

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee**  
**Summary of Discussions of the HEC Retreat**  
**held on 27 August 2005**

**1. Purpose**

1.1 This paper provides a summary of discussions at the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) Retreat held on 27 August 2005 and seeks Members endorsement of the way to take forward views expressed by Members at the Retreat.

**2. Background**

2.1 The HEC Retreat was held on 27 August 2005. 16 Members (including the Chairman), four alternate members, the Secretary and 15 government representatives attended the Retreat. An independent facilitator was invited to facilitate the proceeding of the Retreat. Two guest speakers were invited to share their experience in public engagement exercises and knowledge in harbour history respectively.

2.2 The discussion at the Retreat focused on the following aspects:

- (a) Public Engagement Experiences;
- (b) Harbour Planning Approach and Process;
- (c) Institutional Issues; and
- (d) PR Dimensions.

**3. Views Expressed by Members**

3.1 Members made their views on the four aspects set out in paragraph 2.2. above. Their views, which are subject to further deliberation by the HEC, are summarized in the following paragraphs.

**3.2 Public Engagement Experiences**

- (a) There was a need to consolidate and streamline the public engagement process;
- (b) HEC Members carrying different roles in the public

engagement exercise were required to strike a balance among these roles when taking part in the engagement process;

- (c) The involvement of various stakeholders in the process was necessary in view of increased public aspirations, and that the process required a longer time than before;
- (d) The process of public engagement should be clear, transparent and simplified and that the process be streamlined for efficiency in view of time constraint;
- (e) Provision of possible technical options would facilitate public engagement;
- (f) As a new methodology/approach in engaging the public was adopted, more time and efforts were required in the process;
- (g) A clear indication of policies on areas of traffic and transport, recreation and sports, culture, tourism, etc. from the government was crucial to the work of the HEC;
- (h) Giving relevant information to the public would facilitate them making reasonable choices;
- (i) The secretariat of HEC Sub-committee had spent a lot of time and efforts to ensure a proper platform for the public to express the views;
- (j) Government bureaux/departments concerned had been redeploying their existing own resources to serve the HEC and its Sub-committees and were devoted to the task; and
- (k) Suggested arranging a symposium on public engagement in harbour planning.

### 3.3 Harbour Planning Approach and Process

- (a) A harbour-front enhancement strategy setting out systematically the goal, time frame and areas to be addressed would be required in light of community's rising aspirations.

### 3.4 Institutional Issues

- (a) A designated government organization with delegated authority and adequate resources would be required for implementing harbour-front enhancements;

- (b) Suggested that HEC to be served by an independent secretariat;
- (c) There was a need to clearly express the views of HEC and its Sub-committee by motion;
- (d) The need to set up another HEC Sub-committee on institutional structure should be explored;
- (e) It was suggested that instead of establishing a new harbour authority in Hong Kong, consideration should be given to expand the functions of HEC to the implementation, management and co-ordination of the public sector initiatives and proposals along the waterfronts, and the implementation of master plans for specific areas;
- (f) It would be desirable to deploy staff to support the HEC secretariat on a long term basis; and
- (g) Members are encouraged to speed up the decision-making process of the HEC and its Sub-committees.

### 3.5 PR Dimensions

- (a) The improvement of relationship between TPB and HEC should be considered;
- (b) There is a need to improve the putting of HEC message across to both the Government and the public;
- (c) It was suggested that the Government should take on the role of communicating with the community on what the harbour-front enhancement strategy and its goals were at a macro level;
- (d) HEC website should be improved to include easy access to Harbour Planning Principles and powerpoints presented at HEC and its sub-committee meetings;
- (e) Meet-the-media session, say by briefings, tea gatherings, or attending radio programmes, should be arranged for the Chairmen of HEC and its Sub-committees to brief the media on the progress and initial achievement of the work of HEC;
- (f) It would attract PR attention if there were improvements to

visual effects and organization of events along harbour-fronts;

- (g) It was suggested that all news clippings on HEC should be circulated to Members;
- (h) Private sector could also be engaged in harbour-front enhancement, for example by promulgating their works in improving the harbour-front and encouraging their support to HEC;
- (i) Education programme for the public should be arranged, subject to resources availability;
- (j) More public participation in the overall planning of the harbour should be encouraged; and
- (k) The new culture of planning with the community cultivated over the past year should be reinforced.

#### **4. Way Forward**

4.1 Subject to paragraph 5.1, the Secretariat will compile a consolidated list of views, including those made by Members who had not attend the Retreat, for Members to determine if any follow-up actions are required and set the priority.

#### **5. Advice Sought**

5.1 Members are invited to:

- (a) Note the views arising from the Retreat as set out in paragraphs 3.2-3.5 above;
- (b) Submit new suggestions if they had not participated in the Retreat;
- (c) Endorse the way forward proposed in paragraph 4.1 above.