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Executive Summary

Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030, scheduled to be published in 2020, is regarded to be important to acknowledge the upcoming urban trend and challenge of Hong Kong and provide confidence to citizens about our city’s future roadmap and development strategies.

This Final Report prepared by the URBANET Consultants Limited (Urbanet) presents the consolidation of information gathered from the previous working stage and provides concrete recommendations and actions for the future SSP exercise.

The study process started with a theoretical discussion to deliver the analytical framework as the backbone of the Study and contributed to the latter study stages. The baseline review covers the evaluation of four study directions, including Institutional Setting, Scoping and Approaches, Public Engagement, and Action and Implementation of SSP practices in Hong Kong.

To crystallise the focus and scrutinise specific issues to propose recommendations, eight major areas of improvement are further discussed and substantiated with commentaries received from stakeholder interviews. The international case study was then conducted to discover highlights and best practices in other cities and examine if they would imply any local potential in improving the current conditions.

The proposed overall positioning of SSP are introduced to identify the role and functions of SSP in Hong Kong, they consists of:

(i) consensus-building significance of SSP in civil society;
(ii) advisory functions of SSP among governmental departments; and
(iii) enabling roles of SSP among governmental bureaus.

Four appropriate recommendations are consequently formulated:

(1) Extend the Coverage of Sustainability Strategies and Consideration on Emerging Context;
(2) Restructure the Approaches and Practices of Public Engagement;
(3) Formulate an Action Plan with Regular Evaluation Mechanism; and
(4) Catalyse Coordination and Collaboration among Governmental Agencies.

They echo with the four study directions, and the thirteen proposed actions under these recommendations are categorised into four types of implementation priorities. They are derived based on the significance of recommendation, the duration and interval, and the required resources or changes in institutional settings.
The table below detailed the implementation priorities and proposed actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Priorities</th>
<th>Proposed Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Immediate Actions</td>
<td>● Benchmark with Updated <strong>International Sustainable Guidelines</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Utilise <strong>Interactive Means</strong> to Disseminate SSP Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Formulate an <strong>Action Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Short-term Actions</td>
<td>● Implement <strong>Parallel PE practices</strong> within and outside the SSP study period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Incorporate a <strong>Monitoring Mechanism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● <strong>Regularise the SSP Process</strong> Including its Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Medium-term Actions</td>
<td>● Enhance the <strong>Connection between Aspatial Policies and Spatial Framework</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Increase Consideration of the <strong>Emerging Technological Context</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Incorporate <strong>Innovative Platforms</strong> into Continuous Engagement Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Adopt a Holistic <strong>Regular Review System</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Construct an Inter- &amp; intra-departmental <strong>Data-sharing Platform</strong> for Baseline Study and Plan Formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Long-term Actions</td>
<td>● Establish an <strong>Accountable Feedback Mechanism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Establish the <strong>Strategic Planning Working Coordination Unit</strong> under PICO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study eventually targets to provide proper recommendations to the Government for revising the practices of strategic planning in the future. The key takeaway, study limitations, and future pathways of this final report are identified as major considerations for further studies.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

1.1.1 Strategic spatial planning (SSP) has been increasingly adopted around the world as a crucial instrument in spatial management. It is used to articulate a more coherent view of spatial transformation and to frame future development directions. In Hong Kong, SSP has been practised since 1948, when the Abercrombie Plan (AP) was made. However, the reflection of the strategic planning process has been limited. Considering that the latest strategic plan, Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030 (HK2030+) is due to be published, today is high time to review and provide feedback on the SSP processes.

1.1.2 The URBANET Consultants Limited (Urbanet) was commissioned on 20 January 2020 to undertake the study titled “Strategic Planning Approaches, Processes and Practices: International Review and Lessons to Learn for HK2030+” (the Study) to analyse and to provide recommendations for the SSP process in Hong Kong.

1.2 Study Goal and Objectives

1.2.1 The prime goal of the Study is to review the approaches, processes and practices of SSP in Hong Kong, taking into account local and regional context, international experiences, emerging trends and innovations, and to provide appropriate recommendations accordingly.

1.2.2 The Study comprises three main parts, including (1) Contextual Study, (2) International Review, and (3) Consolidation and Recommendation. For the Contextual Study, the Inception Report reviewed the evolution of Hong Kong’s strategic planning and identified possible areas of improvement (AOI). For the International Review, the working papers absorbed the international experiences and best practices, as well as evaluated comments and suggestions from stakeholders. For the part of Consolidation and Recommendation, the Final Report recommends improvements on HK2030+ and corresponding steps of implementation.

1.3 Study Process and Methodology

1.3.1 The study consists of three stages spanning from 20 January 2020 to 18 May 2020. In response to the main study goal, improvements in strategic planning are proposed on the critique on the meaning and ideology of the current strategic planning practice. Therefore, the Consultant adopted a qualitative approach to achieve the established goals and objectives. Five tasks in three study stages have achieved the designated objectives accordingly. Appendix 1 lists the study targets, tasks and outcomes at corresponding study stages, while Appendix 2 shows the detailed study schedule and the order of tasks in each stage.
Inception Report – Literature Review

1.3.2 First and foremost, the Consultant aims at understanding the concepts of strategic planning. By studying the theoretical literature about the origin and development of strategic planning, the Consultant explained the intention and definition of strategic planning and SSP for the study process afterwards. To better grasp the essence of strategic planning, key elements related to strategic planning are identified from the literature. An analytical framework is created based on the literature for the following baseline review with concise scoping.
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**Figure 1.3.1 Coverage in Literature Review**
Source: The Consultant

Inception Report – Baseline Review

1.3.3 With the conceptual understanding of strategic planning, the Consultant proceeded to the assigned subject, which is the SSP of Hong Kong. Spatial plans and related official documents were first examined to understand the contents, approaches and practices of strategic planning in Hong Kong. These findings are organised according to the analytical framework to form the evolution lines describing the trends of SSP in Hong Kong. Beyond the normative findings, views and commentaries from professionals are examined to support the analysis of the strengths and opportunities of Hong Kong’s strategic planning and to fulfil the objective of identifying AOI. **Appendix 3** records the main sources and materials reviewed by the Consultant.

Working Paper – Stakeholder Interview

1.3.4 Focusing on AOI identified, primary data from stakeholders was collected to better understand their views and concerns regarding the current approach, process and practice of Hong Kong’s spatial planning. The interviews also widened the narratives of understanding of the SSP of Hong Kong to fill the knowledge gap of the Consultant.
in view of their diverse backgrounds, years of experience, and personal standpoints which possibly conflict with each other. Besides, these interviews were conducted to test out claims and preliminary thoughts of possible directions in proposing recommendations by validating preferable recommendations in reality.

1.3.5 To gain a comprehensive understanding from various stakeholders, six sectors related to SSP were identified: (1) Planning Authority, (2) Academia, (3) Planning Profession, (4) Economic Profession, (5) Social Profession and (6) Environmental Profession. By interviewing at least one representative from the six sectors, a multi-perspective dialogue between different players can be formed.

1.3.6 Most interviews were conducted through online video conferences while the remaining interviewees replied to our questions by email. All the responses from 16 interviews were received between 15 March to 1 April 2020. Appendix 4 details the background of these interviewees and the gist of interviews are provided in Appendix 5A – 5P.

Working Paper – International Case Study

1.3.7 The goals of conducting the International Case Study included grasping the worldwide trends and development in strategic planning practices, highlighting best practices in respective aspects of the Baseline Review, and extracting insights and aspirations for Hong Kong’s SSP. The Consultant studied the latest SSPs of the selected cities and conducted comparisons of approaches, processes and practices between them, followed by identifying areas that Hong Kong can learn from for improving the current and future performance of Hong Kong’s SSP in the target AOI.

1.3.8 The Consultant completed the case study analysis for four cities, namely Singapore, Kuala Lumpur, Shenzhen and Melbourne, while two sub-consultants accomplished the other four cities, including Copenhagen, New York, Seoul and Sydney. All cases have been reviewed for drafting the recommendation and the highlights of the findings are later discussed in Chapter 5.

Final Report – Recommendation Assessment and Proposal

1.3.9 To achieve the final objective of recommending improvements on HK2030+ and steps of implementation, a recommendation assessment is carried out to combine the findings of the International Case Studies and the Stakeholder Interview and Analysis. In the assessment, the experience and methods from international best practices are applied to the AOI identified.

1.3.10 Furthermore, the assessment evaluates the adaptability and effectiveness of the application to help fit the foreign practices into the local context. Thus, recommendations that are significant, workable and customised are made for HK2030+. In addition, the complexity and appropriate stages in the SSP process of the recommendations are assessed to outline the possible steps and opportunities in the implementation stage.
1.3.11 Deliverables

Three formal presentations were given to demonstrate our findings in each stage. Three written reports after their respective presentations are as follows: (1) Inception Report; (2) Working Papers; and (3) Final Report. A public seminar shall be arranged after the submission of all deliverables. Figure 1.3.2 concludes the study process and methodology.

![Figure 1.3.2](image)

**Figure 1.3.2  Overview of the Study Process and Methodology**

Source: The Consultant

1.4 Team Profile of the Consultant

1.4.1 The URBANET Consultants Limited (Urbanet) is an interdisciplinary planning and development consultancy firm, offering comprehensive and high-quality services along with the planning and developing process. Our name, Urbanet, represents a Network of Urbanists in our working team, which consists of experienced and dedicated professionals from diverse backgrounds. The Consultant believes good intentions are indeed the key leading to good processes, solutions and outcomes for our people.

