

8. Question and answer session (2)

問答環節 (2)

Comments	Responses
<p>How can we convert the guidelines into something more meaningful instead of just a set of guidelines which the Town Planning Board has told the developers that they can either follow or ignore?</p>	<p><u>Dr. Andrew Thomson</u></p> <p>The simple answer is that we were asked to help create the guidelines. It is now up to the government to see how they are reinforced.</p> <p>But like anything voluntary vs. mandatory, there is a degree of uptake. Legislation tends to correct the minimum performance. It is hard to set legislation which really drives for excellence and reinforcing excellence. Usually it is the best practice which reinforces excellence. Therefore, we need the guidelines to articulate what would be the best practice. If the public engagement process can be robust and transparent enough about harbourfront enhancement and how to use the Harbour Planning Guidelines, there will be a ground for the society to see whether the various developers are implementing good practice or not and we will not have to legislate them. But the problem is it is a very long process. The outcome will not be seen till quite a long time in the future. So right now what we have to be obsessed about is the process that getting through the outcome. The outcome is still to be decided.</p>
<p>For Alvin, in the CHarM project, do you have the right commitment from the major stakeholder, the government? Have you been asked if the model and presentation by the government can reflect the CHarM? For Andrew, the title of the Harbour</p>	<p><u>郭毅權博士</u></p> <p>最初規劃署在HEC的會議上討論如何美化其中兩個碼頭的上蓋，然後大家發覺是一個好時機去進行公眾參與，之後更發現範圍不須只局限於碼頭上蓋，這</p>

Planning Principles (HPPs) was changed from “minimise the land for transport and infrastructure” to “maximise opportunities” . There is no longer any commitment to minimising the land for transport and infrastructure. Why are we losing tracks in the past two years when most of us are concerned about the accessibility and the domination of harbour-front land by transport infrastructure?

是CHarM的來源。所以當初的計劃範圍並沒有包括中環第三期填海那邊的地區，而是希望盡快吸納意見，然後有具體的改善工程，但亦同意最理想的方法是全面地規劃，只是有不同的考慮和限制。政府對這個計劃的承擔可以說有，但又可以說沒有，是在乎於不同性質。政府的工作人員是對這過程的工作作出了承擔並付出了很多時間，但所謂沒有承擔，是CHarM出來的結果，他們並沒有確保會一定落實。

Dr. Andrew Thomson

The titles are not the principles but just the aspirations. The “minimise the land for transport and infrastructure” are put into the details. We are still true to the original principles. It is important to look at the body of the principles.
We did respond to all the questions that came in. Maybe the latest version is not seen yet. We have still addressed the transport issue very clearly not just in one section. The guidelines are long term in nature and should be flexible and not prescriptive. We have tried our best to include everything in the document. As I said it is an evolving process, all comments are welcome.

How do you move forward when you have got so many opinions? What is the problem?

郭毅權博士

由於市民的意見不會是關於一些設計上具體的問題，而是關於原則性的問題，所以在工作坊上我們列出了在不同範疇上的項目，再抽取共同點，然後演化成基本的設計參數，最大的困難便是市民無法看到具體的設計。

We are talking about public participation and how we can perfect the process. But we should also ask about the planning process. If the planning process is not proper, we can have a good process but a not so good result. The key is to review the planning process and ask “Are we making the planning process in such a way that people's concerns are answered? ” Another thing is “what do you think about action?” HEC has done a good job but sometimes it might be beneficial for the government to take the lead and show commitment. If we are all working towards the same vision, the government can show commitment by following the HPPs. The developers and all other people will start to understand the importance. Otherwise, it is difficult for the private sector to come up and follow the guidelines voluntarily without any regulations in place.

Dr. Andrew Thomson

In the absence of strategies like place making or without looking at the urban design, it is difficult for the people to visualise what the end-product would be. When you got a massive site like Kai Tak, you want to be given a vision of what the end-product is. Without a tool, it is difficult to get the end-product into people's mind. That is why we use the conventional planning process. It should be well-understood within the professional community. The plan making goes forward and sometimes the process is slightly different from what the community would expect.

For other issues, at the end of the day, the government takes the lead to follow the principles and guidelines. Some people may say that currently it is a fraud fundamental process because we have stipulated certain givens in that process. But if we start with a blank campus and just turn the campus into a place, there would be something missing in the process. Moreover, we have various projects with different stages. The community has to accept that certain projects are already in progress.

郭毅權博士

公眾參與是一個教育和學習的過程，包括了HEC，希望透過這些示範令政府學習到公眾參與不會阻礙發展，反而會令整個規劃和發展更順暢。另一方面，亦希望市民可學習到公眾參與的義務，並

	<p>不一定需要專業知識，在提出意見同時可監察政府的工作。如果在規劃的範疇做得好，政府可以考慮在其他政策範疇參考公眾參與的工作。</p>
<p>Are the HEC and the process robust enough to deal with the issue of the unequal land distribution in Hong Kong?</p>	<p><u>郭毅權博士</u></p> <p>無論公眾參與做得多好，如果機制不能配合結果亦不會好。其實過程是一個循環，如果公眾參與的過程做得好，便是一個示範，而且可構成壓力去令政府看到現有的規劃程序、方式、機制有何問題並去完善，只要市民擁抱了公眾參與，政府便要更進。</p> <p><u>Dr. Andrew Thomson</u></p> <p>It is an impossible question to answer but what we have seen so far is very encouraging. In one of the review projects, there is a tremendous drive to minimize the impact to the harbour-front, to maximize the ventilation to the surrounding neighbourhood and to provide a vibrant waterfront. Some of the points being discussed are even more ambitious and we have added back some points into the guidelines. Although we can see that we are certainly not perfect, we are moving to the right direction.</p>