



DESIGNING

HONG KONG  
HARBOUR  
DISTRICT

共創  
我們的  
海港區

Building Consensus on Sustainable Planning

# Building Consensus on Sustainable Planning Principles for the Harbour District

為海港區的  
可持續規劃原則  
建立共識

Paper No. 6 Summary Report  
第六號文件撮要報告

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### 目錄

<b>FOREWORD</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
前言 .....	<b>28</b>
<b>1. DESIGNING HONG KONG HARBOUR DISTRICT</b> .....	<b>1</b>
共創我們的海港區 .....	<b>30</b>
<b>2. THE PROCESS AND PURPOSE OF THE INITIATIVE</b> .....	<b>3</b>
倡議行動的過程及目的 .....	<b>32</b>
<b>3. ASPIRATIONS FOR THE HONG KONG HARBOUR DISTRICT</b> .....	<b>6</b>
對香港海港區的期盼.....	<b>35</b>
<b>4. KEY ISSUES AND PRINCIPLES</b> .....	<b>10</b>
主要議題及原則 .....	<b>39</b>
<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	<b>22</b>
結論 .....	<b>50</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</b> .....	<b>27</b>
鳴謝 .....	<b>54</b>

## FOREWORD

Last year a small group of long-term residents and native Hong Kong people asked themselves over lunch what the best strategy was to achieve a world-class Harbour. None of us had any commercial or professional interest in Harbour planning, but we felt strongly that enhancing the Harbour was key to Hong Kong's future development. We immediately realised that the issue was not the Harbour alone – as long as the water quality was improving – but the land surrounding the Harbour, hence the term 'Harbour District'.

What sparked the conversation was the announcement of Sir Norman Foster's winning design for West Kowloon Cultural District. Although the plan appeared to address many relevant issues including a shortage of arts, culture and performance venues, privatisation of venue ownership and management, an attractive and open foreshore without roads, and dramatic architecture, it was also clear that going from 'zero' to 'the world's largest' was a potentially risky proposition for a small part of the foreshore.

Along with the emerging public controversy over West Kowloon, the dispute over the Central and Wanchai reclamations began to attract considerable attention as it was fought through the courts and in the media. It became apparent that to move forward in creating a world-class harbour would require a 'creative initiative' to build community-wide consensus on the right way forward for the Harbour District as a whole.

In November 2003, we arranged funding from independent sources, and asked GML Consulting to conduct in-depth interviews with key opinion leaders and shapers from government, business and civil society groups. In February 2004, we decided to expand the research with a public debate and organised meetings, workshops and conferences in cooperation with the Business Environment Council and the Chambers of Commerce. We also distributed a survey to solicit further community input. The findings of this multi-faceted consensus building project are collated in a series of reports, which can be found on [www.harbourdistrict.com.hk](http://www.harbourdistrict.com.hk). This Summary Report gives an overview of the main findings.

A striking aspect of the debate was the discrepancy between 'professional' and 'personal' opinions. With Government and its many Departments as key players as well as the sole employer of many professionals who are involved inside and outside Government, there was initially a great hesitation to participate and speak freely about why Hong Kong's foreshore areas are in such a deplorable state. However, once participants began to trust the process they, in many cases, spoke with considerable insight and passion – clearly many people care deeply about the future of the Harbour District!

One of the unnerving discoveries during the research was to find that a continuous promenade around the Harbour was already decided upon when the

Government stipulated a promenade around the Regent Hotel development in 1972. In 2004, this and many other excellent ideas for enhancing Hong Kong Harbour District have yet to find their way into a consistent strategy and sustainable planning process.

Recognising widespread community aspirations for an attractive and accessible Harbour, the Government is now responding with new initiatives such as the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee. To move forward, though, there appear to be underlying fundamental issues that need to be addressed. The Designing the Hong Kong Harbour District (DHKHD) consensus building process has indicated that in many cases Hong Kong's land-use and transport planning mechanisms appear to lack the necessary integration, which is resulting in a systemic bias towards land use and reclamation for road building. Combined with a design and procurement process geared at 'highest engineering standards at the lowest cost', the predicament of Hong Kong's foreshore becomes painfully clear. We urge transport-related Bureau and Departments to see the quality of Hong Kong's foreshore 'as their issue' and actively engage in the debate on how they can contribute to a world-class Harbour District. At this point, be assured that the organisers of 'Designing Hong Kong Harbour District' have no specific 'anti-road' agenda. In fact, I personally am involved in the automobile business.

A well-promoted, visual and integrated master planning process with early participation by the community for the future Harbour District is needed. Specifically the placement of the new Central Government Offices, the Convention and Exhibition Centre extension, hotels, offices, arts and culture facilities, parks and amenities, and how these plans interact with transport policy and infrastructure, is critical for improvement of the foreshore of Hong Kong's Harbour District.

The necessary institutional arrangements include a potential 'Chief Planner', a 'Harbour Foreshore Authority', a review of the Town Planning Ordinance, and a review of the current consultation procedures which are extensive, but fail to instill the level of community participation and involvement required to ensure that land-use and transport planning decisions are mature and contribute to a vibrant, accessible and affordable foreshore within a well designed Harbour District.

During the DHKHD process, particularly in the conference, we gained much insight into the possible management of the foreshore and facilities. The Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority is a good reference model and further research is required in what would work for Hong Kong. Debates regarding Harbour Fest, West Kowloon, the current state of cultural venues and facilities, the prohibition on cooked food at the Avenue of Stars, the prohibition on fishing at many areas, and the absence of public boat clubs or moorings, point towards the need for a review of rules and procedures for licencing activities in public areas, arts and culture financing policies, the way we manage venues, etc. This requires the future engagement of Home Affairs, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department and other Departments in the planning for a world-class Harbour.

We believe the reports are a reasonable and fair reflection of the opinions expressed by DHKHD participants, and they have been validated by an Independent Panel. Although by their nature, the findings include criticism of Government policy and processes, the overriding tone of the initiative has been constructive and supportive. Individual Government officers we spoke with, formally and informally, are all in favour of a great Harbour District. It is very much the process of decision-making, which is failing, and this is frustrating for those inside as well as outside the Government. ‘Exasperation’ was the term used by many.

The reports give a consensus view of principles, which require further work to convert into practical solutions. We trust that the findings will help focus resources on addressing these issues and improve the planning for the Harbour District and Hong Kong as a whole.

We thank all the stakeholders from the Government, businesses, and the wider community who helped make the *Designing Hong Kong Harbour District* possible. We are specifically grateful for the time contributed by the organisers, researchers, independent panel members, advisors, supporters, sponsors, endorsers, participants, and media over the past 6 months. We hope that readers of this summary and the supporting reports will find them useful and that the coming years bring a renewed spirit of cooperation to the enhancement of Hong Kong’s Harbour District.

**Paul Zimmerman**

Chief Coordinator

*Designing Hong Kong Harbour District*



# 1. DESIGNING HONG KONG HARBOUR DISTRICT

- 1.1 The *Designing the Hong Kong Harbour District* (DHKHD) initiative was set up in December 2003 as a consensus building exercise to help achieve a world-class Harbour District for Hong Kong. Over a 6-month period the initiative has engaged a great number of key stakeholders, including from Government, business and civic sectors, in a constructive and formative dialogue. The initiative has been jointly organised by The Experience Group, The Business Environment Council (BEC) and GML Consulting (GML), and is supported by over twenty major organisations and prominent opinion leaders in the Hong Kong community.
- 1.2 Victoria Harbour and its adjoining districts, labelled by the initiative as the Harbour District, is the core of Hong Kong and includes the majority of the key assets defining Hong Kong's image and lifestyle: the Harbour, the major financial and commercial buildings, the Government and public offices, key heritage sites and the main culture, art, sports, entertainment, accommodation and food & beverage (F&B) venues. The Harbour and the immediate adjuncts form the heart of the Pearl River Delta where visiting tourists spend much of their time and money, and where residents undertake many of their retail, leisure, arts, entertainment and sports activities.
- 1.3 The 'Harbour District' as such does not exist under the current administration, planning schemes or outlining zoning plan system. There is no integrated OZP specially prepared for the Harbour area and it is not covered by Government's Plan for Victoria Harbour which covers a smaller area. The definition of the **Harbour District** for this study is taken as **the districts surrounding Victoria Harbour from Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter to Kwun Tong, and from Quarry Bay to Sheung Wan**. This area includes the majority of the key assets defining Hong Kong's image and lifestyle as illustrated in the Tourism Action Plan by the Planning Department in 2001 (See inside cover). The foreshore, the land, public facilities and transport infrastructure immediately connected with the Harbour, and specifically all those controlled by Government, are the concern of this initiative.
- 1.4 The Government has established the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee to consider the Harbour-front (foreshore) of Victoria Harbour, protected under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. The boundaries of this extend over a greater area, namely from Siu Chau Wan Point and Ah Kung Ngam Point in the east to the western points of Hong Kong and Tsing Yi (and straight north to the mainland). Although the terms of reference have since been expanded to include the 'adjacent areas' and related transport infrastructure, the Harbour District definition reflects the need to include the surroundings districts in their entirety in the planning (See inside cover).

1.5 Based on our research, we have identified several general issues:

- Majority of the foreshore is dominated by transport infrastructure including surface and elevated roads and no new land will be added;
- Roads are visual and physical barriers separating the lively districts and the Harbour, which are both at ground level, and the limited number of elevated or subway crossings are difficult for elderly and invalid persons.
- There is a lack of public amenities and facilities along the foreshore as much of the space is occupied by fenced-off temporary uses, utility facilities like sewage works, refuse transfer stations, car parks and transport infrastructure;
- There is no vibrancy because the facilities for entertainment, retail, F&B, hospitality, accommodation, arts, culture, sports, in addition to open spaces such as parks and promenades, are missing;
- Access to the Harbour itself is limited as there are no public boating facilities for mooring, berthing or storage, and marine activities like fishing are rarely allowed or encouraged;
- The views of the Harbour and the stunning city panorama are obstructed by tall buildings and elevated roads.

1.6 These and other issues are addressed and recommendations are included in the form of 'principles'. These 'principles' are an invitation for further comment and debate and are aimed to contribute to building consensus on a way forward for the future of the Harbour District. By engaging in this process proactively, the Government has been part of a process which will enable the development of a framework for a sustainable and vibrant foreshore that that will more closely reflect community aspirations.



## 2. THE PROCESS AND PURPOSE OF THE INITIATIVE

2.1 *Designing the Hong Kong Harbour District* was a 6-month consensus building process which involved around 300 stakeholders through:

- Desktop research
- Interviews
- Meetings
- Workshop
- Opinion survey
- Conference

2.2 The purpose of the initiative was to:

- Highlight the key issues affecting the harbour district;
- Identify and build consensus on ways to address these issues; and
- Present the findings for the Government's consideration.

2.3 The initiative resulted in:

- Bringing together over 400 different parties from Government, the private sector and community organisations through round table discussions and meetings to discuss and build consensus on a number of controversial issues on the Harbour (including reclamation);
- Stimulating the debate and clarifying the vision for Hong Kong's Harbour District and what has to be done to make the Harbour truly world-class;
- Engaging the Government at different levels and different Departments in a dialogue with various members of the community in a short time frame completely outside the normal Government process and procedures; and
- Canvassing the public for their views on the Harbour District's current situation and possible future.

### Desktop Research

2.4 A series of Government reports, newspaper articles, academic journals, research papers and other documents were reviewed. A list of materials is provided in **Paper 5**.

## Interviews

- 2.5 Over 90 organisations from different business sectors, the NGO sector and government were contacted for this study, out of which we carried out 45 in-depth interviews. The results of our interviews and additional research are reported in **Paper 1**.

## Meetings

- 2.6 In addition, a series of meetings were held with Public and Media at different venues on February 18, March 5, March 16 and April 15 with a total of 300 participants. Details are recorded in **Paper 5**.

## Workshop

- 2.7 On 27 March 2004, a workshop was conducted with stakeholders to develop themes on designing the Harbour District. Proceedings of the workshop and related papers are provided in **Papers 2 and 1** respectively.

## Opinion Survey

- 2.8 Between April and May 2004, we conducted a public opinion survey to canvas the views of the public on key issues affecting the Harbour District. The results of some 250 responses to the survey are recorded in **Paper 3**.

## EnviroSeries Conference

- 2.9 At the EnviroSeries Conference organised by the BEC on 3 May 2004, local and international experts provided their views on designing Hong Kong Harbour to more than 200 participants at the Island Shangri-La Hotel. The key issues arising from the conference are reported and discussed in **Paper 4**.

## Validation

- 2.10 An independent panel reviewed the process and analyses, and found the findings a fair representation of the views expressed. The panel included:
- Prof. Peter Hills – Director of Centre of Urban Planning and Environmental Management, The University of Hong Kong
  - Prof. Kin Che Lam – Chairman of Department of Geography and Resource Management, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, and
  - Ms Terri Mottershead – Director of Professional Development, MindTheme Consulting

## Reporting

2.11 The findings are collected in several reports and can be found on the web at [http://www.harbourdistrict.com.hk/hkhd\\_new/sub\\_new/pp.html](http://www.harbourdistrict.com.hk/hkhd_new/sub_new/pp.html)

- **Paper 1.** Preliminary Briefing for Stakeholders;
- **Paper 2.** Proceedings of 27 March Workshop;
- **Paper 3.** Public Opinion Survey;
- **Paper 4.** Key Issues;
- **Paper 5.** Research and Meeting References;
- **Paper 6a.** Draft Summary Report and Feedback Received; and
- **Paper 6.** Summary Report (this document).