1.4.2 The Consultant has extensive experience and knowledge in SSP, local and regional planning, development and surveying valuation, natural conservation, sustainability promotion, researching, and community relation facilitation. The Consultant has also successfully delivered and coordinated a number of multidisciplinary planning and development projects. Figure 1.4.1 shows the team structure organised for the Study.
1.5 Structure of the Report

1.5.1 The structure of this Report is as follows:

- **Chapter 1** introduces the background of the Study, the goal and objectives in the Study, as well as the study methodology in corresponding study stages;
- **Chapter 2** illustrates the theoretical support of the formation of the analytical framework applied and elements to be reviewed in the Study;
- **Chapter 3** offers a thorough baseline review towards the strategic spatial planning (SSP) in Hong Kong;
- **Chapter 4** justifies the major areas of improvements (AOIs) in current local practices;
- **Chapter 5** introduces the highlights of international cases and lesson learnt;
- **Chapter 6** suggests the overall positioning of SSP in Hong Kong;
- **Chapter 7** proposes the recommendations and their relevant actions to the current major issues;
- **Chapter 8** outlines the implementation time frame and programme for recommendations and relevant actions; and
- **Chapter 9** concludes the report findings with notifying limitations and future pathways.
2 Literature Review

2.1 Origin of Strategic Planning

2.1.1 Strategy composes one of the most reviewed and greatly developing issues in the scientific community throughout the past eras. Following Lamprou and Vaglona (2017), it is indeed rapid for the historic development of this theory, giving a broad range of meanings, definitions, as well as application recently. The concept of strategy originated in the ancient Greek Age from its military terminology, whilst according to Newman (1951), the systematic technical citation of this phrase has emerged in various scientific papers or documents in current years. Nevertheless, nowadays there is no generally adequate theoretical expression of strategy since the term can be used in many different ways, with numerous interpretations, dimensions, perceptions, also characteristics in line with every field of application.

2.1.2 “Strategy is the direction and scope of an organization over the long-term, which achieves advantage in changing the environment through its configuration of resources and competencies to fulfil the stakeholder expectations”, according to Johnson, Scholes, and Whittington (2005). Apart from this, Scurfield (1985) also considered that strategic planning is about the process of decision-making in terms of the goals or aims of an organisation and the wide range of strategies that are being used in achieving those targets, and is the uppermost level of management activity.

2.1.3 As a common term, the concept of strategy is increasingly expanding and is specialised and studied in diverse scientific areas, including business plans, corporate policy and so on (Lamprou and Vaglona, 2017). Although strategic planning is not about attempting to plan every detail of future activities in each department, nor solely about economic planning, it should be a broad analysis of various aspects or resources. Strategy planning comprises very few simple but vital statements concerning the long-term overall development of a city (Scurfield, 1985).

2.1.4 The process of strategy formulation is a key subject regarding the scientific and academic fields. It is considered for strategic planning to be suitable and acts as a common scientific way of planning, formulating and applying strategic plans, which originally appeared during the 1960s (Lamprou and Vaglona, 2017). The carrying out of strategic planning is concentrated in the discipline of business or corporate management and has numerous interpretations, essentials, characteristics and applications. It forms a targeted manner which considers crucial factors, as well as techniques in a structured and rational method (O’Regan and Ghobadian, 2002). Overall, the framework of strategic planning comprises three particular constituents: the formulation, implementation, and also control or assessment (Lamprou and Vaglona, 2017).
2.2 Intention and Definition of Strategic Spatial Planning

2.2.1 In line with the original meaning of strategic planning mentioned above, strategic planning in the field of urban planning is considered as a comprehensive view of the process of change and a frame for future development directions (Albrechts and Balducci, 2013). This frame defines the way people see challenges, opportunities or practices (Albrechts and Balducci, 2013). The word “spatial” concerns “where” of things, which includes the management or creation of a space, the network and the significant nodes in an area (Healey, 2004). It is considered as a government-led co-production process and a sense-making activity that shapes the behaviour of those who have a role in spatial transformation decisions (Albrechts & Balducci, 2013). Albrechts and Balducci (2013) stressed that SSP is a complement to the traditional statutory planning system in responding to the dynamic reality. Traditional planning methods seem to be ineffective as they are designed for situations of stability (Scho̦n, 1971), whereas in reality, cities constantly reposition themselves, face new issues on public agenda and seek collaboration across a fluid boundary.

2.2.2 The focus of SSP is to address the dynamics in different arenas including economic development, transportation, urban regeneration, environmental management and the integration within these aspects (Alden and Boland, 1996). In SSP, the issues and opportunities found in these arenas are responded via a hierarchical framework, which starts from a comprehensive analysis of issues at the top, down to detailed policies and implementation strategies (Bruton and Nicholson, 1987). On the other hand, SSP is not only a contingent response to wider challenges but is also an active force for enabling change. In the SSP process, values and ideas of desirability and the good society (Ozbekhan, 1969; Friedmann, 1982) are discussed, which are then channelised into strategies in SSP and become an active force for change.

2.2.3 The end product of SSP may not simply be a plan, but a critical analysis of the main processes and the institutional and structural constraints shaping our place and collective ideals, which contributes to an indicative long-term vision, action frameworks and flexible strategies for implementation and a commitment between the key actors (Albrechts and Balducci, 2013). It carries the potential of creating images capable of mobilizing people to action and of constructing a new governance culture (Albrechts and Balducci, 2013). In essence, SSP is as much about processes, institutional setups, and mobilization as it is about the development of argument and justification for future spatial developments (Albrechts, 2010).

2.3 Elements of Strategic Spatial Planning Process

2.3.1 Four critical elements in the SSP process were identified, namely, Power structure, Analysis and Scoping, Co-production and Actualization. Below aims to provide a summary of the essence and key considerations of the four critical elements. The understanding below sets a foundation of how we review the strategic planning
process in Hong Kong and in other international cases later in our study.

**Element 1: Power Structure**

2.3.2 As stated by Forester (1989, p.67), ‘If planners ignore those in power, they assure their own powerlessness. Alternatively, if planners understand how relations of power work to structure the planning process, they can improve the quality of their analyses and empower citizen and community action as well’. Planners play various roles for particular targets, such as innovators, regulators, negotiators and more (Allmendinger, 2017; Christensen, 1985). There lies a common ground – the political basis of the issues that planners have to cope with, that is indeed far from neutral (Forester, 1989). One of the steps in SSP is to find out who are the critical stakeholders, as well as the governance arrangement and its power system (Herslund, Lund, Jørgensen, Mguni, Kombe and Yeshitela, 2015). According to Flyvbjerg (1998), it decides what is vital, that also defines norms and values – power defines reality.

**Element 2: Analysis & Scoping**

2.3.3 “As it is impossible to do everything that needs to be done, ‘strategic’ implies that some decisions and actions are considered more important than others and that much of the process lies in making the tough decisions about what is most important” (Albrechts 2004, p. 752). In accordance with Albrechts (2004), for SSP it has been characterized that there should be a prioritization targeting on a limited number of major issues which are believed to be the most crucial and urgent matters. This is mainly about finding the ‘momentum’, making decisions in terms of the most vital issues while making fair, structural responses towards problems and potential (Albrechts, 2004). It should produce policies and exercises relating to the values in both social and cultural aspects, and also to create something new instead of a solution-based prospect that as a result of present trends, and complements to the traditional statutory planning system (Albrechts and Balducci, 2013).

**Element 3: Co-Production**

2.3.4 Co-production is about discussing and listening to the meaning of challenges, opportunities and visions with those who have knowledge and stake in the issue (Albrechts and Balducci, 2013). At the core of co-production is a struggle for inclusiveness, governmental transparency, accountability and rights of the citizens to be heard and have input in decision-making processes (Friedmann and Douglas 1998). Diverse actors, including politicians, planners, the active (e.g. pressure groups) and the non-active public, shall be engaged such that knowledge of experts, laypeople and those with local information are fully leveraged in SSP (Albrechts and Balducci, 2013). Engagement shall begin before the vision is set and during the SSP process (Bryson and Alston, 2011). New ideas shall be made portable (Albrechts and Balducci, 2013). Resources need to be mobilized such that new ideas “travel” within society. This ensures actors have a common understanding of these ideas, be able to personify them and enter into sensible dialogues in the process of co-production (Albrechts and Balducci, 2013).
Element 4: Actualisation

2.3.5 Actualisation concerns how visions are channelised into future directions and flexible strategies for implementation (Albrechts and Balducci, 2013). The product of SSP shall be able to be an active force for enabling change, rather than merely a response to wider forces (Albrechts and Balducci, 2013). To foster effective implementation, resource allocation decisions and the dynamic process of supervision shall be considered. Grasping the momentum is also essential for the actualisation of SSP strategies, as the resources and environment required for implementation are usually time-specific (Albrechts and Balducci, 2013).

2.4 Analytical Framework and Scope of the Study

2.4.1 The analytical framework (Figure 2.4.1 refers) was derived from the insights drawn from the literature, comprising three major frameworks in terms of the process, steps, classes as well as dimensions and other critical concepts for evaluating SSP (Albrechts, 2004; Healey, 2009; Healey, Khakee, Motte and Needham, 1997). With this basis, the four key features which had been discussed in Section 2.3 were developed and had further modified into four evolution lines as baseline review: (1) Institutional Setting; (2) Scoping and Approaches; (3) Public Engagement (PE) and (4) Action and Implementation with various elements that we would like to analyze and investigate in terms of SSP in Hong Kong context, and shall be discussed thoroughly in Chapter 3. The detailed scope and sources reviewed can be made reference to Appendix 3.

Figure 2.4.1 Analytical Framework
Source: The Consultant
3 Baseline Review

3.1 History of Strategic Planning in Hong Kong

3.1.1 Strategic planning in Hong Kong has been serving as the territorial wide development strategy that facilitated the explosive growth since the 70s in the 20th century. With a total number of seven strategic plans since 1948, it was honoured to have the AP marked the commencement of such meaningful state efforts to promote for the public interest (Town Planning Division, Lands Department [LandsD], 1984).

3.1.2 As the strategic planning mechanism has evolved drastically in these 70 years, the approaches to plan-making as well as the methodology in data collection and lastly the implementation of the strategies have also matured along with the emerging global context, for example, technological advancement in the 70s encouraged scientific reasoning; infrastructure-led developments after post-war reconstruction; and the multidisciplinary growth direction including sustainable development in recent decades.

3.1.3 As such, strategic plans of Hong Kong from different eras have distinctive focuses and objectives just like many global counterparts who have been carrying out SSP. Dating back to the late 40s last century just after the Japanese occupation, Hong Kong suffered from the post-war chaos including loss of homes and businesses, and the AP back then was funded as a welfare scheme that stressed the post-war reconstruction of the port city (Ho, 2018). Afterwards, the Colony Outline Plan (COP) in 1970, the Hong Kong Outline Plan (HKOP) in 1979, and the Territorial Development Strategy (TDS) in 1984 took a step forward to collaborate with census statistics and plan for the economic growth of the city with a wide range of infrastructure projects and new town developments (Town Planning Division, LandsD, 1984). The first three generations of new towns that we are familiar with today, for instance, Tsuen Wan, Tai Po and Tseung Kwan O are the products of these plans (Ho, 2018).

