

4. Question and answer session (1)

問答環節(1)

Comments	Responses
<p>HER review's outcome is driven by public participation but the Kai Tak model is different as the public do not have any say on some of the elements.</p> <p>What we have not done yet is that we still have not found a model which allows the public to understand the land use and infrastructure. We also have not reached out to the community in large but only to the limited audience who wants to be involved and understand the process. We should as well be proactive to suggestions and ideas.</p> <p>Above all, the main concern is that we have focused too much on the process rather than on the outcome. What are we actually achieving?</p>	<p>陳偉群博士</p> <p>在啓德規劃的初期，民間對多用途綜合體育館的支持程度並不高。正因為有啓德規劃檢討，可讓政府相關部門與體育界和民間溝通。直至今天，雖然體育館的計劃不是得到百分百的認同，但至少公眾的接納程度上已提高很多。另外，規劃是一個活的過程，現在所列出的啓德規劃其實只有大約三分之一是有時間表。即是說，假如政府或持份者若不繼續與民規劃，沒有一項規劃會得到公眾認同。這規劃檢討卻可讓我們不斷改進。</p>
<p>As the HEC is going to continue, we should look at the responsibility and the efficiency of the committee in the public engagement progress.</p> <p>Firstly, where is the HEC's involvement in the Central harbour front area and in the West Kowloon harbour front, a major part of which is already under-construction?</p> <p>What is the HEC doing in the marine planning? We have never looked at the broad marine-use plan. What is going to happen on the water? Moreover, we should look at the harbour as a whole. Is the planning of all the projects now in the right</p>	<p>梁剛銳先生</p> <p>究竟 HEC 是 “guardian of the process”，還是 “guardian of the outcome”？</p> <p>其實所有委員都放了很多時間，所以大家都希望達致成果。但最終的成果是怎樣，不應該由程序的倡議者去定斷。即使最終的規劃未必符合自己的意見，只要大部分市民都對規劃滿意，才算做到與民規劃。</p> <p>至於程序方面，昨天的問題是匯報者跟組員意見方面出現偏差，但這對整件事的結果是不會有改變，因為所有意見我們仍有紀錄在案，而顧問團隊亦會再多寫提議，所以對於整個過程是有多過一重保險去確保參與者的看法獲得反映。</p>

<p>place?</p> <p>Secondly, what is the role of HEC? As some of the design and engineering of projects can be continuously improved with the advice from HEC, then is the HEC going to stay involved in the broad land-use plan like Kai Tak in the future and how?</p> <p>Thirdly, is HEC the guardian of the process? Or the guardian of the outcome? The credibility of HEC was damaged yesterday because of the poor-managed process. If HEC is not the guardian of the process but the outcome, then why is the Heliport still included in the plan for Kai Tak when both the developers and the public do not want it? Thus, HEC should be clear of this question and show the public how the job can be done.</p>	
	<p><u>陳捷貴先生</u></p> <p>這次 HEC 證明了有來自不同業界的持份者參與，大家都花了很多時間在與民參與上，雖然過程很長但亦很深入，可引起公眾對問題的認識，而且十分贊成與民參與是需要配合教育。。</p> <p><u>吳永順先生</u></p> <p>HEC 已經盡力去做，海港規劃真的太複雜，將來的規劃是需要一步一步做的，推動公眾參與平台已是很重要的一步，結果怎樣則要看參與規劃和設計之專業人士的質素。</p>

	<p><u>陳偉群博士</u></p> <p>最重要是維持 HEC 這機構的性格，即有不同的持份者發表意見，結果或過程是怎樣亦不擔心。公眾是需要鼓勵和帶領，而政府認真做的話一定可以做更好。</p>
<p>Now the HEC is going to be extended for another term. I suggest starting out imagining the Victoria Harbour with everybody in a large scale. Without really looking at the entire harbour and how to enhance the entire harbour front, it is hard to come out with a result which is good for Hong Kong. Public should be involved. The HEC should be both guardian of the process and the outcome. Before harbourfront enhancements are implemented, HEC should ask the question of overriding public need. Once this question is answered, and with more funds to be provided, more large scale harbourfront enhancements should be implemented for the public.</p> <p>Moreover, production and transit to development should take top priority. The work of HEC should be in place-based approach. When place is put first, the other problems like transport/accessibility and activity will be solved.</p> <p>長久以來，規劃政策都是由政府主導。在參與 HEC 的過程中明白到與民規劃的好處，市民和專業人士的意見已得到反映，公眾參與的過程應該得到認同。另外，維港對旅遊業是十分重要，</p>	<p><u>梁剛銳先生</u></p> <p>《保護海港條例》的確對 HEC 帶來限制，但這個限制我們是需要嘗試去接觸並改變，而且是很嚴肅的事情，可以先以小的試驗計劃開始。</p>

很多旅遊景點都和維港有關，所以整個維港海旁的規劃是需要的。

希望將來可以將與民規劃的概念和過程運用到日常的地區規劃工作中。

應該對下一代提供更多維港的歷史發展和資訊。

在規劃的過程中，應該可以聯絡地區組織多做深化工作，多做配合的工作，因為現在即使提供了平台，但只能吸引關心事件的人參與。