### 3. ASPIRATIONS FOR THE HONG KONG HARBOUR DISTRICT

- 3.1 Victoria Harbour has been a working harbour and reclamation has played an important role in accommodating marine-oriented facilities, warehousing, piers, and other supporting facilities, as well for providing for Hong Kong's growing business and government needs. With marine services moving out to the Outer Harbour, many of previous marine facilities have been converted into office, residential and commercial property.
- 3.2 To accommodate the increase in transport needs, land was reclaimed to provide space for roads in front of these facilities. Further reclamation originally planned in the 1980s for new residential and commercial uses has now been halted and is controlled by the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO)<sup>1</sup>. The Government is currently pursuing reclamation in selected areas of the Harbour District only.
- 3.3 As a result of the constantly changing waterfront and the above developments, a large proportion of the foreshore of the Harbour District is now dominated by surface or elevated roads.
- 3.4 As early as 1972, there were plans for a continuous promenade along the harbour, and a start was made with the promenade around the Regent Hotel. Planning studies<sup>2</sup> undertaken by the Government in more recent years have emphasised the importance of enhancing the value of the Harbour using the waterfront and surrounding areas as focal points for leisure, entertainment, and recreational activities.
- 3.5 Public aspirations, particularly those more openly expressed in the last two years, have led to a number of community initiatives on the future of the Harbour District, including Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour activities and Harbour protection demonstrations, expressing public concerns over the development of the Harbour and the waterfront areas.
- 3.6 From a legal perspective, there have been high-profile court cases regarding the Wan Chai Phase II Reclamation and the Central Reclamation Phase III, the legality of which were challenged by the Society for the Protection of the Harbour. The Court of Final Appeal (CFA), in its judgment of 9 January 2004,

---

<sup>1</sup> According to a Government communication to GML on 17 June 2004, "as a result of the evolving social and economic structure of Hong Kong and the changing public aspiration to protect and preserve the Victoria Harbour, some proposed further reclamation [was] not pursued or will be subject to review. The Government has repeatedly announced that apart from Central Reclamation Phase III and the proposed reclamation schemes at Wan Chai North and Southeast Kowloon, there will be no further reclamation inside the Harbour limits."

<sup>2</sup> Planning Study on the Harbour and its Waterfront Areas (February 2003), Metroplan Review (March 2003), Hong Kong 2030 (ongoing) and Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong (November 2002) – see Paper 1, Appendix B for further information.

provided a final interpretation of the presumption against reclamation under the PHO. The judicial review on Central Reclamation Phase III has been ruled on, while Government's plans for reclamation in Wan Chai and Southeast Kowloon are currently under review and must ensure compliance with the CFA's "overriding public need test" before proceeding. Stakeholders have called for the review of the efficiency and effectiveness of the judicial process as a means of managing land use and planning decisions.

- 3.7 In addition, there is uncertainty surrounding the future design of the West Kowloon Cultural District, which is a significant part of the new harbour front. Further, various projects are under consideration or in progress along the Harbour front.
- 3.8 The Government has enjoyed a relatively 'free' hand in developing the Harbour foreshore in the past and used reclamation to create more land for development and at the same time build infrastructure to deal with the needs of a growing population in line with its territorial development strategy. However, the level and nature of the public sentiment currently being expressed presents a challenge for the Government to come up with a new process and new proposals to ensure the development of the Harbour and the surrounding districts are sustainable and will fulfill Hong Kong's aspirations for the future.

In our stakeholder interviews, almost all stakeholders believe that the Harbour is critical to the future of Hong Kong.

Most stakeholders agreed that:

- *The Harbour is the foremost symbol of Hong Kong and is a unique and irreplaceable asset.*
- *It contains important historic, economic, social and cultural value.*
- *The Harbour belongs to the people of Hong Kong and forms a focal point, which helps to define people's identity.*
- *It is a gathering place and part of Hong Kong's collective memory.*
- *It is an important economic resource for tourism.*

Source: **Paper 1** (Appendix G)

- 3.9 With the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance in place and water quality improving, the emphasis has shifted from the Harbour to the foreshore, i.e., the land immediately connected with the Harbour. Views expressed by

stakeholders include the need for access to the Harbour, population density control, creation and distribution of areas of special activities adjacent to the Harbour, the creation and management of support facilities to support these uses in the future and control of building heights adjacent to the Harbour.

3.10 The foreshore of Victoria Harbour is critical to Hong Kong's global brand image and is an invaluable asset in building this capacity. The survey carried out between April and May 2004 (see **Paper 3**) shows that, for Hong Kong's Harbour District to be world-class, the following attributes are needed:

Vibrancy

- Appealing harbour views
- Marine tourism and leisure activities
- Historic significance
- Impressive architecture and building design around the harbour
- Environmental quality
- A "living" harbour (birds, fishing, sailing, etc.)

Activities

- Wide choice of arts and culture
- Green areas/landscaping
- Wide range of wining and dining
- Plentiful open air spaces
- Facilities for leisure and entertainment

Access

- Ease of pedestrian access and mobility
- Wide range of public transport links

3.11 In order to achieve all of the above, it is necessary to acknowledge the limited availability of land and the need to prioritise competing uses. The foreshore is underdeveloped and used primarily as a vehicular transport thoroughfare. The surface roads and flyovers extending along much of the waterfront put constraints on the development of the foreshore and greatly limit pedestrian access to the Harbour.

3.12 With reclamation less likely to be a material option for increasing the available land, great care and coordinated effort is required to re-engineer our transport infrastructure as well as to re-align our land-use within the Harbour District.

3.13 To reflect the Town Planning Board's vision to make the Harbour "attractive, vibrant, accessible and symbolic of Hong Kong – a harbour for the people and a harbour of life" stakeholders have called for a focus on the "soft"

issues needed to enliven the waterfront including the way we zone the land and license activities.

3.14 Further results from GML's opinion survey in **Paper 3** showed the following:

**Top five topics voted as 'important' for the foreshore of the harbour district**

- |                                  |       |
|----------------------------------|-------|
| • Appealing harbour views        | 88.7% |
| • Pedestrian access and mobility | 86.6% |
| • Environmental quality          | 85.8% |
| • Plentiful open spaces          | 85.8% |
| • Green areas/landscaping        | 83.7% |

(% represents percentage of those surveyed who voted "important or higher")

3.15 Selected comments from stakeholders<sup>3</sup> include:

- *The Harbour District should be developed and improved for the people of Hong Kong, not only for tourists.*
- *Existing promenades and waterfront areas are sterile, concrete, with little diversity and variety of activities.*
- *Better public access is critical for improving quality of life.*
- *Waterfront dining, shopping, sitting-out areas, entertainment should be multiuse-based and be for daytime and nighttime use.*
- *Outdoor art, theatre and other activities can create vibrant and lively ambience.*
- *More open space for relaxation and recreation is needed.*

---

<sup>3</sup> See Paper 1, Appendix G

## 4. KEY ISSUES AND PRINCIPLES

### Land Use and Urban Design

4.1 Based on the data collected during the research (see **Paper 4**, Ch. 3) the following land use and urban design principles are proposed:

#### **Land-use and Urban Design Principles**

- To achieve a world-class Harbour District, the limited land available around the Harbour must be optimised to provide foremost a vibrant, active and accessible foreshore catering for both residents and tourists
- As there is unlikely to be further extensive reclamation in the future, a coordinated effort and integrated plan for the Harbour District as a whole must ensure a well-balanced and sustainable distribution of land for utilities, property development, transport infrastructure and public open space and amenities throughout the Harbour District
- The public wants a foreshore which balances functionality with an active Harbour and a vibrant experience, including convenient pedestrian mobility, ample open space, visual access, entertainment, arts, culture, sports, retail, hospitality, accommodation, food and beverage facilities
- A determined effort is needed to implement the many existing well-developed Harbour planning, urban design and landscaping principles and enhance the Harbour as a natural and key asset for Hong Kong - including, among others, a continuous promenade (already proposed in 1972), stepped building heights, visual access (both from and towards the Harbour), open public spaces, accessibility and vibrancy
- The outline of the Harbour-front should incorporate an interesting and undulating edge profile and public boating facilities including moorings, berthing and storage, as well as piers and fishing berths to ensure that the Harbour itself is accessible for the use and enjoyment by the members of the public.

4.2 Despite efforts by different Government Departments to efficiently deliver public services and upgrade the quality of life, there have been past difficulties in bringing about enhancement of the foreshore. Stakeholders believe that urban planning for the Harbour District seems too often geared to reconciling the objectives and needs of various Government Departments who are responsible for delivering facilities for utilities, drainage systems, pumping stations and transport.

4.3 The extensive urban design principles for enhancement of the Harbour environment for the community have been in existence for some time. However Government's planning procedures which attempt to integrate



every minute requirement and constraint of every Department almost inevitably leads to a bland and utilitarian or over-functional planning solution, with little or no mechanisms to ensure that the implementation will achieve the people friendly urban design objectives set out above.

- 4.4 A large proportion of the current land use in Harbour District is therefore for utility purposes (refuse transfer points, cooling water pumps, outfalls, offices, car parks, transport, etc.), which are incompatible with harbour front enjoyment. Access to the Harbour front is constrained by the road network and often prohibited by fencing. A recent communication from Civil Engineering Department states that there are 35 public piers and landings along the Harbour waterfront, however despite these possible access points the widely expressed views of stakeholders and the public are that quality access to the harbour is limited.
- 4.5 Where the waterfront is accessible (Quarry Bay Park, Shau Kei Wan, Hung Hom, Tsimshatsui promenade, HKCEC, and Queen's Pier), there are only limited stretches of promenades, and hardly any F&B outlets, entertainment, or arts & culture activities.
- 4.6 With no new land to be added, clear choices will need to be made on land-use between utility purposes, property development, surface roads/flyovers and public open space.
- 4.7 In turn, this requires management of the hinterland and the reduction or elimination of land uses which generate the need and demand for such facilities and transport infrastructure, including limiting redevelopment in Tsimshatsui, and eliminating new traffic generating land-use in Tamar (Central Government offices) and Wanchai (Convention and Exhibition Centre Extension). As referenced in GML's survey, 62% of those surveyed indicated that locating Government offices next to the Harbour was "unimportant" compared to other priorities.
- 4.8 There are growing calls to pursue re-designing, re-engineering and enhancing existing areas and facilities over developing new ones. This requires less space and less reclamation, but does incur costs and results in more 'hassle'. New open spaces, improved pedestrian links and additional entertainment, retail, F&B, accommodation, arts, culture, sports facilities can help balance functionality and a vibrant experience in the foreshore.
- 4.9 Open corridors with visual access to the Harbour and the spectacular views of the surrounding city are needed from as many points as possible. Where possible, structures can be removed to open up views from main roads.
- 4.10 With the exception of one private yacht club and Queen's Pier, there is limited convenient access to the water itself for water sports or other activities. Public marinas, boat clubs, shelters, moorings, launches, and

boat storage facilities are required east of the Star Ferry piers along a 'long' harbour front on both sides of the Harbour, to allow the public to get onto the water for leisure activities.

4.11 More recently, the principles for Harbour design were articulated as part of the Harbour Plan Study by the Planning Department and the Hong Kong Tourism Board (May 2001) as:

- Give tourism/recreation uses which can benefit from waterfront access priority in the Inner Harbour Core, while balancing the needs of other marine uses;
- Group tourist attractions in clusters;
- Consolidate tourism clusters in and close to the Inner Harbour Core carefully designed and integrated within a landscape framework;
- Locate secondary tourism nodes and recreation uses around the Outer Harbour, provide good connection to the Inner Harbour Core;
- Improve pedestrian accessibility to the waterfront from public transport nodes;
- Provide greater continuity of waterfront promenades and other transport facilities to link tourism clusters;
- Integrate hinterland areas with the waterfront, through improved visual, landscape and pedestrian linkages; and
- Minimise physical and visual intrusion into the Harbour.

4.12 Stakeholders report that, these principles are mostly tourism oriented and this possibly reflects the way the study was defined and carried out. Little effective public input was evident. The enhancement of the Harbour should be foremost defined from the needs of the residents, as tourists will follow residents. Other stakeholders commented on the limitation of clustering and the need for mixed development throughout the entire Harbour District as one cluster.