3.1.4 Subsequently, the Territorial Development Strategy Review (TDSR) in 1996 was later succeeded by Hong Kong 2030: Planning Vision and Strategy (HK2030) in 2007 and today’s HK2030+ have included environmental considerations and sustainability focuses which saw a shift from pure infrastructure developments to maintaining and increasing the physical, social and environmental capacities of Hong Kong (Development Bureau [DEVB] and Planning Department [PlanD] 2007; DEVB and PlanD, 2015; Planning, Environmental and Lands Bureau, 1998).
3.2 **Direction 1: Institutional Setting in Strategic Planning**

3.2.1 Institutions are the foundation of SSP as it is extensively read as a public-sector activity by academia, for which government bodies participate in every stage of SSP to different degrees. Therefore, the setting of these institutions is not a single-stage focus but rather a process because it connects and facilitates the different check-points of SSP. Since the introduction of SSP in the post-war period in 1948, the transformation of the planning institutional settings as well as the wider political structure has shed light on the current SSP system.

3.2.2 Dated back to the pre-war period, only the Town Planning Board, which consisted of 5 members then, was held responsible for the town planning development process, and there has been an absence of an established planning office since the founding of Hong Kong (Ho, 2018). Not until 1947, the first Town Planning Unit was launched under the Public Works Department (PWD) to assist in the visit of Sir Abercrombie, and it was soon promoted to Town Planning Branch (Ho, 2018; Town Planning Division, LandsD, 1984). Following the upgrade of the Branch to a full-fledged office under the Lands, Survey and Town Planning Department in 1979, the status of planning as a public service and as a profession have started to climb.

3.2.3 The idea of strategic planning serving as a territorial-wide development strategy that guides public and private investment was then emerged to better facilitate the planning of the sub-regions and Hong Kong comprehensively (Town Planning Division, LandsD, 1984). It is supported by the establishment of the “Strategic Planning Unit” in 1980 and “Structure Planning Section” in 1982, the former of which was in charge of the territorial-wide development while the latter focused on sub-regional planning and upheld the base for the former. It is then observed that planning as a public service has been stressed on as it is believed that different dimensions of planning, especially SSP, are capable of boosting the development of the city.

3.2.4 Seeing a thriving priority of SSP, the reorganisation of PWD in 1982 saw the change of governance of planning and later the establishment of an individual planning body. It is reflected by the reconfiguration of departments since the defederalisation of PWD that planning was governed by Lands, Survey and Town Planning Development in 1982, followed by the establishment of PlanD in 1990 administered by the newly formed Planning, Environment and Lands Bureau, and gradually the evolution of today’s PlanD supervised by the DEVB (Town Planning Division, LandsD, 1984). Across different eras of SSP, PlanD or its ancestor have remained as the worker of preparing, drafting and somehow realising the strategic plans (DEVB and PlanD 2007; DEVB and PlanD, 2015; Town Planning Division, LandsD, 1984).

3.2.5 Given the leading role of PlanD in formulating plans including SSPs that encompass the future development of the city in different terms, the plans are yet to be approved by Legislative Council (LegCo) and the Executive Council (ExCo) for funding and
making them effective respectively. As the LegCo and ExCo are the goalkeepers of the plans and policies, the formation of the legislation and administration bodies is critical to explain the legitimacy of the plans including HK2030+. The ExCo, chaired by the Chief Executive, acts as the highest policy-making body and is seen as the final goalkeeper of policy and plan-making with the greatest power followed by LegCo as the law-making body in Hong Kong that takes the role to review and monitor the government performances and also approve budgets (ExCo, 2017; LegCo, 2020). However, only LegCo has relatively higher public representativeness as it is partially elected by Hong Kong citizens, the policy and plan-making as well as implementation mechanisms are widely regarded as administration-led, and have always been questioned for their representativeness and legitimacy (Ng, 1993).

3.2.6 Majority of the interviewees have also explained the current institutional mechanism, in where the planning jurisdiction is governed by Development Bureau (DEVB) and supported by PlanD as a technical department responsible for plan-making while the execution has always been done by Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) or Transport Department (TD), which implies PlanD has a rather underrated status in the bureaucratic hierarchy indeed. Moreover, as the strategic plans attempted to include non-spatial focus, for which this approach has already exceeded the jurisdiction of PlanD while it has no right to lead other bureaus on their actions. Thus, inter-departmental cooperation and sometimes coordination are vital for a seamless strategic plan.

3.2.7 Yet, the ideal cooperation practices can hardly be found in Hong Kong as shown by the following instances. The jurisdiction of bureaus and departments are constraints towards comprehensive interdepartmental cooperation. Many have suggested a high level of the steering committee is required to execute the intricate strategies proposed in the strategic plans, yet the government still treats the committee as a traditional mediator to ensure the plan would not contradict to their own department’s policies, while some suggested widening the roles of the steering committee. Nevertheless, interviewees from the planning authority generally pointed to the position of the steering committee in the government hierarchy note to remember.

3.2.8 Finally, interviewee F has put forward an inspiring discussion, which she has commented the business as usual settings or practices carried out by the government has contradicted with the intention for doing strategic planning as it is not like a regular planning study but a whole-of-the-city development framework for the next 10 years or so in face of the future challenges and opportunities. Therefore, the question of “should we have business-as-usual settings or how should we not adopt business-as-usual practices for SSP” should always be asked as soon as seeing the need to draft the development blueprint.
3.3 **Direction 2: Scoping and Approaches of Strategic Planning**

3.3.1 The driving factors and goals of preparing a plan are very much related to the existing context when the plan is conceived. A general trend is that newer plans are not only problem-solving in nature, but are also done with an intention to plan in a visionary manner (DEVB and PlanD, 2007, p. 5; DEVB and PlanD, 2016a, p. 1). More forward planning can be found in current plans, for example, the TDSR aimed to create a broad and long-term framework for planning (Planning, Environment and Lands Bureau, 1998, p. 1). The socio-political context also changed from colonial governance to connection with China and the region (DEVB and PlanD, 2016a, pp. 10, 18; Ho, 2018, pp. 144-145; Planning, Environment and Lands Bureau, 1998, pp. 1, 3-4).

3.3.2 In terms of working practice, the interval for conducting SSP becomes more regular. The planning time frame is also extended (DEVB and PlanD, 2007, pp. 5, 14; Planning, Environment and Lands Bureau, 1998, pp. 92, 95). It also becomes less top-down, as public consultation or engagement exercises have been included in the SSP process since TDSR (DEVB and PlanD, 2007, p. 14; DEVB and PlanD, 2016a, p. 1; Planning, Environment and Lands Bureau, 1998, p. 15). While SSP in Hong Kong has always been adopting the rational comprehensive planning approach, including information collection and population projection, more qualitative aspects are considered in newer plans (DEVB and PlanD, 2016a, pp. 1, 6; Ho, 2018, pp. 144, 146).

3.3.3 In view of uncertainties, interviewees generally agree on the importance of flexibility, while they do not have a completely identical interpretation of flexibility. Accordingly, they also see different methods as ways to achieve flexibility.

3.3.4 In terms of the scoping of plans, agreed by the interviewee, SSP should have a balance of scoping and consideration of different aspects, including both economic and also broader sustainability issues that cover the cultural and environmental aspects, as well as both hardware and software infrastructural development.

3.3.5 There are also changes in the planning system. More inter-references between plans and documents in the planning field can be observed. No matter the strategies proposed in these plans are implemented or not, the changes in methodology and approach will become a foundation and a legacy that continues to influence future planning (Lai and Baker, 2014, p. 216).

3.3.6 Generally, the changes above are positive. However, there are issues that need improvement. First, there is an insignificant review to the previous plan. While the fact that the time interval for conducting SSP has become more regular, they do not include a systematic process for review. In most cases, they are completely new plans, with most of the content being started afresh. The plan that has outlined what to review in the most detailed manner is HK2030, which had a full chapter on reviewing to mark the start of the plan (DEVB and PlanD, 2007, pp. 1-8). Yet, the sense of review in the current SSP process only includes updating assumptions and
projections, as what HK2030+ does is merely updating, which is “revisiting” in its own word (DEVB and PlanD, 2016a, p. 1).

3.3.7 Some interviewees also pointed out that the conventional approach of putting economic growth before other sustainability issues (such as quality of life and environmental protection) is still adopted. One of the interviewees from the environmental field mentioned that HK’s SSP is still focused on ‘competitiveness’. It fails to acknowledge the importance of social fabric (including culture and history) to a satisfying and dignified life. Similarly, in terms of cultural heritage preservation, Hong Kong mainly focuses on preserving historical structures but did little to address the management of other non-structural assets related to cultures, such as the people and the development of the traditional industry.

3.3.8 There was a general agreement that the government should balance consideration on both spatial and non-spatial issues, at the same time view sustainability at the broader perspective in the SSP process. Rather than focusing on economic development, more effort shall be put in environmental, social and cultural development (interviewees from the environmental field and academia). While it was acknowledged that there is a need for grey infrastructure to drive development, some added that innovative models that focus more on non-spatial considerations shall be examined in SSP in HK.

3.4 **Direction 3: Public Engagement for SSP**

3.4.1 PE is a vital element in SSP to convince and acquire support from the general public. As defined in the literature review, SSP is a social process which should include various stakeholders to construct its themes (Healy, Khakee and Needham, 1997). Without proper PE process, the plan will be doubted and opposed due to its weak legitimacy.

3.4.2 TDSR was the starting point of having regular PE practices for Hong Kong’s SSP (Planning, Environment and Lands Bureau, 1998). During that period, 4 stages of SSP study processes with 3 PE phases were introduced (PlanD, 2001a). Extensive public consultation programmes were held, such as “70 briefings of 47 community, business, statutory, advisory, professional and academic bodies. Both Chinese and English Consultative Digests were produced for widespread distribution” (Planning, Environment and Lands Bureau, 1998).

