preference: exhibition + road show + public vote + marketing/opinion survey of potential users at the Piers area (5 Sundays); feedback from other citizens also welcomed. Their ballots form part of the marks for the competition entries.	5,000 (each week 1,000)
5	Discussion & Preliminary Decision on the Competition: The Task Group comprised of HEC, CE@H, C&W DC, & Island DC to review on the 5 entries and select one for mock run.	Task Group
6	Experiential Vote on Mock “Enjoying Harbourfront Programmes”: on-site test run of the selected design (to the scale as far as possible to set up mock temporary structures) in 5 weeks to let participants experience the operation and suggest for modifications (e.g. different settings of gardens, café, live bands, cultural performances etc.).	500 (each week 100)
7	Final Decision on competition result and recommendations for modification of the design	Task Group

6.4. **Time Line:** (in months)

Stage	Months								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									

7. **The Next Step**

Upon endorsement in principle by HEC on this proposed participatory programme, representative of HEC taking charge of this should proceed on with the partnership engagement process by liaising with potential partners, and the Task Group overseeing the whole programme be set up as soon as possible to work out the details, including detail programme design and budget.

8. **Advice Sought**

Members are invited to comment and endorse on the proposed model and programme.

Dr Alvin Kwok
 Member
 Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
 July 2004