## Transport Policy and Infrastructure

4.13 From **Paper 4** (Ch. 4), the following transport principles are proposed:

### Transport Policy and Infrastructure Principles

- Mobility should be balanced with the public's wish to enjoy the space and access to the Harbour foreshore.
- Transport infrastructure to keep Hong Kong mobile should minimise the land used for elevated and surface roads in the foreshore and deploy engineering standards and designs that promote - rather than bar - pedestrian access to the Harbour-front
- With the Harbour naturally at ground level, pedestrian access is preferable at the same level. If putting roads underground is not possible and surface roads are necessary, then pedestrian access can be provided using wide tunnels or building large decks across semi submerged roads. Many of the existing elevated walkways are inconvenient or inaccessible, particularly for invalids and the elderly
- A more balanced evaluation of alternative modes of transport (such as rail) should be implemented taking into account environmental impact, footprint and sustainability, irrespective of ownership and financing mechanisms.

4.14 The road network in the foreshore is extensive. Other than in a few places, residents and tourists are unable to easily get from where they live, stay or work to the Harbour front because of road infrastructure. There are elevated and surface roads ringing the Harbour waterfront, except in West Kowloon and Kai Tak.

4.15 Following the court rulings it appears that the current interpretation of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance, provides a bias towards reclamation for road infrastructure. It appears that roads have a better chance of passing the 'overriding public needs test' if it can be proven that the need for it is compelling and present and there is no reasonable alternative. Combined with the current process whereby the 'highest engineering standards at the lowest cost' are applied in procurement and design, this may lead to a sterile waterfront, a Harbour without activity, and a foreshore consisting of transport infrastructure. **Only a determined and coordinated land-use and transport strategy for the Harbour District (the foreshore AND adjacent areas) can steer Hong Kong away from this scenario.**

4.16 The space occupied by roads is determined by road alignment. Key factors are engineering constraints, and the cost and interruption to traffic flow. Minimising the road area is not an objective for the design of surface roads. In addition, many stakeholders perceive that alternatives such as rail or

traffic management measures often appear<sup>4</sup> to be given only secondary consideration.

- 4.17 Given the limited space available, reducing the space taken up by roads in the foreshore is logical and critical. The consequence of this is that more money is needed to put roads underground in tunnels and to re-engineer existing road corridors. If capacity can't be increased, traffic volume must be strictly managed with traffic management measures, and by limiting land use and restricting intensity in the relevant areas through building height restrictions, plot ratios, change of land –use or moratoriums.
- 4.18 With both the Harbour and the main tourist and residential areas at ground level – much consideration is needed for pedestrian mobility between these and across the vehicular thoroughfares. Ideally pedestrian access should be open-air at ground level to ensure convenience and visual access to the Harbour. As an example, in Wanchai North and around the Exchange Square and IFC Two ground level is a 'dead zone' and the functionality of the 'elevated city' is limited. Expanding the 'elevated city' has the danger of creating more such dead zones. They should foremost be seen as additional pedestrian capacity rather than a replacement for ground level mobility and vibrancy.
- 4.19 The subway crossings in Tsimshatsui are cumbersome, and the staircase/walkways in Causeway Bay, Taikooshing and Sheung Wan do not resolve the need for mobility. Wide underground passages such as the one to the Central Star Ferry (and wider) are preferable to narrow subways such as under Salisbury Road. Most of the current elevated walkways over roads in the foreshore are limited in function and inconvenient, especially for invalids and elderly.
- 4.20 A new approach is required to resolve the mobility and vibrancy. For Central and Wanchai, according to the present design of CRIII, there will be open space corridors – Statue Square Corridor, Civic Corridor and Arts and Entertainment Corridor - to bring pedestrians from the hinterland to the future waterfront. They will need to be tested for the above requirements.

---

<sup>4</sup> Government in the 17 June statement to GML cited that in the construction of the Central – Wan Chai Bypass, other options have been examined, including the Western Harbour Crossing, extension of the MTR to Kennedy Town, provision of hillside escalators from Central to Mid-levels, provision of bus-bus interchanges at the fringe areas of Central, restricting loading and unloading times in Central and adoption of Electronic Road Pricing.

In GML's survey on the harbour district (see **Paper 3**), people were asked for their views on **access to the harbour and surrounding districts**. The following topics were voted as most 'important'

- |  |        |
|--|--------|
| • Ease of pedestrian access and mobility | 86.6 % |
| • Wide range of public transport links   | 80.8 % |

(% represents percentage of those surveyed who agreed)

- 4.21 Given the demand for greater mobility, the increase in residents and tourists accessing the Harbour and foreshore, and the absolute limitation on space, a complete revision of transport strategy and policy is needed, including a stronger 'pedestrian first' emphasis to answer the call for greater accessibility to the foreshore of the Harbour District.
- 4.22 Greater use of ferries, including a circular ferry system, and water taxis is recommended to improve the mobility of residents and tourists in the Harbour District.
- 4.23 Sustainable development of the foreshore will require an integrated review of transport strategy and policy, together land-use planning for the Harbour District, the foreshore and hinterland areas. Pedestrian movement along and to the foreshore should be included as an important part of such transport review.

## The Central Wanchai Bypass and P2

- Mobility is at the core of the transport debate along the Harbour foreshore. Much of the current road infrastructure has been part of the overall road network planned to link up Central Business District (CBD) to the rest of Hong Kong including the New Towns and the Kowloon district.
- Phase Three of the Central reclamation (CRIII) is one of the two remaining portions of the Central and Wan Chai reclamation. At present, east-west traffic on the north side of Hong Kong Island relies mainly on the Connaught Road Central/Harcourt Road/Gloucester Road corridor. Government findings show that this has reached its capacity, resulting in the current traffic congestion.
- The Comprehensive Transport Study 3 (CTS-3), Government's transport planning tool, proposes that there is a need for a new trunk road, that is, the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) to solve the congestion problem.
- According to the Environment, Transport and Works Bureau, the current peak hour vehicle/capacity (v/c) ratio of Gloucester Road is 1.1 to 1.2. As Connaught Road Central, Harcourt Road and Gloucester Road form a continuous corridor where traffic conditions of one will impact on the rest of the trunk route, CTS-3 has predicted v/c ratios of 1.3 and 1.4 in 2011 and 2016 respectively for the Corridor in the future if the CWB is not provided. Assuming that the CWB were in place, both the corridor and the CWB would have v/c ratios of 0.9 and 0.7 in 2011 and 2016 respectively.
- Additional surface road systems are required as slip roads for the CWB and to handle traffic from the 600-room Four Seasons Hotel and the 55-level Four Seasons Place, IFC Two, new commercial developments on CR III, new Central Government Offices at Tamar and an extension of the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre.
- The forecasted vehicular traffic arising from the proposed commercial developments on CR III alone is about 1,200 vehicle trips per hour during the peak periods. This traffic is predicted to use mainly the Road P2 network and can affect the v/c ratios of the trunk corridor and the CWB.
- In other words, whilst the case for transport infrastructure for CRIII meets the CTS-3 requirements of maintaining mobility in a sustainable manner (i.e. capacity, alignment, form, modal split, interconnection, financial, and environmental factors), it is critical to note that pedestrian access to the Harbour front, safeguarding space for public facilities and open public space, and access to the harbour itself to ensure an active harbour, are not considered. P2 road will be a major surface road in addition to the CWB submerged in a tunnel.
- The 'cost' of land used for surface and elevated roads and limitations on access are not equated in the design of roads around the Harbour. Broad public 'acceptability' proven during consultation is of limited value as such consultation is normally limited to presentations to transport related groups and there is currently limited sensitivity for Harbour front enhancement aspects among the public, LegCo members, transport advisory board, District councilors, and others.

Source: **Paper 4** (Chapter 4)

## Institutional Arrangements

4.24 From **Paper 4** (Ch. 5), the following institutional principles are proposed:

### Institutional Principles

- Planning concepts, proposals and decisions should be community-focused and evolve through a *process* underpinned by early and ongoing stakeholder engagement and consensus building
- More effective and efficient mechanisms as well as new mechanisms and structures are needed to promote collaboration among the different Government Departments and balance long-term quality of life benefits over cost control and expedience, particularly for infrastructure and public space and facilities
- A single authority is recommended to be responsible for transport, land-use, planning, environment and community engagement and should be guided by the principles of sustainable development (for the Harbour district foreshore)
- A statutory body is recommended to be responsible for managing the foreshore, hold executive and consultative powers, and decide upon funding and financing of projects
- Experts for reviews of transport and land-use plans should be appointed by independent bodies to ensure that such reviews are truly independent
- Communities, including businesses, must be invited at an early stage to participate in formulating (visual) strategic plans, developing planning briefs and reviewing proposed designs to build consensus, and ensure mature solutions reducing the potential for conflict.

4.25 There is wide agreement that enhancing the Harbour District requires a high level of coordination in its planning, design, and management. At present these responsibilities are shared between numerous Government Departments and agencies, and private sector organisations, each with different objectives and priorities. Stakeholders noted that this problem is exacerbated with a planning process where boundaries of planning responsibilities are often based on administrative convenience, hence reducing the functional coherence. The way forward must include an improved mechanism for coordination of the different Departments so that they can more easily fulfill their overall mission.

4.26 The public can express their views when Government organises public exhibitions and at the public meetings arranged by planners. Often, however, this comes in the advanced stages of development and lack alternative options to choose from. Members of the public have not had the chance to be involved, in both practical and psychological terms, in the earlier

conceptual design stages, briefing or strategic planning stages. Too little is spend on the promotion of consultation exercises and the strategic plans lack visual aids and clear choices. The bodies consulted in the planning process tend to be political and professional parties, or specific committees of LegCo and District Councils, which have a limited focus.

- 4.27 Opinions may filter through via District Councilors, but this relies on their community outreach network functioning adequately. Hence there appears to be limited scope for the grass root and business communities to participate in a meaningful manner during these early stages.
- 4.28 In the last year, legal proceedings regarding reclamations within the Harbour District have aroused much interest and stimulated awareness on the part of the public. In response to wide community concerns for integrated planning for the Harbour, the Government announced on 28 April 2004 the formation of the *Harbour-front Enhancement Committee* to provide a more transparent and wider public consultation forum for different sectors of the community.
- 4.29 What is recommended is a single authority at the highest level of Government responsible for both land-use and transport planning.
- 4.30 For the Harbour District it is recommended that a statutory body, a Harbour District Authority reporting into the single authority, is fully in charge of all policies, strategies, planning and transport and land-use management for the foreshore areas. It is imperative that a Harbour District Authority is and is seen to be represented at the highest level with executive powers over planning, transport, land-use and ongoing management within the Harbour District but, importantly, also has consultative obligations to ensure comprehensive public participation.
- 4.31 How such body is implanted in Hong Kong requires urgent research and debate. Agreement is needed on what powers to purchase, sell, develop and manage land, and to market harbour and foreshore related activities, are vested appropriately in a Harbour District Authority. Whether the Harbour District Authority has limited powers or separate Authorities are established for specific areas needs to be balanced with the overhaul of the legal, fiscal, land development and planning systems required in Hong Kong.
- 4.32 Alternatively the Town Planning Board could be the 'Harbour Authority'. First a Strategic Plan and then detailed plans similar to an Outline Zoning Plans are required for the 'Harbour District' or the 'Harbour and Foreshore Areas'. These can be prepared by the Planning Department in conjunction with the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee and major public consultation exercises. Once completed, the Town Planning Board would be charged with approval of all development plans within the area, INCLUDING transport infrastructure. This will require legislation to make the necessary amendments to the Protection of the Harbour and Town Planning Ordinances.



4.33 A clear process needs to be agreed for the testing of all reasonable development alternatives, including the appointment of Independent Experts required for such reviews. This will address the stakeholder concern that reviews are truly independent rather than a promotion, or justification of existing plans or prevailing views of the Departments involved.

4.34 Community wide participation, including the business community, is required for idea formulation, planning and implementation at an early stage to ensure that there is consensus on mature solutions, and that the potential for conflict is reduced. To accommodate changing public opinion during long-term projects such as reclamations and major roads, the community participation process needs to be a continuous one.

In GML's survey (see <b>Paper 3</b> ) on the Harbour District, people were asked for their views on <b>planning for the future</b> . The following five statements were rated as 'agree'	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visionary, long term and future thinking instead of cost- and transport led planning</li> <li>• An integrated harbour district master planning process is needed rather than a project by project approach</li> <li>• Public must be consulted with alternative planning choices together with clear cost and environmental implications</li> <li>• Quality of life planning, rather than an engineering-led process is needed</li> <li>• Clear analyses of public concerns and willingness to change is needed from planning authorities in the course of consultation</li> </ul>	<p>83.3%</p> <p>82.8%</p> <p>81.6%</p> <p>81.6%</p> <p>81.2%</p>
(% represents percentage of those surveyed who agreed)	

## Implementation Issues

4.35 From **Paper 4** (Ch. 6), the following implementation principles are proposed:

### Implementation Principles

- Decision-making regarding the planning of the Harbour District should adhere to sustainable development principles. The Harbour District should be a focal point for the community and itself evolve as a community
- Vibrancy of the Harbour and the foreshore must cater to the taste and affordability of different groups of people. A mixed usage development and varying types of commercial participation - not just high-end tourist facilities - are vital
- Vibrancy requires a review of licences and permits for stalls, vendors, entertainers and others on public land and facilities to ensure the availability of retail, food and beverages and other entertainment activities
- An active Harbour should be promoted through public marinas, boat clubs, shelters, launches, boat storage facilities, piers, moorings, and fishing berths so that the public can access the Harbour for marine activities
- Ongoing planning of the foreshore areas is as important as getting the management right, with a Harbour Authority responsible for allocating land for specified developments, attracting the appropriate tenants for venues, marketing Harbour activities and organizing promotional and marketing activities.
- Public and business involvement during implementation is crucial and Government should engage in formative and continuous dialogue with the communities including District Councils and commercial stakeholders to ensure buy-in, community backing and flexibility in the development and implementation of land-use and infrastructure plans
- Broad measures are needed to mitigate the impact of construction and development of the Harbour foreshore (including temporary land-use solutions, venues, art projects) and ongoing communication with all stakeholders to ensure transparency of the work in progress.