3.4.3 HK2030 was another turning point of PE in SSP. It had the highest frequency of PE phases, 4 stages with 4 PE processes. The ways to carry out PE were more diverse and innovative due to the rise of the Internet, such as setting up an electronic discussion forum (DEVB and PlanD, 2007). The public also became more concerned with liveability. Questions from the public as well as responses from the government were more about social values and sustainable development, for example, the importance of sustainability in relation to the vision “To Strengthen the position of Hong Kong as Asia’s World City” (DEVB and PlanD, 2007).
3.4.4 Apart from the above, Hong Kong 2030+ is the latest SSP, which contained one PE period that lasted for 6 months and their practices were similar to what had been done in HK2030 but on a larger scale. More than 250 PE activities were organised by the government, including public forums, topical discussion sessions, and guided visits. Although the PE report is not released yet, the general public was more active in participation than they were for the former plans (100-200 written submissions in every stage in HK2030) as more than 4,000 written opinions were received (DEVB, 2017). It provided detailed topical information to consult people and the general public had diverse means to express their opinions. There were also rounds of discussion and formal considerations in the LegCo. Still, the public had less chance to take part in the agenda-setting process as it was mostly a top-down approach. Limited effectiveness on administrative absorption of politics (Hong Kong Policy Research Institute and Hong Kong Vision, 2016) and late release of PE report also undermined the efficiency of PE.

3.4.5 Some of the interviewees suggested that the PE process should not only appear in the late stage of HK2030+. Interviewee K thought that ideal consultations should start early and talk to people in everyday language. Hence, this can get a sense of what ordinary desire and what they are appealing. After that, the government can go back to formulate broad principles and outline strategies. Both interviewee F and M suggested the government should not just do ad-hoc community engagement in SSP.

3.4.6 From the concern of the effectiveness of communication, some of the interviewees stated that although the government had tried to engage the general public, it was not effective enough. An Interviewee from planning authority, also admitted that the PE booklet was difficult for people who didn't have related knowledge to understand. The statement from interviewee L proved this point as he/she was engaged by the government before. He/she didn’t know how to discuss related topics and not everyone was interested in it and interviewee K thought that there was not enough promotion to the public, and the government mostly told the representatives only.

3.4.7 Overall, the interviewees endorsed it is important to let the public know the PE result. However, the divergence of opinions was that some doubted the late release of the PE result and some stated there are a lot of sudden events that disrupted the release of the PE result. In addition, interviewees illustrated the government has to be more careful about the ways to tackle the opinions. Interviewee P said that the government couldn’t just release the result quantitatively, but ignore the importance of qualitative opinions and an interviewee from the economic sector said that the understanding of the government for public opinions is based on quantitative methods only. Hence, the government has to make a balance between the quantitative and qualitative data which can finally increase the credibility of the plan.
3.5 Direction 4: Action and Implementation from SSP

3.5.1 SSP in Hong Kong provides focus to channel policy initiatives and executions, under a rational and systematic approach. Implementation and practices are the last instruments in SSP for translating planning aspirations into actual planning outcomes. As such, they have one of the, if not the most important effect in the overall planning process.

3.5.2 The earliest AP aimed to address the substantial social problems due to explosive population growth in the post-WWII era, including overcrowding, inadequate land use and poor transportation systems (Wang, 2016). It set up visions for mid-term (10 years) and long-term (50 years) development and proposed several spatial strategies from an experimental perspective. Developing suburbs, expanding existing urban areas in Kowloon and Hong Kong Island by reclamation, improving cross-harbour transport networks by constructing a tunnel, and lowering the population density in urban areas were some examples (徐頌雯, 2019). Although Abercrombie’s forecasts and proposed countermeasures were not completely realised, the issues and solutions he raised were excellent points of reference for the city's future planning work. Concurrently, the government began to improve planning legislation and mechanisms to support future development, including the establishment of the Town Planning Office in 1949, Town Planning Board in 1951, and Resettlement Department and Housing Authority in 1954 (Wang, 2016).

3.5.3 Since Hong Kong experienced an extensive expansion in the socio-economic sector in the 1960s, the development pattern from the 1970s gradually shifted from a unicentric peripheral extension to multinucleate development (Wang, 2016). New town planning has frequently featured a high degree of integration of residential and non-residential elements (Phillip, 2002). This was further preceded by the land use-transport planning model in TDS in 1984, in which additional strategic studies were conducted to facilitate future development in the 1990s to 2000s. Examples include the first sub-regional development strategy for the South West New Territories (SWNT) and the announcement of the Port and Airport Development Strategy in Policy Address 1989 (Cheng, 1997).

3.5.4 TDS Review in 1996 evaluated TDS and provided a basis for the preparation of more detailed plans and programmes to meet the medium (2006) and long term (2011) development needs of Hong Kong (Planning, Environment and Lands Branch, 1996). Examples include the introduction of the sustainable development concept in the proposed planning studies for identified growth potential areas including “the North-Western New Territories”, “the North-Eastern New Territories”, “and Hong Kong Island South and Lamma Island”. They were translated into recommended Outline Development Plans, covering both strategic and non-strategic growth areas (Hong Kong 2030 Planning Vision and Strategy, 2018a).
3.5.5 HK2030 and HK2030+, compared to previous SSPs, have been vision-driven rather than trend-based in the past. They have incorporated the regional context and taken a wider perspective in plan formulation. As such, they have featured less technical but more proactive and pragmatic strategies, such as proposing Central, Southern and Northern development axes (Hong Kong 2030 Planning Vision and Strategy, 2018a), which are modified into Western Economic Corridor, Eastern Knowledge and Technology Corridor and Northern Economic Belt in HK2030+ (HK 2030+, 2017).

3.5.6 However, critics suggest that these pioneering plans solely rely on land use planning and ignore some fundamental issues in our society (HKU Convocation Standing Committee, 2004; 王潔思, 2018b). The vision itself in the current SSP concerns merely with two keywords through ‘livable’ and ‘competitive’. Observed from the plan by him, they both referred to a narrow sense in which meaning ‘space’ for accommodation and offices and economic growth which was labelled as ‘development’ respectively. Mentioned by interviewee I, the vision proposed was all related to land supply while overlooking other issues including conservation, natural environment, social fabric such as culture and history, etc.

3.5.7 Apart from these, the lack of a clear implementation plan leads to doubts in terms of putting the plan into actions, considered by interviewees I, L, F. Additionally, the spatial concepts suggested in the SSP including the bubble diagrams, corridors, the areas of NDA and Central Business District 3 (CBD3) were unclear on their implementation, questioned by interviewee F, the way of how those universities linked as a corridor which in fact remained uncertain as there were no rules, detail settings or plans on certain facilities.

3.5.8 Moreover, a reason for failing the translation between vision to actions is the process of consensus-building between the public and the authority. As said by an interviewee, there was a huge time gap between PE and the actualization of plans, which planning consultation often directly skipped to the last step while ignoring the process in the beginning or middle stages, and informed the public only until the detailed plan was drawn.

3.5.9 Considered by interviewee C, F and K, Hong Kong today lacks a monitoring mechanism which should be a process or a procedure during the implementation stage. The inexistence of this leads to ineffective monitoring by the public as people are not able to observe the developments of plans clearly and openly. Similar to this, the lack of regular reviews on SSP is also taken into account by various interviewees (J, M, P, O).

3.5.10 The inconsistency of plans affects the overall planning of Hong Kong since there is insufficient highlighting on the process of implementing, in addition, the monitoring or reviewing process of plans. Besides, said by an interviewee, as the reality is dynamic and ever-changing, it is difficult to keep SSP always aligned to actual projects, hence, the solution is to take reference from the latest situation and adjust parameters, which reflects the importance of having a regular review on SSP.
3.6 **Overall Performance of SSP Practices in Hong Kong**

3.6.1 From the evolution lines above, we can see the importance of SSP in Hong Kong as they have already existed for more than 70 years and contributed a lot throughout the history of Hong Kong. In addition, the practices of SSP were dynamic and variable. All of the four directions have experienced different transformations due to their internal and external environments.

3.6.2 The evolution of SSP practices from the colonial past to nowadays is much appreciated for its widened scope of considerations when it comes to planning and development, especially the emerging focus being stressed in the environmental aspect. The planning time frame is also extended and the content of SSP is gradually becoming more forward-looking in nature. Narratives from the public are increasingly considered through a series of engagement activities designed in each SSP from time to time, and so to enrich the public’s understanding and awareness of spatial issues. The status of SSP, and even the planning profession, are also strengthened via more coordination between different governmental departments, and it is also seen as an overarching land policy by high-level administrative bodies in formulating long-term development plans for Hong Kong. Generally, professionals and citizens have contributed their endeavour as well as ideas to optimise Hong Kong’s SSP, the efforts continuously made by the planning authority are deemed impressive and significant.

3.6.3 In pace with the evolving theoretical concepts and technologies, the directions and means for people to conceive their SSPs would be different. In general, the SSP process is developing towards a positive direction. Despite this, there is no best but only better. With increasing living standards, our citizens have higher expectations for SSP and we should not be satisfied with the status quo if we want Hong Kong to make more progress.

3.6.4 Therefore, the SSP in local practices still has room to improve in considering the existing limited capacity of the institutional setting to debate, formulate and implement spatial and aspatial policies covered in SSP. Meanwhile, in view of foreseeable and unpredictable challenges ahead, the current SSP also has not fully manifested its potential in addressing environmental and societal issues with a visionary mindset. The changes in PE practices of HK2030+ also have not been successful to demonstrate enhanced mutual understanding between the planning authority and general public regarding the responses to public views and participation means and communication tools in PE activities. Spatial strategies put forward in HK2030+ are also deemed ineffective and insufficient to advance the actualisation of the vision and give impetus to the progress of progress policies.

3.6.5 A more in-depth discussion of identified major AOI is consolidated in **Chapter 4** so as to lead to further discussion and crystallise the focus to propose recommendations.
4 Major Areas of Improvements (AOIs)

4.1 Overview

4.1.1 Chapter 3 has conducted the baseline review under four directions derived from the analytical framework and has pointed out some positive changes along the year for SSP practices and some potential issues. This chapter serves as a more critical nature, and eight major areas of improvement identified from the four directions (Figure 4.1.1 refers) are discussed in a more detailed way in this chapter.

![Figure 4.1.1 Overview of Areas of Improvements](source: The Consultant)

4.2 Identification and Selection Rationale

4.2.1 There are several criteria for the selection of the main areas for improvement. First, to narrow down the study scope, the most significant and major issues are chosen. It is intended to generate the greatest value for enhancing the SSP process.

4.2.2 Another factor contributing to selection is the authority of the government, in particular the PlanD. For authority, it is not necessarily limited to the scope of work of PlanD. Instead, it refers to the possible actions which PlanD can take within its power to bring changes or impacts. For example, when considering more multidisciplinary aspects that require cooperation between departments, such as institutional setting and implementation, there is still a possibility for PlanD to improve the process.

4.2.3 While only some issues are selected for further study, it is still necessary to acknowledge the presence and importance of those non-selected issues. They have been pointed out in Chapter 3. The government should constantly monitor the
performance in those aspects, and if opportunities for feasible improvement arise, the government should consider taking actions to tackle them.

4.3  AOI-1: Capacity of Institutional Set-up

4.3.1 The aforementioned transformation of the institutional settings in the making and implementation of SSP as well as the existing wider political power structure has laid the background for the identification of some areas of improvement in relation to governance which “Hong Kong 2030+” and perhaps future strategic plans could make reference to the limited capacity of institutional set-up, in both vertical communication and horizontal cooperation is pointed out specifically against a mature administrative and technical planning mechanism in view of the sophisticated planning discourse.

4.3.2 At all times, cross-departmental coordination and cooperation are ideally to be perpetuated in the whole SSP process, meaning the absence of these mutual efforts in any of the three stages would alter the progress and efficiency in preparing and actualizing the plan. The key stages are namely data collection; agenda-setting; and plan realization, for the baseline studies; vision formulation; and implementation respectively.

4.3.3 Baseline Studies often include plan reviewing, identification of major planning issues, and recognition of current and future constraints and opportunities, which are routinely conducted prior to the making of strategic plans, which are engaged with different disciplines. Nevertheless, the data collection for HK2030+ and previous plans have solely relied on the submission of departmental reports that are non-standardized (DEVB and PlanD, 2017), for example, they might have different assumptions and projection rationales that could undoubtedly disturb the justification and foundation of the territorial-wide strategy.

4.3.4 The city is currently under the absence of a common data library platform to be accessed by all departments, especially spatial data although the vision of building a “smart city” stands for a few years now. It is also acknowledged the government has been attempting to build a “Spatial Data Sharing Platform” since 2017, targeting to serve internal cooperation and for public access, the sharing platform is still work in progress (DEVB, 2018). Understanding PlanD takes a leading role in preparing the strategic plans, tasks of agenda-setting are respectably consolidated by the planning professionals under the department with reference to a wide range of experts and advisors, from which the vision of the city beyond 2030 are formulated to guide the forthcoming advancement.

4.3.5 Besides, it is observed an intention to widen the scope of the vision in the recent strategic plans that have gone further from solely infrastructure-led strategies and have attempted to broach into broader socio-economic discourses counting sustainability and liveability, etc., which is again multidisciplinary that could not be accomplished with single institution capacity but joint-professional efforts with
counter-departments. The new attempt explains the essence of planning, that it is never concerned only with development but is committed to improve the liveability of the city for its inhabitants and the sustainability of the city for the growth of the globe. Despite, planning is governed by DEVB while other contributing components in planning, for example, conservation and environmental protection are managed by different policy bureaux with some might not even be a sizable department as shown by the Conservation Branch under Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) (Gov HK, 2019). The technical cooperation between PlanD and these departments might be challenging as more uncertainties would arise from the multiple layers of communications.

4.3.6 Having acknowledged the complexity of strategic planning, it is said a high-level steering committee will be introduced in HK2030+ in accountable for the policy-implementation down to concrete technical operation (LegCo, 2017). The above agreement between different policy bureaux and their ancillary departments is in progress and is administratively facilitated by PlanD. Likewise, the coordination and sometimes cooperation between institutions in the practical translation of visions have to be carefully monitored given the directional nature of the deliverables of the strategic plans; the far-reaching time frame covered; and the growing emphasis on diverse urban discourses as learnt from the previous plans and the normative model endorsed by the academia. An implementation mechanism including setting out the coordination and cooperation structure of institutions is needed to actualize the Strategic Plan and eventually to make it meaningful (王潔恩, 2018b).

4.3.7 It is understood that the final report of Hong Kong 2030+ has due to be published and we are at an early position to look into its implementation, the key message here is to advise a comprehensive institutional cooperation and coordination mechanism across data collection; agenda-setting; most importantly implementation to ensure a high-level strategic plan in guiding the future advancement of the city.

4.4 AOI-2: Low Flexibility Considering Future Uncertainties

4.4.1 Accuracy and flexibility are positive elements in strategic planning (Xu and Zhang, 2013, p. 80). The first major area of improvement is the low flexibility in actions toward future uncertainties.

4.4.2 As the baseline of a strategic plan, projections form the basis of the whole plan. In terms of population projection and in turn housing projection, HK2030+ reports the projection done by Census and Statistics Department that the population will reach 8.22 million, which is the peak, in 2043 (Nissim, 2016; 思言行, 2016). It is hence questionable why in HK2030+, the city is planned to accommodate 9 million people (Nissim, 2016; 思言行, 2016). As a result, the plan is criticised as nothing more than a guesswork (Nissim, 2016). This demonstrates that accuracy may not be well achieved in HK2030+.
4.4.3 As for flexibility, it is closely related to the scenario setting. Scenario setting is also seen as central to the strategic planning process (Albrechts, 2005, cited in Mäntysalo, Kangasoja, and Kanninen, 2015, p. 177; Zegras and Rayle, 2012, cited in Mäntysalo, Kangasoja, and Kanninen, 2015, p. 177). Scenarios can be set for both projection and implementation. Chakraborty and McMillan (2015, p. 22) classify scenarios as normative, predictive, or explorative. The normative type refers to preferred scenarios built on aspirational targets (Chakraborty and McMillan, 2015, p. 22).

4.4.4 The predictive type refers to scenarios which mark the future that is most likely to happen by prediction based on trends or previous decisions (Chakraborty and McMillan, 2015, p. 22). The explorative type refers to scenarios that illustrate what can possibly happen, in addition to those likely to happen, in response to variations caused by uncertainties (Börjeson et al., 2006, cited in Chakraborty and McMillan, 2015, p. 22; Chakraborty and McMillan, 2015, p. 22). Chakraborty and McMillan (2015, p. 22) also argue that scenarios should be compared for the selection of an intended future which illustrates common wishes.

4.4.5 The role of scenarios is very important in SSP. According to Mäntysalo and Grišakov (2017, pp. 350-351), planners are needed because the future is unknown and unpredictable, and predictions should not be deterministic and be relied on. Therefore, alternative scenarios for the potential futures are needed (Mäntysalo and Grišakov, 2017, pp. 350-351). In relevance to the elements of accuracy and flexibility, this implies that flexibility is needed to complement the accuracy element, which is something that can never reach its highest.

4.4.6 Flexibility is especially important in the planning process which is of a higher level in the hierarchy and which considers long-term developments, such as strategic planning (Mäntysalo, Kangasoja, and Kanninen, 2015, p. 179). It is especially true given that the planning time frame in newer plans is extended (Planning, Environment and Lands Bureau, 1998, pp. 92, 95; DEVB and PlanD, 2007, pp. 5, 14).

4.4.7 However, HK2030+ proposes strategies on the basis of a single scenario (DEVB and PlanD, 2016a). The multiple scenarios element which was present in HK2030, including scenario-based options and what-if scenarios, is removed (DEVB and PlanD, 2007, pp. 12-13). The lack of flexibility to compensate for low accuracy may render the plan a less applicable one, and this requires improvement.

4.5 AOI-3: Reliance on Economic and Grey Infrastructural Development

4.5.1 Although increasing consideration of environmental and social aspects can be observed in newer plans (DEVB and PlanD, 2007, pp. 25-34; DEVB and PlanD, 2016a, pp. 29-31, 34; Planning, Environment and Lands Bureau, 1998, pp. 100-101, 121), there is still an over-reliance on economic and infrastructural development, and this is another major area of improvement. The general approach of HK2030+ is still development-focused. This signifies that the government continues to adopt an
outdated bureaucratic approach, which is characterised by the obsession with infrastructure, to view urban issues. This approach is also the consequence of a lack of effort in identifying the key issues for a visionary future.

4.5.2 First, the plan attempts to promote a view that people need more living spaces, and consequently it argues for the urgent need to increase the average housing area (鄒崇銘, 2016). However, the plan is criticised for its lack of attention to the root problem that there is an inequality in housing (鄒崇銘, 2016). This illustrates the government’s adoption of a more quantitative focus than qualitative focus, which simplifies the problem (鄒崇銘, 2016). It may also imply a misleading interpretation by manipulation of the baseline condition, in order to justify the government’s desire for development.

4.5.3 Second, the plan considers itself as visionary and it includes competitiveness as one of the elements in its vision (DEVB and PlanD, 2016a, pp. 1, 20). However, it is doubtful whether competitiveness can be enhanced simply by infrastructure-focused strategies proposed in the plan, as the importance of hardware facilities is diminishing (子雲, 2017). There is a need for the government to acknowledge that contexts, requirements, and expectations for the current era are different from those in the past (子雲, 2017).

4.5.4 Third, while the plan also explicitly states its aim to increase liveability, it is criticised that its infrastructural-led approach results in more emphasis on functionality rather than liveability (DEVB and PlanD, 2016, p. 18; 子雲, 2017). In terms of environmental issues, there is a lack of detailed deliberation (子雲, 2017). A similar condition can also be found in the cases of strategies of creating an inclusive city and nurturing talents, which are essential to good urban life but only have a one-page elaboration each (DEVB and PlanD, 2016, pp. 34, 42).

4.5.5 Lastly, there is a criticism for the plan’s utilisation of international indicators to justify the importance of economic and infrastructural development while overlooking the positioning of Hong Kong in the new political context and its impacts on urban development (陳嘉琳, 2017). It is criticised that its obsession with development without considering Hong Kong’s uniqueness will finally turn the city into an average city in the Bay Area, which will be conflicting to the vision (陳嘉琳, 2017).