4.36 Currently, much of the Harbour front is dominated by high vertical sea walls. To achieve a vibrant, accessible and active Harbour, the public must be provided facilities for the development of water sports and other leisure activities on and around the Harbour, including piers and different types of partly or semi-enclosed water bodies for a range of functions, which establish a relationship between the foreshore and the central Harbour area.

4.37 Various 'price' levels of 'vibrancy' ("the cost of a cup of coffee") on the foreshore can be achieved with mixed ownership of the land and more liberal licencing policies for the establishment of commercial ventures on public land. Tourists will follow the residents (note Stanley, Temple Street, and Sai Kung Waterfront). Care must be given to ensure that development of the foreshore does not preclude free or affordable 'vibrancy'. Mixed usage – not just high-end tourist facilities is vital.

4.38 During construction, continuous public involvement during this process is a crucial to keep the foreshore of the Harbour district attractive for tourists and residents. Government should work closely with the District Councils, tourism organisations, business groups, and the public on the development of the Harbour District.

4.39 As Hong Kong enters into construction mode around the Harbour District, it is important to make the place lively. Interesting hoarding designs, temporary licences for markets and food outlets, and temporary venues are ways of keeping the area vibrant and attractive for tourists and residents while the work is in progress.

#### **Kowloon Canton Railway Corporation – the West Rail story**

The construction of West Rail by the KCRC provides many key lessons for Government on how to engage the public during this process. Continuous public involvement was stressed throughout and has helped to bring ownership of the project to the people - a crucial ingredient of success. Points to note are:

- Consultation of different sectors of the public throughout various stages of implementation of new projects, including the statutory consultation bodies and the general public;
- Anticipation of public concerns (e.g. Mei Foo residents would have strong views on the West Rail project because they had already been affected in the past by other works projects);
- Early consultation with the residents undertaken well before gazettal of proceedings;
- Provision of detailed designs, construction programme and other associated facilities to residents and stakeholders;
- Regular communication (e.g. newsletters were produced and mailed to each household in the locality of the project before and during the project);
- Two-way communication to avoid any misunderstandings; and
- A high degree of transparency (through the setting up of a project website, 24-hour hotline and real time web camera monitoring for the public).

Source: Presentation by KCRC, EnviroSeries Conference (3 May 2004)

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 **Consensus Building** – The Designing Hong Kong Harbour District initiative has demonstrated that community consensus-building is possible around an issue as complex and controversial as the development of the foreshore of Hong Kong’s Harbour District. The multifaceted and participative research process that Designing Hong Kong Harbour District has embarked on has helped pull together parties from Government, businesses and civil society to engage in constructive dialogue and to reinforce the need to implement a vision of a world class harbour. As two stakeholders summed up:

*“We were pleased to participate in the Designing Hong Kong Harbour District workshop. Specifically, we consider that the workshop demonstrated very clearly the benefit and value of Government representatives, business, professionals and the wider community coming together and working together to build a wide consensus on the Hong Kong Harbour District and to develop positive plans for a way forward. The workshop also demonstrated an excellent mechanism for consensus building that could have wider application to similar issues of genuine concern.”*

*“As a leading local and regional company, we support the need for a sustainable decision-making and planning framework to promote and develop Hong Kong's unique Harbour front. The Harbour must be fully accessible for leisure, recreation and tourism purposes, and this in turn requires strong decision making in terms of future transport, infrastructure and development planning. We are pleased to be a key stakeholder within this consensus building initiative and fully endorse the report's conclusions and recommendations.”*

- 5.2 **Faith in the Future** – The study comes at a time when Hong Kong itself is going through a dynamic process of political reform and debate on governance. Much of the discussions regarding the Harbour and surrounding areas are symbolic of other planning issues affecting Hong Kong’s community. Widespread concern remains as to the legitimacy of the Government’s decisions for further reclamation and the purpose and benefits of such actions, as well as the ability of the existing infrastructure planning mechanisms to deliver on the promise of a world-class Harbour District. Therefore, the process with which the Government proceeds with enhancing the Harbour District and how well this reflects community aspirations, can be an important step in developing a positive political climate and increasing faith in the future.
- 5.3 **The Protection of the Harbour Ordinance** – The Ordinance safeguards the Harbour and has served to kindle controversy, but does not provided

guidance for enhancing Hong Kong's key assets – the Harbour, its stunning views and foreshore areas. Current interpretation rests on what 'overriding need' can be construed as. The danger therein lies that this wording can be used to justify one 'thing' but not necessarily the 'things' which best serve those who wish the Harbour to be a place of enjoyment and beauty for all. Hong Kong will not have a truly world class harbour if adversarial government and community relations are allowed to persist in land-use planning, reclamation, transport infrastructure, and the development and management of public facilities.

- 5.4 **Sustainable Development** – Fundamental to the success of a world-class Harbour is the embedding of sustainable principles in the planning process and the implementation of the public's aspirations. A sustainable planning and development process should be Hong Kong's ultimate goal, and one that befits a world city of today and for the future.
- 5.5 **An Invaluable Asset** – With the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance in place and the water quality improving, the key issue is no longer the Harbour but the foreshore, i.e., the land immediately connected with the Harbour. Hong Kong will need to build capacity to handle an estimated 70 million tourist trips and 9.2 million residents by 2030. Hong Kong is destined to be Asia's world city for global financial and business services that, together with tourism, form the mainstay of our economy. The Harbour District, the Victoria Harbour, the foreshore and adjacent districts, defines our global brand image and is an invaluable asset in building this capacity.
- 5.6 **Aspirations** – Our research indicates overwhelmingly that people want a vibrant and accessible foreshore in the Harbour District. For a number of reasons, Hong Kong has only partially achieved this and there is much more that has to be done to truly effect this change. The time has arrived for the aspirations of Hong Kong's communities to be realised: early and on-going public participation in any plans for the Harbour District is key; a review of transport and land-use policies, strategies and planning mechanisms is long overdue; and a single authority needs to be put in charge of the Harbour District with the mandate to deliver a Harbour and foreshore that people want.
- 5.7 **Space** – Without reclamation, clear choices must be made between property development, surface/elevated transport infrastructure, and public open space for the remaining land in the foreshore.
- 5.8 **Physical Access** – A 'pedestrian first' strategy is required with a goal of ensuring ample, convenient and liberal access to the foreshore areas.
- 5.9 **Visual Access** – Open corridors with visual access to our Harbour and the spectacular views of the surrounding city are needed from as many points as possible. Where possible structures can be removed to open up views from tourism districts.

- 5.10 **Vibrancy** – More than enhancement or beautification with trees and benches, vibrancy is about the availability of entertainment, retail, food & beverage, hospitality, accommodation, arts, culture, sports, in addition to open space such as parks and promenades.
- 5.11 **Affordable vibrancy** – Tourists will follow the residents (note Stanley, Temple Street, and Sai Kung Waterfront). Care must be given to ensure that development of the foreshore does not preclude free or affordable ‘vibrancy’.
- 5.12 **Active Harbour** – Public marinas, boat clubs, shelters, moorings, piers, launches, boat storage facilities, fishing piers and boardwalks are required east of the Star Ferry along both sides of the Harbour, to promote the development of water sports and other activities.
- 5.13 **Footprint of Roads** – Given the limited space available and the domination by transport infrastructure, it is critical and logical to reduce the space used (‘footprint’ and ‘waterprint’) for surface and elevated roads in the foreshore.
- 5.14 **Roads only Scenario** – Under the current interpretation of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance it appears that Government is adopting a narrow perception that only reclamation for transport infrastructure can pass the ‘overriding public needs test’. Combined with a policy of the ‘highest engineering standards at the lowest cost’ and building infrastructure for overcapacity, the ultimate outcome is a sterile waterfront, a harbour without activity, and a foreshore consisting of only transport infrastructure. A clear policy is required that takes a wider view of “public need” to steer Hong Kong away from this scenario. Enjoyment of a high quality pedestrian waterfront by the public should be able to meet the “over-riding public need” test as easily, or easier, than the need to reclaim for roads and cars.
- 5.15 **Transport Modes** – Current financing and ownership models for the different modes of transport favor vehicular traffic. A sustainable development of the foreshore, and the evaluation of all reasonable alternatives, must therefore specifically include a review of the modal split and related policies.
- 5.16 **Process and Independent Experts** – A clear process needs to be agreed for the testing of all reasonable alternatives, including the appointment of Independent Experts. This will ensure that reviews are truly independent rather than a promotion of existing plans or prevailing views of certain Departments.
- 5.17 **Public Participation** – Community wide participation, including the business community, is required for idea formulation, planning and implementation to ensure that there is consensus on mature solutions, and that the potential for conflict is reduced. For such consultations to be genuine, early involvement (in both practical and psychological terms),

including the setting of agendas and briefs, is required. Continuous public participation is needed during the implementation stages.

- 5.18 **Institutions** – It is strongly recommended that a statutory body is responsible for foreshore development such as a ‘Harbour District Authority’ with a board composed of different stakeholders, full control over areas of land, power over all facilities and infrastructure within its domain, and with clear guidelines on consultation, participation, adjudication, mediation and appeals. This body must report into a single authority at the highest level of Government responsible for land-use and transport planning.
- 5.19 **Town Planning Ordinance** – Issues identified in the study can be taken into account in the current review of the Town Planning Ordinance.
- 5.20 **Integrated Planning** – A ‘visual’ strategic planning process is recommended defining a social, economic and environmental framework for the Harbour District as a whole, which serves as a brief for planning individual areas. Such planning should cover adjacent districts and not just the foreshore.
- 5.21 **Leisure harbour** – By declaring a long-term vision for the Harbour west of the Star Ferry as the working harbour, and east as the leisure harbour (traffic limited to Cruise liners, ferries, military vessels, sailing and fishing craft and the occasional barge when needed) all different Departments, together with the various community groups, can work towards a common goal.

5.22 In addition, a wide variety of recommendations were collected during the research process. Examples listed below are some of these suggestions.

**Central and Wanchai** – By moving the extension of the Convention and Exhibition Centre, and the new Government Offices to North Point/Quarry Bay, Kai Tak or elsewhere, the planned 13 lanes of road around the Grand Hyatt and the 6-lane P2 can be reduced significantly.

**North Point/Quarry Bay** – We recommend to commencing a feasibility study into submerging the Eastern Island Corridor. With the northern edge of the current road as the new harbour-front, significant land values can be created to fund this conversion.

**Taikooshing** – A wide underpass is recommended under the highway to connect with the Quarry Bay park, and the development of a public boat club and related facilities in the park.

**Kwun Tong** – Submerging the Kwun Tong Bypass can create a better connection between Kwun Tong and Kai Tak, giving living, working and leisure in Southeast Kowloon the full benefit of the harbour.

**Tsimshatsui** – Redeveloping the restaurant facilities of the Cultural Centre and ultimately consider removing the space and arts museum to create a visual corridor from Nathan Road.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This publication would not have been possible without the participation, advice and support of the following:

### Organisers

Mr. Paul Zimmerman, The Experience Group  
Dr. Andrew Thomson, Business Environment Council

### Research

Dr Thomas Tang, GML Consulting  
Ms. Aurea Yung, GML Consulting  
Mr. Miskho Hansen, Present Tense  
Ms. Cecilia Chu, Present Tense

### Independent Panel

Professor Peter Hills, The University of Hong Kong  
Professor KC Lam, The Chinese University of Hong Kong  
Ms. Terri Mottershead, MindTheme Consulting

### Advisors

Dr. Wai Kwan Chan, Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce  
Mr. Bosco Fung, Planning Department  
Mr. Albert Lai, Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour; Conservancy Association; Hong Kong People's Council for Sustainable Development  
Ms. Christine Loh, Civic Exchange  
Mr Vincent Ng, Urban Design Alliance  
Mr. Gordon Ongley, Swire Properties  
Mr. Tom Osgood, Creative Initiatives

### Media & Communication

Ms. Loretta Chang, Bbluesky  
Ms. Samantha Fernando  
Yellow Creative (Hong Kong)

### Supporters and Sponsors

American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong; Australian Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong; AGC Design; Canadian Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong; Civic Exchange; Clear the Air; Fairmont Shipping; Friends of the Harbour; Fringe Club; Green Lantau Association; Hongkong Land; Jones Lang LaSalle; Living Islands Movement; MF Jebsen International; Quamnet; Save Kai Tak Campaign; Save our Shorelines; Society for Protection of the Harbour; South China Morning Post; Sunday Communications; Mr Albert Cheng; Mr Erwin Hardy  
*EnviroSeries Conference sponsors:* Freescale Semiconductor Hong Kong; Gammon Skanska; Island Shangri-La, Hong Kong; The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation; The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933); Swire Group; Wharf (Holdings)

### Participants

Over 400 people participated in the survey, conference, meetings and workshop, representing Government, Business and Civic Groups.