4.5.6 To conclude, while vision refers to a shared future or goals identified (Chakraborty and McMillan, 2015, p. 22), the plan demonstrates several areas which show that the government is not sympathetic enough about citizens’ needs, that the identification of what the problem is and where to go is not satisfactory, and that the plan is built on the basis of numbers. The developmentalist logic behind the government’s decision is criticised to be the culprit of widening the gap between the living qualities of the rich and the poor (陳嘉琳, 2017). This shows the need to move the strategic planning focus away from development. The government’s view of seeing infrastructure as the panacea for wicked urban problems should be abandoned.
4.6 AOI-4: Public with Less Chance to Participate among Different Plan-making Stages

4.6.1 The less chance here comprises two aspects: (1) Hinder the opportunity of PE in each stage when compared with former plans and (2) Public had less chance to take part in the agenda-setting process. Hong Kong 2030+ had put a lot of effort and different means to collect opinions from various deputations and individuals. More than 250 PE activities were held during the PE period (DEVB, 2017). However, there is still room for further improvement.

4.6.2 First of all, looking at the arrangement of PE and the major study tasks of Hong Kong 2030+, there was only one PE phase assigned in the middle of the study. From the PE booklets, we discovered that the Hong Kong government would like to put the consultation of focus topics, overall planning approaches, potential development framework, etc. into one engagement period lasting for six months (DEVB and PlanD, 2016a; DEVB and PlanD, 2016b).

4.6.3 Although this could provide a comprehensive analysis to the general public during that particular engagement period, it lowered the flexibility of the public to express their views. When we compared 2030+ with former plans, they proceeded in an orderly way and step by step. A 4 stages study process with 3 PE periods was introduced in TDSR (PlanD, 2001) while Hong Kong 2030 had 4 PE phases in different stages (DEVB and PlanD, 2007). The general public could demonstrate their views in different stages and coordinate with more diverse opinions. Thus, Hong Kong 2030+ should consider this factor in PE.

4.6.4 In addition, the agenda-setting process was mainly done by the government. DEVB and PlanD had done different qualitative researches and realistic considerations to identify the elements that the general public should focus on (Hong Kong 2030+, 2017). According to the guidelines on public consultation published in 2003, “The decision of when and how to consult the public on any specific policies and programmes rests with the relevant responsible bureau and departments” (Constitutional Affairs Bureau, 2003).

4.6.5 On the first day of PE, the government illustrated their considerations to compile the study and they already stated that they wanted to have a further discussion about the issues under three major building blocks with the public. This might produce a negative impression to the public that the government already had an established position before PE. For instance, the criticism from Tung Chung Community Development Alliance stated “Although it is a development strategy, the strategy is from top to bottom in terms of concept or direction. It seems that it has been assumed that it is necessary to develop new towns and expand capacity” (LegCo, 2017).
4.7 AOI-5: Ineffective Communication in Public Engagement Activities

4.7.1 Former vice president of the Hong Kong Institute of Planner, Mr. Kenneth To, once said that there is a language gap in Hong Kong’s planning. It is about the academic and professional knowledge in the consultation paper (Inmediahk, 2007). Administrative absorption of politics is always a means for the government to handle public opinions from society. Different social elites were incorporated into quasi-autonomous nongovernmental organizations to provide professional opinions to the government (Jin, 1973; Wong, 2015). Various advisory committees also contributed to the Hong Kong 2030+ plans, such as the Lantau Development Advisory Committee (DEVB, 2020).

4.7.2 After combining these professional opinions and quantitative researches, more than 700 pages of informative topical papers and about 150 pages of PE booklets were released. However, since there was a knowledge gap between these professionals and the general public, the general public might consider it as a “white elephant” because they may not be able to read the topical papers comprehensively, such as the rally by “Save Lantau Alliance” (Sing Tao Daily, 2017). Hence, the ways to introduce theoretical concepts to the public are indispensable. The government should produce a sense of down to earth to the public which can lighten their knowledge gap.

4.8 AOI-6: Opaque Process on Digesting Public Engagement Comments

4.8.1 For the recent SSP process, it lacks transparency in PE results. PE is a complex process and requires a lot of time to accomplish its report. Former Secretary for Development, Mr. Eric Ma said, “The updated territorial development strategy will be finalised after taking into account the relevant assessment results and public opinions” (DEVB, 2017). Although the PE period ended on 30 April 2017, the report has not been released after three years. There wasn’t any explicit information about when the report will be issued.

4.8.2 When compared with previous strategic plans, Hong Kong 2030 released their reports into different phases promptly. The first stage of PE ended on 5 April 2001 and Stage 1 Public Consultation Report was released in November 2001 while the second stage of PE ended on 31 March 2002 and Stage 2 Public Consultation Report was released in November 2002 (Hong Kong 2030 Planning Vision and Strategy, 2018a; Hong Kong 2030 Planning Vision and Strategy, 2018b). Both of them were published only about half a year later. Hence, for Hong Kong 2030+, only some photos of the activity’s highlights were shown on the website which would create a lack of confidence in the government.
4.9 AOI-7: Ineffective Translation of Vision to Actual Spatial and Aspatial Actions

4.9.1 Planning visions eventually convert into implementations. However, disparities between intellectual planning and reality actions often weaken planning effectiveness. Disparities identified in the planning implementation process could be observed from stage of 1. translating vision into strategies and; 2. translating strategies into actual practice.

4.9.2 Abstract planning visions introduced by the institute are transformed into spatial strategies headmost. For example, the vision “Embracing New Economic Challenges and Opportunities” set to adapt to the trend towards a knowledge-based economy and enhance economic resilience by diversifying Hong Kong’s future economic sectors with quality jobs (HK2030+, 2017).

4.9.3 However, critics suggested “diversifying economic sectors” would not be achievable because of its narrow scoping. HK2030+ emphasized on high value-added industries such as high-tech and existing financial industries. While ignored secondary economic industries and the benefiting effects brought by supporting industries when considering future development (香港01, 2019a; 鄭司律, 2017). Moreover, 2030+ lacked adequate consideration on existing citizens’ skills and education level (香港01, 2016) which might lead to a repeat of the house-job spatial mismatch during the Tung Chung New Town planning. It raises questions on whether the economic vision should be addressed by such an ambitious strategy.

4.9.4 “Creating Capacity for Sustainable Growth” is another vision in “2030+” disputed for its unusual concept where environmental capacity can be artificially created by strategies such as the ELM and NTN development. Lai Kwong-tak, the founding chairman of The Professional Commons questioned the translation between sustainable growth and constructing infrastructure projects in his article (黎廣德, 2017a) and argued the planning authority’s doublespeak was indeed covering the true vision with provocative names.

4.9.5 The discrepancy could also be identified in the translation from strategies to implementation. Apart from the above-mentioned institutional setting issue, the “Hong Kong 2030+” strategic spatial plan was considered to have insufficient proposals in the actualization phase (任憲邦, 2017). For instance, although the “railway as backbone” concept has been repeatedly emphasized in “Hong Kong 2030+”, concrete transport-related policies associate with NTN planning were severely insufficient (公共運輸研究組, 2017; 鄭崇銘, 2016).

4.9.6 Some scholars also criticized the flashy yet abstract strategy labels in “Hong Kong 2030+”, such as Eastern Knowledge and Technology Corridor and Western Economic Corridor, as these names cannot be effectively converted into realistic practices but
only remain as attractive expressions on paper (王潔恩, 2018a; 黎廣德, 2017a; 黎廣德, 2017b).

4.9.7 Understanding the evolution of SSP in Hong Kong has emerged into a more vision-based and futuristic approach, yet this has also brought territorial planning to a more conservative and intellectual style. Eventually widened the disparity between planning visions, strategies, implementations and outcomes. The planning authority should aim to minimize the void by solidifying planning strategies and increase the linkages between actions and strategies, hence improving the overall planning comprehensiveness.

4.10 AOI-8: Insufficient Emphasis on Regular Progress Review

4.10.1 In general, policy implementation is often the concluding step in Hong Kong’s SSP process, in which limited reviews were conducted on previous planning practices. Though the HKOP in 1979 and TDSR in 1996 had included reviews regarding the last published plan (Friedmann, 2004), they focused on the planning objectives and strategies, instead of post-planning implementation.

4.10.2 While timely evaluation allows planning institutions to facilitate planning by recognizing updated planning situations and adjust for subsequent development actions. Improvement in emphasizing regular progress reviews in respect of the implementations of the plans could be beneficial in the long run for SSP. The government should set up an authorized body which will be committed to policy facilitation and departmental integration.

4.10.3 Compared to the former “Hong Kong 2030”, Chapter 9 and Annex VI in the final report of that plan included brief action timetables on the committed and assumed major transport projects. Implementation timeframe is missing in the current “Hong Kong 2030+” (土地正義聯盟, 2017). This eventually leads to growing concerns on confidence and feasibility issues. For example, 守護堅城關注組 (2017) doubted unachievable for the “Hong Kong 2030+”’s strategy, in which the supply of open space per capita will reach 2.5 sq. meters under the committed planning schedule.

4.10.4 Insufficient hypothetical scenarios and parameters also cannot provide a promising planning outcome to the public (鄒崇銘, 2016). The incrementalism ideology behind Hong Kong’s planning system might also be the reason the authority struggled to bring up a complete implementation timetable (楊子雋, 2018).

4.10.5 Introducing a solid timeframe for implementation and policy review can ensure planning practices would not break off from planning initiatives. It can improve the planning quality and more importantly, enhance the continuity between plans and provide a more solid basis for upcoming spatial planning.
4.11 **Suggested Pathways for improving SSP practices**

4.11.1 This chapter provided detailed elaboration on eight major areas of improvement for the current SSP process in Hong Kong, analysis is also shared and discussed in the stakeholder interviews to test out these claims and arguments. These areas of improvement identified under the four study directions in baseline review, help crystalise the focus of the discussion on highlights in international cases and most importantly, on exploring pathways to offer recommendations in latter stages.