## 前言

去年某天，一小群長期居港的人士和土生土長的港人在午飯期間把話題扯到創造世界級海港的最佳策略。我們當中沒有人在商業或專業上參與海港的規劃，但大家都強烈認為，改善海港對香港未來的發展至為重要。我們馬上意識到，問題不單在於海港 — 只要水質在改善，海港問題便逐步解決 — 也在於環繞海港的土地，也因此產生了「海港區」這個名詞。

觸發上述討論的，是政府宣布 Norman Foster's 的設計為西九龍文娛藝術區的冠軍作品。雖然計劃看似回應了許多相關的議題，包括香港缺乏文娛藝術表演場地、把場地業權及管理私有化、一個具吸引力兼開放的無車路海濱地帶、引人入勝的建築設計等等，然而同樣明顯的是，一個由「無」到「全球最大」的建議，對海邊一塊小土地來說，潛在的風險卻很高。

西九龍發展引發公眾爭議的同時，中環及灣仔的填海計劃亦因為法律訴訟及傳媒的報道，開始吸引廣泛的關注。很明顯，要讓維港成為世界級的海港，就需要一股「富創造性的原動力」去為整體海港區的發展前路建立社會共識。

2003 年 11 月，我們透過獨立的渠道集資，委託 GML 顧問公司深入訪問政府、商界、民間團體裏的主要意見領袖。2004 年 2 月，我們決定擴大研究範圍，與商界環保協會及各個商會合作，舉辦公眾辯論、會議、工作坊、研討會。我們亦進行問卷調查，尋求社會上更多人士的意見。這個以多面向建立共識的計劃，其研究結果結集於一系列的報告之內，公眾可瀏覽 [www.harbourdistrict.com.hk](http://www.harbourdistrict.com.hk)。本撮要報告介紹了主要的研究結果。

辯論其中一個最顯著的特點，是「專業」與「個人」意見之間的差異。政府偕其轄下的部門是海港區發展的主要參與者，也是許多在政府內外參與其中的專業人士的唯一僱主，以致許多人士最初極不願意參與討論，暢所欲言，說出為何香港的海濱地帶狀況如此糟透。不過，一俟參與者開始信任搜集意見的過程，不少人都十分投入，提出有見地的觀點：很明顯，大家都極之關切海港區的未來！

研究過程中，其中一個最令人不安的發現是，政府早在 1972 年決定於麗晶酒店附近興建海濱長廊的時候，就已經決定要在海港四周興建連貫的行人長廊。到了 2004 年，此構思連同許多其他改善香港海港區的上佳建議，尚待被納入貫徹如一的海港區策略及可持續的規劃過程。

政府已經意識到社會期盼一個富吸引力及容易直達的海港，並推出一些創新做法，如成立共建維港委員會。然而，尚有基本的問題需要解決。在共創我們的海港區共識建立過程中，顯示不少情況之下，香港的土地運用及運輸規劃機制，似乎欠缺所須的綜合原則，以致系統出現漏洞 — 土地運用及填海都偏向道路建設。再加上政府的設計及採購過程，都採取「以最低成本達至最高的工程水平」的原則，對香港海濱造成的沉重代價至為明顯。我們促請與運輸政策有關的政策局及部門，視香

港海濱的質素為己任，積極參與辯論，反思他們如何可以作出貢獻，締造一個世界級的海港區。走筆至此，請各位安心，「共創我們的海港區」主辦者並無特殊的「反道路」理念。事實上，本人有參與汽車業務。

將來的海港區所需要的，是一個獲廣泛宣傳、可見、綜合的總體規劃過程，市民並可在早期便參與當中。特別是新中區政府合署的位置、會議展覽中心擴建部分、酒店、寫字樓、文娛設施、公園及公共設施，以及這些計劃如何與運輸政策及基建互動，對改善香港的海港區沿岸至為關鍵。

所需的制度安排包括創造一個「總規劃師」的職位、籌組一個「海濱管理局」、檢討城市規劃條例，以及檢討現行的諮詢程序。現行諮詢程序雖然廣泛，但未能引發市民的討論及參與，以確保土地使用及運輸規劃的有關決定是成熟的，並在一個設計良好的海港區的框架之下，協助建立一個生機勃勃、方便、成本合理的海濱。

在共創我們的海港區的研究過程中，特別是在研討會上，我們就如何管理海濱及其設施，得到莫大的啓示。悉尼的海濱管理局（**Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority**）是一個很好的參考模式，我們需要進一步研究哪些地方適用於香港。由維港巨星匯、西九龍、文化場地及設施的現況、星光大道上禁止熟食、許多地方禁止釣魚、缺乏公共遊艇會或停泊設施等等所引發的討論，在在凸顯許多範疇都需要檢討，包括公眾地方發牌活動的規則及程序、文藝資助政策、我們管理場地的方法等等。這都需要民政事務局、康樂及文化事務署、及其他部門，在未來共同參與世界級海港的規劃。

我們相信有關報告合理公正地反映了所表達出來的意見，有關意見已經獲得共創我們的海港區獨立專責小組的核實。儘管研究結果的性質包括批評政府的政策及過程，動機的大前題卻是有建設性，且對政府有支持作用。我們正式與非正式接觸的政府官員當中，大部分都支持一個上佳的海港區。失效的往往是決策過程，對此政府內外都感到挫折。「惱怒」是許多人的共鳴。

各個報告提出原則上的共識，需要進一步努力才能將之化為實際的解決方案。我們相信研究結果會有助於把資源集中於解決問題之上，並改善海港區及香港整體的規劃。

我們感謝政府、商界、社會各方人士，讓「共創我們的海港區」得以成事。我們特別感謝主辦者、研究員、獨立專責小組成員、顧問、支持者、贊助人、認可人、參與者、傳媒在過去六個月所貢獻的寶貴時間。我們希望本撮要以及相關的一系列報告能使讀者有所裨益，並能帶來新的合作精神，共建香港的海港區。

**司馬文 (Paul Zimmerman)**

主統籌人

共創我們的海港區

## 1. 共創我們的海港區

- 1.1 共創我們的海港區的倡議在 2003 年 12 月提出，目標是建立共識，讓香港建立一個世界級的海港區。在六個月期間，在倡議的框架下邀請了眾多各界相關的人士參與有建設性和積極的對話，他們當中有來自政府、商界、社區。行動由 The Experience Group, 商界環保協會及 GML Consulting 共同主辦，並獲得超過二十個大型機構，以及本港知名的社區領袖支持。
- 1.2 維多利亞港以及毗連的區域在此倡議中被稱為「海港區」，是香港的核心，並包括大部分劃定香港形象及生活方式的主要財產：海港、主要金融及商業大廈、政府及公共機構辦事處、主要的古蹟、主要的文化、藝術、體育、娛樂、住宿及餐飲場地。海港及其緊連的地區，是珠江三角洲的心臟，是遊客花最多時間金錢的地方，也是本港居民進行購物、消閒、文娛、體育活動的地方。
- 1.3 嚴格來說，在現行的行政架構或分區計劃大綱 (OZP) 裏，「海港區」並不存在，亦無特別就海港範圍劃出綜合的分區計劃大綱；政府的維港規劃覆蓋的範圍較小，並無包括整個海港區。本研究的海港區，是指油麻地避風塘至觀塘以及鰂魚涌至上環、包圍著維多利亞港的區域。這個範圍包括大部分劃定香港形象及生活方式的主要財產，這點已在規劃署於 2001 年制定的旅遊業行動計劃中描繪出來。與海港直接連繫的海濱、土地、公共設施、運輸基建——特別是由政府控制的——都是本倡議行動所關注的地方。
- 1.4 政府成立了共建維港委員會，以顧及維多利亞區的海濱地帶；目前維港是受到保護海港條例所保護。維港的界限由東面的小酒灣尖至阿公岩尖，以及港島最西之點至青衣（並由該處以直線向北至大陸）。雖然範圍已擴至「毗連區域」及相關的交通基建，但海港區的定義反映出有需要在規劃過程中，整體地包括圍繞維港的區域。
- 1.5 根據我們的研究，我們找出幾大問題：
  - 海濱大部分地方被交通基建佔據，包括地面及高架道路，而且不會有新加的土地；
  - 道路成為分隔有生命力的區域及海港的視覺和實際屏障，因為兩者都是處於地平線，數目有限的行人天橋及隧道又對長者及殘障人士不便；
  - 沿海濱地帶缺乏公共場所及設施，因為大部分地方要不是被行人止步的臨時用途佔據，就是公共事業的所在地，如污水處理、垃圾轉運站，又或者是停車場及交通基建；

- 缺乏活力，因為娛樂、零售、餐飲、接待、住宿、藝術、文化、體育，以及停車場與海濱長廊等開放空間一一欠奉；
- 市民難以通往海港，因為沒有公共船艇設施，供停泊、放錨或貯儲，而海上活動如垂釣往往被禁或不受鼓勵；
- 海港的景色及醉人的城市全景，遭高樓大廈及高架路遮擋。

1.6 這些及其他議題都在研究裏一一觸及，有關建議並以「原則」的形式寫成。這些「原則」歡迎評價及討論，其主旨是為創建海港區的未來建立共識。政府積極參與這個過程，讓一個能夠發展可持續及富活力的海濱的框架建立起來，使之能更有效反映市民的期待。

## 2. 倡議行動的過程及目的

2.1 共創我們的海港區是一個維時六個月的共識建立過程，透過下列幾方面讓約三百名相關界別人士參與其中：

- 文獻研究
- 訪問
- 會議
- 工作坊
- 意見調查
- 研討會

2.2 倡議行動的目的是：

- 標示影響海港區的主要議題；
- 就如何處理這些議題，找出並建立共識點；及
- 向政府呈交研究結果，供其考慮。

2.3 倡議行動的成果：

- 聚合超過四百名各界人士，分別來自政府、商界、志願團體，透過圓桌討論及會議，就一連串有關海港的富爭議議題（包括填海），商討並建立共識；
- 誘發辯論，釐清大家對香港海港區的前景視野，並討論如何令維港真正成為世界級的海港；
- 短時間之內，完全在正常的官式過程及政府程序之外，讓不同職級、不同部門的官員與社會各界人士對話；
- 搜集公眾對海港區現行及未來可行的情況的意見。

## 文獻研究

- 2.4 回顧了一系列政府報告、報刊文章、學術刊物、研究論文、其他文章。資料表單詳見**第五號文件**。

## 訪問

- 2.5 研究接觸了超過九十個組織，分別來自商界、非政府界別及政府，當中我們進行了四十五個深入的訪談。訪談及進一步的研究結果見**第一號文件**。

## 會議

- 2.6 此外，與公眾人士及傳媒在不同地點舉行會議；二月十八日、三月五日、三月十六日、四月十五日的會議，共有三百人參與。詳情見**第五號文件**。

## 工作坊

- 2.7 2004年3月27日，與各相關界別人士舉行了工作坊，訂出建立維港區的主題。工作坊的進程及相關文件分別見於**第二號及第一號文件**。

## 意見調查

- 2.8 2004年4至5月期間，我們進行了一項民意調查，搜集市民對影響海港區的不同議題的意見。二百五十名回覆者的意見結果見**第三號文件**。

## 國際環保會議

- 2.9 商界環保協會於2004年5月3日在港島香格里拉酒店舉行的國際環保會議，聚合了二百名本地及海外的專家，就香港的海港發表意見。會議帶出的主要議題，見**第四號文件**。

## 審核

- 2.10 獨立專責小組檢視了研究過程及分析，認為結果公正地反映了各界所表達的意見。專責小組成員包括：
- 香港大學城市規劃及環境管理研究中心主任 Peter Hills 教授
  - 香港中文大學地理及資源管理學系系主任林健枝教授
  - MindTheme Consulting 專業發展總監 Terri Mottershead 女士。

## 匯報

2.11 研究結果結集於一系列報告，可瀏覽下列網址：  
[http://www.harbourdistrict.com.hk/hkhd\\_new/sub\\_new/pp.html](http://www.harbourdistrict.com.hk/hkhd_new/sub_new/pp.html)

- 第一號文件 · 相關界別人士初步簡報；
- 第二號文件 · 三月二十七日工作坊進程；
- 第三號文件 · 民意調查；
- 第四號文件 · 主要議題；
- 第五號文件 · 研究及會議參考；
- 第六 a 號文件 · 報告撮要初稿及回饋
- 第六號文件 · 報告撮要 (本文件)。



### 3. 對香港海港區的期盼

- 3.1 過往維多利亞港一直是投入工作的海港，填海扮演了重要的角色，以容納海港設施、貨倉、碼頭，及其他相關的設施，以及滿足香港商界與政府不斷膨脹的需求。隨著海港服務移至外港區，許多昔日的海港設施亦轉作寫字樓、住宅、零售物業。
- 3.2 為容納上升的運輸需求，政府在這些設施面前填海，以提供興建道路的空間。不過，原本在八十年代初以填海用作新的住宅及商業用途的計劃，因為保護海港條例<sup>5</sup>而停止。政府現時只會在海港區個別範圍填海。
- 3.3 由於不斷轉變的海濱及上述的發展，海港區一大部分現時遭地面或高架道路佔據。
- 3.4 早至 1972 年，已有計劃在沿海港的地方興建延綿的行人長廊，並以當時的麗晶酒店外的海濱長廊為先行者。政府近年進行的規劃研究<sup>6</sup>，強調海港增值的重要性，利用海濱及其周遭的環境，成為休息、消閒、娛樂等活動的聚焦點。
- 3.5 公眾期盼，特別是過去兩年公開表達的意見，催生了多個社會自發的倡議行動，包括「想創維港」的活動以及保護海港的示威，顯示公眾對海港及海濱區域發展的關注。
- 3.6 從法律觀點考慮，就灣仔第二期填海計劃及中區填海第三期工程都有被廣泛報道的法律訴訟，兩項填海工程都被保護海港協會質疑其合法性。終審法院在 2004 年 1 月 9 日的判詞中，就根據保護海港條例、反對填海的論據提出最終解釋。法庭就中區填海第三期工程的司法覆核作出裁決之際，政府在灣仔及東南九龍填海的計劃亦正進行檢討，確保計劃符合終審法院所訂下單一的「凌駕性公眾需要測試」準則。相關界別人士呼籲檢討司法程序成為管理土地使用及決策規劃的方法的效率與效用。
- 3.7 此外，各界開始對西九龍文娛藝術區將來的設計存疑；落成後該藝術區將會是新的海旁區的重要一部分。此外，海旁尚有其他不同的項目正在進行或考慮當中。

<sup>5</sup> 據政府在 2004 年 6 月 17 日給 GML 發出的函件中所述，「由於香港的社會經濟結構不斷轉變，公眾亦改變了，期盼保護及保存維多利亞港，因此某些建議中的進一步填海計劃不會進行。政府已多次宣布，除了中區填海第三期工程，及灣仔北與東南九龍的擬議填海計劃之外，海港內不會再進行填海。」

<sup>6</sup> 海港及海旁地區規劃研究（2003 年 2 月），都會計劃檢討（2003 年 3 月），香港 2030（進行中）及香港城市設計指引（2002 年 11 月）－詳情見第一號文件附件 B。

- 3.8 一直以來政府享有高度的「自由」去發展海港沿岸，並一直以填海製造更多可供發展的土地，同時進行基建，以應付根據其全港發展策略而不斷擴大的人口所衍生的需要。然而，現時公眾所表達的意見的水平及性質，在在給政府帶來壓力，要其重新釐訂新程序、新建議，確保海港及其四周的區域發展是可持續的，並且符合香港對未來的期盼。

在我們與相關界別人士的訪談當中，幾乎所有受訪者都認為海港對香港未來十分關鍵。

大部分相界關別的人士都同意下列幾點：

- 海港是香港最首要的象徵，也是一項獨特、無可代替的資產。
- 它包含重要的歷史、經濟、社會、文化價值。
- 維港屬於香港人，同時形成一個焦點，協助界定港人的身分。
- 它是人們聚首一堂的地方，而且是香港的集體記憶的一部分。
- 它是旅遊業重要的經濟資源。

來源：第一號文件 (附件 G)

- 3.9 隨著保護海港條例的實施以及水質改善，重點亦由海港本身轉移到海岸，也就是說，直接連接海港的土地。相關界別人士表達的觀點，包括需要有方便通往海港的路徑，人口密度控制，在海旁設立、分配特別活動區域，設立並管理支援設施，以在未來支援這些用途，並控制海港兩旁的樓宇高度。

3.10 維港的海濱對香港的國際形象十分關鍵，而且對建立此一形象來說是無價的資產。2004年4至5月期間進行的調查顯示（見第三號文件），香港的海港要成為世界級，就必須具備下列的特點：

生氣

- 引人入勝的海港景色
- 海上旅遊及休息活動
- 歷史意義
- 海港兩旁有令人難忘的建築及樓宇設計
- 環境質素
- 一個「活」的海港（雀鳥，釣魚，揚帆等）

活動

- 多項文化藝術選擇
- 綠色地帶／園林設計
- 多項餐飲選擇
- 充足的戶外地方
- 休息及娛樂設施

通達

- 行人可容易到達及走動
- 多項公共交通接駁

3.11 要做到上述幾點，必須承認土地供應有限，並把互相競逐土地資源的用途緩急先後。海濱發展不足，並主要用作汽車幹線。地面及高架路延伸海旁大部分地方，限制了海濱的發展，亦令行人卻步。

3.12 以填海增加土地供應的可能性降低，因此需要更大、更有協調的精力，在海港區內重新編排交通基建，並重組土地用途。

3.13 嚮應城市規劃委員會的理想宣言——令維多利亞港成為「富吸引力、朝氣蓬勃、交通暢達及象徵香港的海港——港人之港，活力之港」，各個相關界別的人士呼籲集中於如何將土地分區及如何為活動發牌等「軟性」議題，使海濱富有活力。

3.14 第三號文件刊錄的 GML 民意調查進一步顯示下列結果：

**對海港區海濱「重要」的頭五個議題**

- |              |       |
|--------------|-------|
| • 引人入勝的海港景色  | 88.7% |
| • 行人可容易到達及走動 | 86.6% |
| • 環境質素       | 85.8% |
| • 充足的戶外空間    | 85.8% |
| • 綠色地帶/園林設計  | 83.7% |

(% 顯示受訪者認為「重要或程度更高」的百分比)

3.15 相關界別人士<sup>7</sup>的部分意見包括：

- 海港區不應單單爲了遊客，而應該爲香港人而發展及改良。
- 現有的海濱行人長廊及海岸區缺乏生氣、冰冷，活動缺乏多元選擇。
- 公眾容易抵達海濱，對改善生活質素十分關鍵。
- 海濱的餐飲、購物、閒坐、娛樂區域，應該以多用途爲基礎，並能供日夜使用。
- 戶外藝術、劇場、其他活動能製造朝氣勃勃及充滿動力的氣氛。
- 需要更多供鬆馳及消閒的戶外空間。

<sup>7</sup> 見第一號文件附件 G

## 4. 主要議題及原則

### 土地用途及城市設計

4.1 根據研究期間搜集的資料（見**第四號文件**第三章），建議下列土地用途及城市設計原則：

#### 土地用途及城市設計原則

- 要創建一個世界級的海港區，海港四周的有限土地必須合理運用，以提供一個充滿生氣、活力、容易到達的海濱，讓居民及遊客享用。
- 由於未來繼續大量填海的可能性不大，必須協調力量，為整個海港區訂出統一計劃，確保土地分布是可持續的，讓整個海港區內的公用事業、物業發展、交通基建、公眾戶外空間及設施等用途之間取得平衡。
- 公眾希望海濱平衡各項功能，同時擁有一個活躍的海港及朝氣勃勃的體驗，包括行人走動便捷，充足的戶外空間，視野無礙，以及娛樂、藝術、文化、體育、零售、待客、住宿、餐飲等設施。
- 就海港規劃、城市設計、綠化等其實已有相當成熟的原則，以改善海港、確立它是香港主要的自然財產；現在需要的是讓原則實施的決心。這些原則包括一條延綿的行人長廊（早於 1972 年提出），層推的建築高度，視野無礙（由海港望出或望向海港皆如是），戶外公共空間，容易直達，朝氣蓬勃等。
- 海濱的岸線應該包含有趣及波浪形的輪廓，能容納公共船艇設施，如供停泊、放錨、貯儲，以及碼頭及垂釣區，確保海港本身可供市民使用及享受。

4.2 儘管不同政府部門都嘗試有效率地提供公共服務，提升生活質素，但實現改善海岸的工作卻困難重重。相關界別的人士認為，海港區的城市規劃，過於偏重協調不同政府部門之間的目標與需要——公用事業、渠務系統、抽水站、交通。

4.3 一套廣泛的為公眾改善海港環境的城市設計原則早已存在，不過，由於政府的規劃程序嘗試綜合每一個部門的每一項細微要求，因此幾乎無可避免地導致乏味、功利、過於講究功能的規劃方案，同時卻缺少甚或沒有機制，確保上述以人為重的城市設計目標得以實現。

- 4.4 因此，海港區目前大片的土地用途都是為共用事業服務（垃圾中轉站、抽水冷卻、排水、寫字樓、停車場、交通等等），與海濱供市民享用的目標相違背。通往海濱的路遭道路網絡阻隔，而且往往有鐵絲網攔阻去路。土木工程署近日一份函件指出，海岸區有三十五個公眾碼頭及上岸點，但儘管如此，相關界別人士及公眾都普遍認為，通往海港的具質素的通道有限。
- 4.5 即使是公眾易達的海濱區（如鰂魚涌，筲箕灣，紅磡，尖沙咀海濱，會展中心，皇后碼頭），行人廊的長度有限，而且缺乏餐飲店、文娛康樂活動。
- 4.6 由於不會再新加土地，在公用事業、物業發展、地面道路/天橋、公眾戶外空間等各個土地用途之間，必須作出明確的選擇。
- 4.7 這又需要管理海濱後方，減低或消除會製造對上述設施及交通基建需求的土地用途，包括限制尖沙咀的重建，減少因天馬艦（中區政府合署）及灣仔（會議展覽中心擴建部分）的土地用途而製造的新交通需求。正如 GML 的調查顯示，62%的受訪者認為在海港旁邊放置政府辦事處，相比起其他用途而言並「不重要」。
- 4.8 有愈來愈多呼聲要求重新設計、重新推動、改善現有的地點及設施，而不是重頭發展新的項目。新項目需要更小空間及土地面積，但會牽涉成本及「擾民」。新的開放空間、改良的行人接駁、附加的娛樂、零售餐飲、住宿、文化、藝術、體育設施，可以協助平衡不同功能，以及創造海濱的活潑體驗。
- 4.9 需要多條開放長廊，讓海港及包圍海港的城市美景成為公眾可享用的景觀，並且應該盡量在市內開闢能觀景的地點。在可能的情況下，可以移走建築物，讓人從主要道路便能觀賞維港的海濱。
- 4.10 除了一個私人的遊艇會和皇后碼頭之外，實在缺乏往維港水域的方便通道，讓市民參與水上運動或其他活動。公共小艇停靠區、船艇俱樂部、避風塘、停泊處、下水滑道、船艇貯儲站等，都是天星碼頭以東沿維港兩岸所須的設施，讓公眾能夠前往維港參與休閒活動。
- 4.11 規劃署及香港旅遊發展局在 2001 年 5 月所進行的海港規劃研究中，把海港設計的原則詮釋為：
- 讓那些設於海旁會較有利的旅遊和康樂用途，優先設於海港中心區；但同時兼顧其他用途的需要
  - 把旅遊景點組成遊覽區群

- 把旅遊景點集中設於海港中心區；海港中心區經小心設計，並且容入一個園林設計框架當中
- 把次級遊覽區和康樂用途設於外港一帶，提供良好的接駁前往海港中心區
- 改善公共運輸系統與海旁行人通道的連接
- 闢設更連貫的海濱長廊，把各個旅遊景點連接起來
- 通過改善視覺、景觀和行人連接系統，把毗鄰地區與公眾海旁地區融為一體
- 盡量避免破壞海港的環境和景觀，以及保存天然海岸線

4.12 相關界別的人士認為，上述原則主要以旅遊業主導，原因可能與研究的定義及進行方法有關。公眾實質的參與似乎不足。改善維港，應該首先從居民的需要出發，因為遊客會跟隨居民所好。亦有相關界別的人士認為遊覽區群的構思有局限，而且需要視整個維港區為一個區群，混合發展。

## 運輸政策及基建

4.13 在第四號文件（第四章），就運輸原則有以下建議：

### 運輸政策及基建原則

- 交通暢順，跟公眾希望享受維港海旁的空間及通道兩者之間，應該取得平衡
- 令香港保持暢通的運輸基建，應該盡量減少在海旁興建高架及地面道路，而且應該運用工程標準與設計，提高—而並非阻止—公眾通往海旁的便利
- 由於維港天然就處於地平線，行人通道最好亦應該處於同一水平。如果不可能把道路藏於地底，而必須將道路建於地面，那麼行人通道亦應該是寬闊的隧道，又或者在半遮藏的道路上興建大橋面。許多現存的高架行人道不是難以直達，就是不方便行人，對傷殘人士及長者尤甚
- 應該對不同交通工具（如鐵路）進行更平衡的評估，考慮其環境影響、佔地面積、可持續性等，業權及集資方式不應對評估構成影響