4.11.2 Identified major areas of improvement are concluded as below:

**Study Direction 1: Institutional Setting**
- AOI-1: Capacity of Institutional Set-up

**Study Direction 2: Scoping and Approaches**
- AOI-2: Low Flexibility considering Future Uncertainties
- AOI-3: Reliance on Economic and Grey Infrastructural Development

**Study Direction 3: Public Engagement**
- AOI-4: Public with Less Chance to Participate among Different Plan-making Stages
- AOI-5: Ineffective Communication in Public Engagement Activities
- AOI-6: Opaque Process on Digesting Public Engagement Comments

**Study Direction 4: Action and Implementation**
- AOI-7: Ineffective Translation of Vision to Actual Spatial and Aspatial Actions
- AOI-8: Insufficient Emphasis on Regular Progress Review
5 International Case Study

5.1 Overview

5.1.1 International Case Study examined the possible directions where Hong Kong is able to make a change. Supported by real-life practices in other parts of the world, this part shall suggest whether all claims and aspirations from the stakeholder interviews, as well as some preliminary thoughts from the Consultant, are attainable, and help identify the possible routes for Hong Kong. The Consultant completed the case study analysis for four cities, namely Singapore, Kuala Lumpur, Shenzhen, and Melbourne. Apart from Singapore and Kuala Lumpur, the two sub-consultants accomplished the case study on the other four cities, including Copenhagen, New York, Seoul, and Sydney.

5.1.2 As the developments of SSP in cities vary, a brief background of their strategic planning practices is provided to lay the basis for further discussion. Key insights that are contributing to the SSP of Hong Kong are also highlighted below and they have inspired the formulation of recommendations discussed in Chapter 7.

5.2 Singapore

Demonstrating Proactiveness in Environmental Sustainability Strategies and Sustainability Guidelines as Objective Checks

5.2.1 It is observed that Singapore first formulates its own sustainability strategies in Concept Plan (CP), then uses the international framework to review the strategies. The key measures in Singapore’s CP concluded in the document of “Planning for a Sustainable Singapore” (Urban Redevelopment Authority [URA], 2012) shows a balanced and in-depth consideration of economic, societal and environmental aspects in SSP. In terms of societal sustainability, housing affordability, as well as preserving heritage and identity, are set as two of the key objectives (URA, 2012).

5.2.2 In terms of environmental sustainability, it can be seen that Singapore’s strategies concentrate on the concept of “self-reliance” (interviewee J), which is referred to as the essence of environmental sustainability (Girardet, 1990). It is about minimising resource inputs from the external community and the production of waste outputs (Maclaren, 1996). The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDG) was used as a framework to review if the CP is in line with international guidelines (Government of Singapore, 2018).
Coordinating Holistic Review Practices

5.2.3 Primarily two plans are established for the planning in Singapore: The Concept Plan and the Master Plan. Since the CP aims at catering for the foremost infrastructure projects and land uses comprehensively, the CP review is a multi-agency-involved and a large-scale exercise led by the URA (Hamnett and Yuen, 2019). It mobilises diverse agencies from different sectors, including the environmental, social, economic, and infrastructure sectors. The review is to be updated with the basis of the most recent land use needs and the population and economic trends.

5.2.4 Nevertheless, a mid-term review was carried out in 2006 to consider the rise in population forecast and new growth sectors (Singapore Parliament, 2007). This reflects the fact that to better respond to the fast-changing environment, the Singapore government would conduct regular reviews on their SSP to cater to the latest needs and react to changes.

5.2.5 After the CP, the proposals are translated into the Master Plan, which is a statutory plan for land use demonstrating approved land uses and densities in different areas. With a five-year time interval for carrying out its review, it shows the city’s development for the coming 10 to 15 years, which is a shorter time frame.

Establishing an Independent Statutory Agency as Multidisciplinary Think Tank

5.2.6 There is an independent statutory agency branched out from the executive body of the city-state, namely Centre for Strategic Futures (CSF). On top of the comprehensive nation-wide town planning, CSF was established in 2015 as part of the strategy group directly under the Prime Minister’s Office to serve as a think tank to focus on the whole-of-government strategic planning, prioritisation, as well as coordination within the public sector for the future fast-changing environment (CSF, 2020).

5.2.7 More specifically, the CSF develops scenarios from a whole-of-government perspective to navigate emerging strategic challenges and to harness the potential opportunities for the Singaporean government to work on aspects which might be overlooked by the URA. Besides, CSF conducts long-term multidisciplinary research for the future development of the nation. One of the approaches to strategically plan government-wide is to build mindsets, expertise, and tools, as the Singaporean government strongly believes that having a strategic and visionary thinking shared across the government is central to coping with future challenges (CSF, 2020).

Utilising Lifestyle Survey as Regular Engagement Tools

5.2.8 Opinions collected from the URA Lifestyle Survey 2009, the Online Survey 2010 and the Public Forum were used to compile the “report on the quality of life” and “report on sustainability and identity” respectively, which would serve as references for the draft CP. The draft CP was finally exhibited in the second half of 2011 to further
investigate the ideas from the public. This was the final engagement stage before the publication of the finalised CP2011 (URA, 2010b).

Incorporating innovative engagement tools

5.2.9 Technological integration of public engagement format is identified as a tool to improve the effectiveness of illustration. Virtual Singapore is the major project that promotes interactive engagement exercise for the public (NRF, 2020). A dynamic three-dimensional city model assists the participants to visualise spatial strategies and planning ideas. More approachable and entertaining manner improves two-way communication, and enhances the public understanding of planning issues, especially for the youngsters.

5.3 Kuala Lumpur

Having Spatial and Aspatial Coverage on Housing and Open Space Strategies

5.3.1 To achieve its sustainability goals, both hard and soft infrastructure are considered in Kuala Lumpur Structure Plan (KLSP) (Kuala Lumpur City Hall [DBKL], 2020). For instance, in response to housing issues, both the provision and affordability of housing are concerned and set as two of the priorities to be solved. The definition, current problems, details of the related actions, and target on housing affordability are clearly elaborated in the plan. In terms of open space, not only does the plan mention the provision of open space needed per capita, but it also considers various management innovations (known as “Green Governance”) such as establishing a public trust fund for green areas.

Benchmarking with International Sustainability Guidelines

5.3.2 Unlike Singapore’s practices, Kuala Lumpur uses international guidelines as its framework to formulate its sustainability management strategies in SSP. KLSP2040 demonstrates how each goal, strategy, and action developed corresponds to each SDG (DBKL, 2020). The plan also makes reference to the United Nations New Urban Agenda. Using international sustainability guidelines as a framework helps Kuala Lumpur ensure a balance between consideration of different aspects, from the economic and social to the environmental aspect, comprehensively.

Establishing a Unified Database for Evaluating City Performance

5.3.3 In KLSP2040, a new technology has been introduced for better monitoring and supervising the progress of implementation with a more collaborative departmental infrastructure. In the plan, the set-up of Urban Observatory (KLUO) on the local level is proposed to create a unified database that includes urban information utilised by different parties, including the government, private sector, and community (DBKL, 2020a; KPKT Ministry of Housing and Local Government, 2018).
5.4.3 Based on the goals of the plan and the SDGs allied with monitoring and decision-making aspects, city performance can be analysed by KLUO. It is a more readily available data centre, an information-sharing network, and a major reference for stakeholders. It plays a significant role in monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of actions, and assessing the impacts brought by the developments and monitoring their progress. KLUO also puts emphasis on sustainable development and will conduct annual reports regarding city sustainability achievements.

5.3.5 To make sure the efficiency of KLUO, it will work with those observatories directly, participate with organisations in all stages of urban development, and formulate an information-sharing network among all departments and agencies for better coordination (DBKL, 2020a).

5.4 Shenzhen

Imagining and Preparing for the Potential Futures under Technological Impacts with a Forward-looking Mindset

5.4.1 Shenzhen’s SSP has been characterised by its groundbreaking, visionary, forward-looking, bold, and imaginative mindset (趙鍾維, 2018; 趙鍾維, 2018a; 趙鍾維, 2018b). It has always been a city for urban planning experiments by providing a flexible context for trial and error (Ng, 2011, p. 638; Ng and Albrechts, 2019).

5.4.2 Greater Shenzhen Towards 2050 (SZ2050) demonstrates the visionary mindset of Shenzhen, as it proposes to provide flexibility for the future generation by concerning the potential impacts brought by technological advancement (規劃中國, 2018). It emphasises the planning for future uncertainties by organising a seminar for discussion among experts from the planning profession and the IT sector and even science fiction writers to brainstorm about the discourse and pictures of future (城 PLUS, 2017, cited in 規劃中國, 2018; 規劃中國, 2018). The directions to prepare for technology-related uncertainties include removing the hindrance to technological innovation and reserving rooms for development of IT-related sectors (規劃中國, 2018). Shenzhen is aware of the increasing complexity of the city and adopts adaptive planning to turn itself into a resilient city that can cope with threats proactively and systematically (規劃中國, 2018).

Adopting Rolling Planning Practices

5.4.3 In terms of review, Shenzhen’s SSP adopts the concept of “rolling planning” for review in the Master Plan level every five years (林嘉淇, 2018; 趙鍾維, 2018a). This enables Shenzhen to “plan in a moderately advanced way” (林嘉淇, 2018; 趙鍾維, 2018a). With this concept, Shenzhen is able to adapt to the needs of different eras (趙鍾維, 2018a).
5.5 Melbourne

Ensuring Proper Implementation of Strategies with the Introduction of an Implementation Plan

5.5.1 Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 is the latest metropolitan planning strategy guiding the long-term development of the city. To ensure proper implementation of the planning strategies, a separate five-year implementation plan was released to accompany the strategic plan.

5.5.2 The Implementation Plan expands further on the planning policies, eventually converting them into 112 proposed actions. Each provides a holistic and detailed explanation and relationship with different planning visions (State of Victoria, 2017a). Precise consideration gives vision’s justification for coherent actions and encompasses tangible action plans (Hamnett and Freestone, 2017).

5.5.3 Another component of the Implementation Plan is the clear identification of action stakeholders. While the implementation of Plan Melbourne requires supervision across state government departments, authorities, and local city councils, as well as the involvement of many other stakeholders including local communities and NGOs (Greater Dandenong, 2020; State of Victoria, 2017a), the Implementation Plan lists out responsible parties for lead agencies and project partners across different governance structure layers.

Emphasising Spatial and Aspatial Coverage on Housing and Cultural Strategies

5.5.4 The practice to be highlighted in Melbourne’s case is the mix of soft and hard infrastructure considerations to enhance social sustainability. For instance, in terms of housing issues, its SSP not only stresses on the supply of land to solve housing issues, but also considers reforms to define affordable housing, creates a clear head of power for affordable housing contributions, and clarifies the role the planning system has to play in the delivery of new housing (The State of Victoria, 2017a). For culture and identity, not only does the plan consider the preservation of historical structures, but it also aims at involving the aboriginals (the local people) in heritage management (The State of Victoria, 2018a).