4.14 海旁的道路網絡龐大。除了小部分地方之外，居民及遊客很難從他們居住、留宿或工作的地點前往海濱，原因是道路基建成構障礙。除了西九龍及啓德之外，其他地方都有高架及地面道路環繞海旁。

4.15 法庭裁決之後，似乎保護海港條例的現行詮釋偏向以填海建造運輸基建。似乎道路通過「凌駕性公眾需要測試」的機會很大，只要能證明道路有必然及即時的需要，而且並無其他合理的選擇。加上現行政府在採購及設計過程中，採取「以最低成本達至最高的工程水平」的原則，就可能導致一個了無生氣的海旁，一個沒有任何活動的海港，一個只有運輸基建的海濱。**要打破這個悶局，香港的海港區（海濱及毗鄰區域）必須採取果斷及協調有效的土地用途及運輸策略。**

4.16 道路佔據的空間取決於道路排列。現時建路的主要考慮因素是工程上的局限，以及對交通流量造成的代價及阻礙。盡量減少路面面積並非現時地面道路設計的目標。此外，許多相關界別的人士都認為，鐵路或交通管理等措施往往只得到次要的考慮<sup>8</sup>。

<sup>8</sup> 政府在六月十七日給予 GML 的聲明中，表示在興建中環及灣仔繞道時，已考慮過其他選擇，包括西區海底隧道，地鐵伸延至堅尼地城，中環至半山的行人扶手電梯，中環邊陲提供巴士轉駁站，在中環限制上落貨，以及採納電子道路收費。



4.17 由於空間有限，減少海旁道路所佔的空間是合邏輯及重要的目標。這樣的結果是需要把道路轉移到地下隧道，或重新調動現有的道路走廊。如果負荷量不能增加，那麼交通量就必須受到嚴格管理，並限制土地使用，透過限制樓宇高度、容積率、改變土地用途或暫停發展來限制有關地區的使用率。

4.18 由於海港及主要旅遊與住宅區處於地面水平，需要認真考慮行人在這些區域之間穿梭及橫過主要行車幹線的問題。最理想的是，行人通道在戶外地面，以方便行人及讓人看到海港的景色。例如，灣仔北及交易廣場與國際金融中心二期的地面，現時是個死寂地帶，而所謂的「架空之城」的功能性亦十分有限。進一步擴展「架空之城」有製造更多死寂地帶的危險。這些架空地方應該被視為附加的行人設施，而非代替地面的流動性及生氣。

4.19 尖沙咀的行人隧道毫不方便，銅鑼灣、太古城、上環的樓梯/行人道並不能解決流動性的需要。寬闊的行人通道，如通往中環天星碼頭的一條（更寬更佳），遠勝於狹窄的隧道，如梳士巴利道的行人隧道。目前大部分建於海旁道路之上的高架行人道作用有限，而且甚不方便，對傷殘人士及長者尤甚。

4.20 需要以新方法去解決流動性及（缺乏）生氣的問題。就中環及灣仔而言，根據現時的中區填海第三期工程設計，會有戶外的行人走廊——皇后像廣場走廊、文娛走廊、藝術及娛樂走廊，將行人從海港區後方帶到將來的海濱。需要試驗這些走廊是否符合上述的要求。

在 GML 對海港區的調查中（見**第三號文件**），受訪者被問道通往海港及其周圍區域的意見。下列議題被視為「重要」

- 行人容易到達及走動 86.6 %
- 多種公共交通接駁 80.8 %

(% 顯示受訪者同意的百分比)

4.21 由於有提高流動性的需求，居民及遊客前往海港及海濱的人數增加，以及空間上的限制，實在有需要全面檢討運輸策略及政策，包括更強調「以行人為先」，以回應使行人更容易前往海港區海濱的呼聲。

4.22 建議多使用渡輪，包括一個循環渡輪系統，以及水上計程車，以改善海港區內居民及遊客的流動性。

4.23 海濱可持續發展，端賴全盤檢討運輸策略及政策，以及海港區、海濱、後方區域的土地用途規劃。行人沿海濱及前往海濱的走動，應該成為運輸政策與策略檢討的重要部分。

## 中環及灣仔繞道與 P2

- 有關海港海濱的運輸討論，流動性是核心問題。現時的道路基建是整體道路網的一部分，連接中環商業區及香港其他部分，包括新市鎮及九龍區。
- 中區填海第三期工程是兩項餘下的中區及灣仔填海計劃的其中一項。目前，港島北邊的東西行，主要倚靠干諾道中／夏慤道／告士打道走廊。政府研究顯示，此段路已達到飽和，造成現時的交通擠塞問題。
- 第三次整體運輸研究（CTS-3－政府的運輸規劃工具）建議，有需要興建新的主幹路，即中環及灣仔繞道以解決擠塞問題。
- 環境運輸及工務局資料顯示，現時繁忙時間告士打道的車輛/道路負荷比率是 1.1 至 1.2。由於干諾道中、夏慤道、告士打道組成連續的走廊，其一的交通狀況會影響主幹道的其餘部分，CT-3 預計如果不興建中環及灣仔繞道，到了 2011 年及 2016 年，車輛/道路負荷比率便會分別升至 1.3 及 1.4。假設興建中環及灣仔繞道，沿告士打道及繞道的車輛/道路負荷比率到 2011 及 2016 年，分別是 0.9 及 0.7。
- 此外還需要額外的地面道路系統，作為中環及灣仔繞道的岔道，以及應付有六百個房間的四季酒店及有五十五層的 Four Seasons Place、國金二期、中區填海第三期工程上的商業項目、添馬艦的新中區政府合署、以及香港會議展覽中心擴建部分等所帶來的交通需求。
- 單單中區填海第三期工程上的商業項目，就預計會在繁忙時間帶來每小時 1,200 架次的交通量。預計這些交通流量主要會使用 P2 的道路網，並會影響主幹道的車輛/道路負荷比率。
- 換言之，雖然中區填海第三期工程的運輸基建符合 CTS-3 的要求，即以可持續的方式（容量，排列，形式，工具分散，互連，財政與環境因素）保持流動性，需要注意行人能通往海港沿岸，確保預留空間予公共設施及戶外公共空間，以及確保行人能通往海港本身等因素，並無列入考慮範圍。P2 將會是走地下的中環及灣仔繞道以外，另一條主要的地面道路。
- 用於興建地面及高架道路的土地的「代價」，以及對行人通道的限制，並沒有在環繞海港的道路設計中獲得考慮。諮詢期間獲得的廣泛公眾「接受性」，意義有限，因為類似諮詢的對象通常局限於與運輸相關的團體，加上現時公眾、立法會成員、交通諮詢委員會、區議員及其他人士對改善海濱的狀況，敏感程度有限。

來源: 第四號文件 (第四章)

## 制度安排

### 4.24 第四號文件（第五章），對制度原則有以下建議：

#### 制度原則

- 規劃概念、建議、決策應以社區為焦點，並透過盡早與不斷讓相關界別的人士參與及共識的建立，由**過程**發展出來
- 需要更具效益及效率的機制，也需要新的機制與結構，加強不同政府部門之間的合作，並在生活質素，以及成本控制與快捷之間取得平衡；在基建及公共空間與設施的問題上，這點尤其重要
- 建議由單一的機構負責運輸、土地用途、規劃、環境、社區參與，另外海港區的海濱應由可持續發展的原則主導
- 建議由一個法定機構管理海濱，擁有行政諮詢權力，並決定項目的撥款及財務
- 應由獨立機構委任專家檢討運輸及土地用途規劃，確保有關檢討真正獨立
- 社會各界（包括商界）必須在早段就參與制訂策略計劃，制訂規劃大綱，檢討建議中的設計，以尋求共識，確保方案成熟，避免衝突。

4.25 各界普遍同意改善海港區，需要在規劃、設計、管理各方面高度協調。目前，這些職責由不同的政府部門及機構，以至私人組織負起，每個單位都有不同的目標及優先考慮。相關界別的人士指出，在規劃過程中，由於規劃的職權分野是基於行政方便而劃分，令問題更加嚴重，降低了功能上的互相配合。未來的機制必須有所改善，讓不同部門能夠協調，以更容易達到彼此的總體任務。

4.26 政府舉辦的公開展覽及由規劃師安排的公開會議上，公眾可以表達意見。不過，這些活動往往在發展的後期才舉行，以致缺乏不同的方案選擇。公眾人士沒有機會在概念設計、草圖大綱或策略規劃等的早期階段，便在實質及心理的層面上參與當中。政府不大花工夫推廣諮詢工作，而策略規劃亦缺乏視覺效果圖及清晰的選擇。規劃過程中諮詢的對象，往往是政治及專業團體，又或者是立法會及區議會轄下的專責委員會，它們的關注面有限。

4.27 公眾意見理論上可以透過區議員轉達，但這要視乎他們的社區外展網絡是否運作順利。因此，草根及商界人士欲在早期便有意義地參與諮詢討論，所能做到的有限。

- 4.28 去年，在海港區填海而觸發的法律程序，喚起市民的興趣關注。為回應市民對海港有統一規劃的期盼，政府 2004 年 4 月 28 日宣布成立共建維港委員會，提供一個更具透明度、更廣泛的公眾諮詢平台，讓社會不同界別的人士能參與討論。
- 4.29 建議在政府最高層，有單一的機構負責土地用途及運輸規劃。
- 4.30 就海港區而言，建議成立一個法定機構、一個海港區管理局，從屬於上述的單一機構，並全權負責海旁區域所有政策、策略、規劃、運輸、土地用途管理。這個海港區管理局必須 — 而且必須讓人看到 — 有最高層的代表，並對海港區的規劃、運輸、土地用途、長遠管理擁有行政權力，不過同樣重要的是，它必須有責任諮詢意見，確保公眾能廣泛參與。
- 4.31 此一機構如何能在香港建立，急須研究及討論。各界必須協議海港區管理局將會獲委什麼樣的權力，去買賣、發展、管理土地，同時推廣與海港及海濱相關的活動。另外，海港區管理局權力有限，抑或就不同範疇建立不同的管理局的問題，須與法律、財政、土地發展與規劃機制所需的徹底改革取得平衡。
- 4.32 另一個方法是讓城市規劃委員會成為「海港管理局」。首先需要的，是一項戰略性計劃及類似分區計劃大綱 (OZP) 的詳細規劃，定出「海港區」或「海港及海濱區域」。以上可以由規劃署聯同共建維港委員會，以及主要的公眾諮詢渠道訂出。計劃完成後，城市規劃委員會將負責區內所有發展規劃的審批工作，包括運輸基建。這需要立法程序，修改現行的保護海港條例及城市規劃條例。
- 4.33 各界需要就一個清晰的過程達成協議，以測試所有合理的發展方案，包括委任獨立專家進行評估。這是回應相關界別人士的關注 — 他們認為有關檢討應該是真正獨立的，而不是為現存的規劃或政府部門的主導意見提供宣傳的機會或將之合理化。
- 4.34 包括商界在內的社會人士在前期階段便廣泛參與，對於概念形成、規劃、實施都是需要的，因為這確保了成熟的方案有共識基礎，並將衝突的可能性降低。在填海及主要道路等長遠計劃進行期間，為回應民意變化，社會的參與需要持續不斷。

在 GML 就海港區的調查中（見第三號文件），受訪者被問問題他們對 規劃未來的意見。下列五項聲明被評為「同意」

- |                                   |       |
|-----------------------------------|-------|
| • 高瞻遠足的未來思維，而不是以成本及運輸主導的規劃        | 83.3% |
| • 需要綜合的海港區總體規劃過程，而不是以單體項目為基礎      | 82.8% |
| • 必須就不同的規劃選擇，連同清楚的成本及環境評估諮詢公眾     | 81.6% |
| • 生活質素規劃，而不是以工程為主導的過程             | 81.2% |
| • 諮詢過程當中，規劃當局需要清楚分析公眾的關注點，並願意作出改變 |       |

(%表示同意的受訪者的百分比)

## 實施議題

4.35 第四號文件（第六章），就實施原則有以下建議：

### 實施原則

- 有關海港區規劃的決策，應該恪守可持續發展的原則。海港區應該是社區的焦點，本身亦應該發展為一個社區
- 海港與海濱的生氣必須迎合不同階層的品味，亦應是豐儉由人。應該有混合發展以及不同種類的商業形態參與其中——而不單單是高檔的遊客設施
- 要創造生氣，需要檢討在公眾地方及設施給予攤檔、小販、賣藝者及其他人士的發牌制度，以確保有零售、餐飲、其他文娛活動提供
- 一個活躍的海港，應有公共小艇停靠區、船艇俱樂部、避風塘、下水滑道、船隻貯儲處、碼頭、放錨區、垂釣區等，讓公眾可以前往海港參加水上活動
- 海濱區要有長期規劃，管理得宜同樣重要：成立一個海港管理局，分配特定發展項目的土地，為各場地吸引合適的租戶、推廣海港活動、主管宣傳及市場推廣
- 公眾及商界參與實施的階段異常重要，政府亦應該從原則形成的階段，便不斷與社會各界對話溝通，對象包括區議會及商界裏相關的人士，以確保原則得到商界及社會的支持，並在發展及土地用途與基建計劃的實施上，保留彈性
- 需要採取廣泛的措施，降低海港海濱建設及發展工程所帶來的影響（包括臨時土地用途、臨時場地、藝術計劃等），並不斷與相關界別人士保持溝通，確保工程進行的透明度。

4.36 目前，海濱大部分地方被高直的防波堤佔據。要海港充滿朝氣，並且是容易直達及有眾多人士參與當中的活動，就必須向公眾提供設施，讓其可在海港及四周參與水上活動及其他休閒活動。設施應包括碼頭，以及局部或半隱蔽的水體建築，作多種功能用途，讓海港中心區與海濱建立關係。

4.37 海濱的「生氣」必須豐儉由人（「一杯咖啡的價錢」），這可以透過土地業權以混合形式批出，以及採取更開放的公地商業活動發牌制度。遊客是會跟隨本地居民所好（赤柱、廟街、西貢海傍是其中的例子）。必須注意海濱發展並不排除免費或廉價的「生氣」。海濱必須有混合用途——而不只是高檔的遊客設施，這點非常重要。

4.38 工程期間，必須有公眾參與，讓海港區的海旁維持對居民及遊客的吸引力。政府在海港區的發展期間應該與區議會、旅遊團體、商界、公眾保持緊密合作。

4.39 隨著香港進入海港區的工程階段，必須令區內保持生氣。有趣的貯儲設計、市場及熟食檔的臨時牌照，以及臨時活動場所等，都是保持區內活力的方法，並可以在工程進行期間吸引居民和遊客。

#### 九廣鐵路公司 — 西鐵故事

九龍鐵路公司興建西鐵的經驗，值得政府借鏡，參考如何令公眾可以參與建造過程。從一開始九鐵便強調公眾參與，並讓市民對工程擁有真正的發言權——這是成功的重要元素。值得注意的幾點包括：

- 在新工程項目的各個實施階段中，諮詢社會各界，包括法定諮詢機構及市民大眾；
- 估量市民的關注（例如美孚的居民必然對西鐵工程有強烈意見，因為他們過去已經受到多項工程的影響）；
- 在程序刊憲之前，便盡早諮詢居民；
- 向居民及相關界別人士提供詳盡的設計圖、建造計劃及其他相關的資料；
- 定期溝通（例如在工程前及工程期間，製作通訊，寄給工程區內的每一個住戶）；
- 雙向溝通，以避免產生誤會；
- 高透明度（設立工程網址、二十四小時電話熱線、即時網上視像傳播供公眾監察工程）。

來源：九廣鐵路公司在國際環保會議上的演示（2004年5月3日）

## 5. 結論

- 5.1 **共識的建立** — 共建我們的海港區倡議行動，顯示即使如香港海港區發展這樣複雜及富爭議性的議題，亦可以在社會裏尋求建立共識。共建我們的海港區推動的多面向與參與式的研究方法，讓政府、商界、公民社會裏不同人士參與富建設性的對話，令各界更加覺得有需要讓世界級海港的遠景得以實現。正如兩位相關界別人士如此下了結論：

「我們欣喜參與了共建我們的海港區工作坊。特別是我們認為工作坊清楚顯示，政府代表、商界、專業人士、社會各界聚首一堂，一起努力的益處價值；大家為香港的海港區建立廣泛共識，並為前景建立正面的計劃。工作坊亦示範了一個出色的機制，可以在其他同樣引起廣泛關注的議題上，用以建立共識。」

「作為一家主要的本地與區域性公司，我們支持有需要建立可持續決策及規劃的框架，以推廣及發展香港獨特的海傍。海港必須完全方便直達，供休閒、娛樂、旅遊業之用，這又在在需要在未來的運輸、基建、發展上採取果斷的決策。我們欣喜成為共識建立過程的主要相關界別人士，並且完全支持報告的結論與建議。」

- 5.2 **對未來的信念** — 研究進行之際，適逢香港面臨政改及管治問題的辯論。環繞維港及其四周區域的討論，其實也象徵了影響香港社會的其他規劃問題。政府決定繼續填海的合法性，類似行動的目的與利弊，以及現行的基建規劃機制能否令世界級海港的承諾兌現，社會仍存在種種疑問。因此，政府推行改善海港區的過程，以及過程如何反映社會的期盼，其實都是重要的一步，有助發展正面的政治氣氛，並使人對前景的信念增強。
- 5.3 **保護海港條例** — 條例保護海港，並激發了紛爭，不過條例並沒有為改善香港的主要資產 — 海港、其醉人的景色及海傍地區 — 提供指引。目前的詮釋繫於「凌駕性需要」的解釋。這樣的危險性在於，此個字眼可用於將「某個事物」合理化，而非必然是「多個事物」，即使後者最能夠令海港為所有人享用，本身亦成為一處美景。如果在土地用途、規劃、填海、運輸基建、公共設施發展管理等問題上，政府與市民的關係持續對立，香港就不可能擁有真正的世界級海港。



- 5.4 **可持續發展** — 世界級海港得以成功，關鍵是在規劃及實現公眾期盼的過程中，融入可持續發展原則。可持續規劃與發展過程應該是香港的最終目標，此目標亦適用於今後世界級城市的發展。
- 5.5 **無價資產** — 保護海港條例實施，水質改善，主要的問題也不再在於海港本身，而在於海濱，即連接海港的土地。香港需要具備足夠的能力，到 2030 年分別處理七千萬旅遊人次及九百二十萬名居民。香港志在成為亞洲的國際都會，以全球金融與商業服務成為經濟的支柱。海港區、維港海濱及毗鄰區域，界定了我們的全球形象，亦是建立以上能力的無價資產。
- 5.6 **期盼** — 我們的研究強烈顯示，公眾希望海港區的海傍生機勃勃，而且方便直達。基於種種原因，香港只局部實現了這個目標，而且仍需努力以真正推動此一改變。實現香港人期盼的時機已到：海港區任何的規劃都必須盡早及持續讓公眾參與當中；遲遲未有落實的、對運輸與土地用途、政策、策略、規劃機制的檢討工作；以及有單一的管理局，負責實現一個香港人希望擁有的海港及海傍。
- 5.7 **空間** — 在不填海的前題下，必須為海傍餘下的土地，在物業發展、地面/高架運輸基建、公共戶外空間幾者之間取捨。
- 5.8 **行人通道** — 須採取「以行人為先」的策略，以確保通往海傍區有足夠的方便、開放的通道。
- 5.9 **開放景觀** — 開放長廊，讓海港及包圍海港的城市美景成為公眾可享用的景觀，並且應該盡量在市內開闢能觀景的地點。在可能的情況下，可以移走建築物，開闢從旅遊區能觀賞的景色。
- 5.10 **生氣** — 生氣不是僅以樹木或長椅就能創造，亦需要有娛樂、零售、餐飲、待客、住宿、藝術、文化、體育等設施的供應，再加上公園與行人長廊等戶外空間。
- 5.11 **豐儉由人的生氣** — 遊客會跟隨居民的喜好（赤柱、廟街、西貢海傍是其中的例子）。必須注意海濱發展並不排除免費或廉價的「生氣」。
- 5.12 **活躍的海港** — 公共小艇停靠區、船艇俱樂部、避風塘、停泊處、下水滑道、船艇貯儲站等，都是天星碼頭以東沿維港兩岸所須的設施，以發展水上體育及其他活動。
- 5.13 **道路佔用的面積** — 由於空間有限，亦被運輸基建所佔據，減少海傍地面及高架道路使用的空間（無論是陸地或架於水上的空間）都是關鍵、合邏輯的。

- 5.14 **只建道路的方案** — 根據現時對保護海港條例的詮釋，政府似乎採納了一個狹窄的目光，就是只有填海用作運輸基建才能通過「凌駕性公眾需要測試」。加上現行政府在採購及設計過程中，採取「以最低成本達至最高的工程水平」的原則，就可能導致一個了無生氣的海旁，一個沒有任何活動的海港，一個只有運輸基建的海濱。要打破這個悶局，必須採取明確的政策，對「公眾需要」採取更闊的解釋。公眾享受高質素行人海濱能符合「凌駕性公眾需要」的可能性，應該與填海用作起路行車相等，或者更易。
- 5.15 **運輸工具** — 現時不同運輸交通工具的財務及擁有權模式，都偏向以汽車為主要的工具。因此，海傍要有可持續的發展，以及要評估所有合理的選擇，就必須特別檢討交通工具多元分散及相關的政策。
- 5.16 **過程與獨立專家** — 各界需要協議一個明確的過程，以測試所有合理的選擇方案，包括委任獨立專家。這可以確保檢討是真正獨立的，而不是為現存的規劃或某些政府部門的主導意見提供宣傳的機會。
- 5.17 **公眾參與** — 包括商界在內的社會人士廣泛參與，對於概念形成、規劃、實施都是需要的，因為這確保了成熟的方案有共識基礎，並將衝突的可能性降低。諮詢要真正發揮作用，必須在早期階段便讓社會（在實質及心理層面上）有所參與，包括制訂議程及簡介文件。在實施階段當中，亦必須有公眾持續的參與。
- 5.18 **制度** — 建議成立一個如「海港管理局」的法定機構負責海濱發展，董事局由相關界別人士組成，對其職權範圍內的土地擁有全面的控制權，並對區內所有設施及基建擁有權力；就如何諮詢、引入參與、裁定、調解、上訴等方面，管理局應有清晰指引。管理局應該向屬於政府最高層、負責土地用途與運輸規劃的機構負責。
- 5.19 **城市規劃條例** — 本研究所找出的問題，可以納入現正進行的城市規劃條例的檢討工作範圍。
- 5.20 **綜合規劃** — 建議進行「可見」的策略性規劃過程，為整個海港區制定一套社會、經濟、環境框架，成為規劃個別地區的指引。此項規劃過程不應局限於海傍區，亦應包括海傍毗鄰的區域。
- 5.21 **休閒港** — 透過宣告長期遠景，把天星碼頭以西的維港訂為投入工作的海港，以東為休閒港（海上交通只限於郵輪、渡輪、軍艦、帆船、垂釣船，以及在有需要時容許駁船進入），讓所有政府部門及不同的社會團體都可以朝著同一個目標工作。

5.22 此外，研究過程中搜集了一系列的建議。其中一些建議臚列如下：

**中環及環仔** – 將會議展覽中心的擴建部分以及新的政府合署搬到北角 / 鰂魚涌、啓德或其他地方，建議中在君悅酒店周圍興建的十三線車道，以及六線的P2，規模便可以大幅降低。

**北角/鰂魚涌** – 我們建議就東區走廊潛入地底開始進行可行性研究。現時東廊北邊成爲了新的海濱，土地價值可以支持此一改變。

**太古城** – 建議在高速公路下建造一條寬闊的通道，連接鰂魚涌公園，並在公園發展一個公共船艇俱樂部及相關的設施。

**觀塘** – 將觀塘繞道潛入地底，可以令觀塘與啓德有更佳的連接，讓東南九龍盡享海港的優勢，改善生活、工作、休閒環境。

**尖沙咀** – 重新發展文化中心的餐飲設施，最終考慮搬遷太空館及藝術館，讓彌敦道成爲一條可觀賞海港的走廊。

## 鳴謝

本刊物得以出版，端賴下列各位的參與、意見、支持：

### 主辦者

司馬文先生 – 歷豐諮詢集團  
譚安德先生 – 商界環保協會

### 研究

鄧錫權博士 – 智仁諮詢有限公司  
翁懿華女士 – 智仁諮詢有限公司  
Miskho Hansen 先生 – Present Tense  
Cecilia Chu 女士 – Present Tense

### 獨立專責小組

Peter Hills 教授 – 香港大學  
林健枝教授 – 香港中文大學  
Terri Mottershead 女士 – MindTheme Consulting

### 顧問

陳偉群太平紳士 – 香港總商會  
馮志強署長 – 規劃署  
黎廣德先生 – 想創維港; 長春社; 香港可持續發展公民議會  
陸恭蕙女士 – 思匯  
吳永順先生 – Urban Design Alliance  
Gordon Ongley 先生 – 太古地產  
Tom Osgood 先生 – Creative Initiatives

### 傳媒及傳訊

曾小敏小姐 – 藍藍的天  
Samanthi Fernando 小姐  
Yellow Creative (HK) Limited

### 支持者與贊助人

香港美國商會; 香港澳洲商會; 創智建築師; 香港加拿大商會; 思匯; 爭氣行動; 東昌航運; 海港之友; 藝穗會; 綠色大嶼山協會; 香港置地集團; 仲量聯行; 捷成馬國際; 華富; 保護海港協會; 南華早報; Living Islands Movement; Save Kai Tak Campaign; Sunday Communications; 鄭經翰先生; Erwin Hardy 先生

國際環保會議贊助人：Freescale Semiconductor Hong Kong; 金門建築; 港島香格里拉酒店; 香港上海匯豐銀行有限公司; 九龍巴士(1933)有限公司; 太古集團; 九龍倉集團

### 參與者

超過四百人參加了調查、研討會、會議、工作坊，他們分別代表政府、商界、民間團體。

## Notes

## Notes