Developing the Monitoring and Reporting Framework in Regularised Review

5.5.5 Since the previous SSP in Melbourne which is the Plan Melbourne 2014, some importance has already been attached to the review mechanism, which requires the metropolitan planning authority to report annually to both the Parliament and the Minister for Planning for the implementation progress and decision making, also conduct a review on the performance of the plan after five years for refreshing initiatives and actions (The State of Victoria, 2014).
5.6.2 The latest SSP in the city, Plan Melbourne 2017-2050, has taken it to the next level. As mentioned, there will be a separate implementation plan for a comprehensive execution plan, which has not been seen before. It will also be updated regularly to keep up with the needs of the city’s growth. Apart from that, a monitoring and reporting framework has been developed to supervise the implementation progress. Both the Plan Melbourne and the Implementation Plan will be reviewed formally with a five-year time interval (The State of Victoria, 2017a; The State of Victoria, 2017b).

Achieving Transparency in Digesting Public Comments

5.6.7 For Melbourne, the planning authority has issued reports to incorporate the comments they received. For example, in Plan Melbourne 2014, “Strategic Principles Engagement Summary” and “Discussion Paper Engagement Highlights” illustrated the interpretation of planning authority on PE comments (The State of Victoria, 2012; 2013). In the making of Plan Melbourne 2017-2050, the authority has also issued a submission report and an engagement activities report to summarise the findings in PE (The State of Victoria, 2016b). Preferences of respondents in PE activities are presented in both quantitative and qualitative methods. The authority also exhibits all written submissions from various stakeholders on its web page (The State of Victoria, 2016c).

Strengthening Public Understanding to Reduce the Knowledge Gap

5.6.8 To reduce the knowledge gap between the government officials and the public. The authority issued a series of publications during the making of Plan Melbourne 2014, including the “Managing Melbourne: Review of Melbourne Metropolitan Strategic Planning”, “9 Strategic Principles”, and “Melbourne Facts: Trends and Opportunities”. These publications explain the then situation of Melbourne and what could be done in the future to the public (The State of Victoria, 2014). The public could have a clearer picture about the place they live in and more importantly, the thoughts and direction of actions of the authority.

5.6 Copenhagen (Extracted from Sub-consultants)

Designing Responsive Public Engagement Exercises in Different Stages of SSP

5.6.1 Firstly, PE exercise in Copenhagen is carried out at different stages. According to the Planning Act (2012), the public should be involved in the planning process at all levels, including the municipal, regional and national levels. A proposal together with its premises is mandatory to be published prior to the implementation of any plans (Plantopia, 2020).

5.6.2 The disclosure of planning information is transparent for facilitating public participation. All the proposed and adopted plans, as well as data regarding land use and the environment are available online for public access on the Danish Natural Environment Portal and the City of Copenhagen’s Consultation Portal (Plantopia,
2020). The general public could have a comprehensive look at, and voice out their opinions on these planning strategies (Plantopia, 2020).

5.7 **New York City (Extracted from Sub-consultants)**

*Having Strong Emphasis on Consideration of Technology*

5.7.1 The city invests in forward-looking physical and digital infrastructure projects and projects that prepare for and mitigate hazards, promote digital literacy, and nurture talents and invest in the technology sector, and recognises the need of resiliency in response to the uncertain future including cyber threats (Plantopia, 2020).

*Regularising the Review with Data-driven practices*

5.7.2 The city regularises a time interval of four years for reviewing their strategic plans, and the process will be completed within 1 year. This helps ensure the content of the plan to fit in an updated context (Plantopia, 2020).

5.7.3 The data-driven planning approach is also encouraged, which refers to the integration of comprehensive and complex data with analytical techniques like Geographic Information System and modelling, to improve the delivery of missions in strategic planning. They also have qualitative data collection methods such as face to face interviews and focus group meetings (Plantopia, 2020).

*Attempting a Wide and Deep Outreach on Public Engagement*

5.7.4 The planning authority has applied different methods to collect opinions from the general public, ranging from pop-up events, small focus group discussion, school visiting tours, community meetings to online surveys and social media sharing. Based on the official figures, there were more than 14,000 citizens participating in the OneNYC survey through OneNYC webpage, social media and questionnaires distributed at public events (Plantopia, 2020).

5.8 **Seoul (Extracted from Sub-consultants)**

*Regulating Statutory Review and Maintenance Plan to Provide Feedback to SSP*

5.8.1 According to Article 23 (Improvement of the Urban Master Plan) of the Act on Planning and Use of National Territory, a review on the feasibility of the urban master plan of the relevant region is needed every 5 years. Therefore, it became necessary to review the 2020 Seoul Master Plan, which was finalised in 2006, and revise the plan in accordance with the change in conditions (Gr8t Planning Studio, 2020).

5.8.2 Other noticeable highlights include the measurement of macroscopic changes of the city, the review of the appropriateness of related plans, the introduction of
Maintenance Plan to provide feedback to the plan contents (issues, objectives, and strategies), the release of an annual evaluation report on existing urban trends and monitoring KPIs, and recommendation on way forward emphasising on policy and implementation plans review. Meanwhile, land-use zoning within urban management plans (UMP) will also be changed upon review (Gr8t Planning Studio, 2020).

**Establishing a High-level Coordination Office**

5.8.3 The establishment of the Planning and Coordination Office (PCO) responds to the low legitimacy of the previous strategic plans even within the Seoul Metropolitan Government (Gr8t Planning Studio, 2020). The PCO is a central policy coordinator at the vice-mayor level, where strategic planning is one of its main focuses and subsequent departments are obliged to follow (Gr8t Planning Studio, 2020).

**Achieving Co-envisioning Exercise of SSP to Create a Shared Vision**

5.8.4 During the envisioning stage, focus group and questionnaire survey approaches have been adopted to understand citizen’s aspirations. Particularly about the focus group, the 100-citizen group was formed by random sampling to include members from a diverse background (i.e. age, living district, occupation, education, etc.) (Gr8t Planning Studio, 2020).

5.8.5 Regarding public communication, the city spends constant effort to enhance public understanding and exposure of SSPs through diversified communication channels. Since the 2030 Seoul Plan, urban basic plans have been simplified into more apprehendable language for laymen and streamlined the number of goals (Gr8t Planning Studio, 2020). Civic Education Programmes such as “Seoul Urban Planning Citizen’s Academy” also strengthen the public’s urban planning capabilities and understanding. Moving into a digital era, online communication platforms have also been adopted (Gr8t Planning Studio, 2020).

**5.9 Sydney (Extracted from Sub-consultants)**

**Establishing a Commission Responsible for Supervising the SSP Process**

5.9.1 Greater Sydney Commission oversees the strategic planning of Greater Sydney, and it is an independent office funded and directly reporting to the state government (New South Wales Government) dedicated specifically to SSP (Gr8t Planning Studio, 2020). It is a legal requirement for departments to comply with the commission’s requirement (Gr8t Planning Studio, 2020).

**Conducting Innovative and Extensive Engagement Exercises**

5.9.2 In contrast to the use of conventional publicity events and briefing sessions at which communication is largely unidirectional, the city has employed innovative engagement methods and the latest technology to facilitate meaningful dialogue
with a wider spectrum of stakeholders. For example, the “Talk Bus” went deep into communities across six districts in the region to invite the participation of local people on the ground and gather their thoughts about their neighbourhoods (Gr8t Planning Studio, 2020).

5.9.3 In addition to the wide coverage, quality outcomes are also emphasised. An exciting event called Community Challenge, which provided a creative platform for students, community groups and practitioners to brainstorm ideas about how to make the cities a better place to live, was held, and a report will be produced to document the finding and to serve as a valuable input to the preparation of upcoming Urban Design Guide. The first-of-its-kind mobile application - My Metropolis App was developed as a continuous commitment to PE, where Sydneysiders, especially young people and children could have a chance to imagine and create their future city (Gr8t Planning Studio, 2020).

5.10 Lesson Learnt from international SSP practices

5.10.1 The SSP practices in eight cities are varied yet insightful for further exploration on the potential directions for each area of improvement (AOI) to propose recommendations after considering the feasibility of these practices in the local context. Particular derived lessons learnt for each AOI are specified below.

AOI-1: Capacity of Institutional Set-up

- **Empower PlanD with higher authority**: to change planning from solely plan-making into a stream-lined process including implementation; co-considering conservation and land supply element is a way to integrated and sustainable development; and
- **Establish an independent think tank**: to build a common strategic mindset shared across the whole government structure in taking the city forward.

AOI-2: Low Flexibility Considering Future Uncertainties

- **Reconsider previous good practices, especially those in HK2030**: to reuse good practices and to increase the number of effective flexibility practices in formulating a strategic spatial plan (DEVB and PlanD, 2007, pp. 12-13; DEVB and PlanD, 2016; Ng, 2008, p. 18); and
- **Explore flexibility methods for strategy formulation and implementation**: to propose projects that are flexible in terms of reversibility and reserve the room for new arrangements for project implementation according to the new situation (Cheong, 2018).

AOI-3: Reliance on Economic and Grey Infrastructural Development

- **Adopt international sustainability guidelines**: to use a well-recognised framework as an anchor to rationalise the strategies proposed in SSP or serve as objective checks for SSP; and
• **Balance consideration of hard and soft Infrastructure**: to address different aspects of sustainability and urban issues which require not only solutions from spatial consideration, but also from non-spatial consideration.

**AOI-4: Public with Less Chance to Participate among Different Plan-making Stages**

• **Implement regular PE rather than ad hoc action**: to make the engagement more comprehensive.

**AOI-5: Ineffective Communication in Public Engagement Activities**

• **Broaden the engagement targets**: to engage not only those actively participated, but also the hard-reaching groups to ensure a thorough and inclusive discussion; and

• **Provide explanation and guidance for the public to discuss**: to publish the facts and conditions of the city to help align the understanding between authority and the public.

**AOI-6: Opaque Process on Digesting Public Engagement Comments**

• **Adopt a mixed-approach in the analysis of engagement comments**: to address the quality and quantity of comments; and

• **Report the digest process in various ways**: to deliver the feedback by more timely and active means.

**AOI-7: Ineffective Translation of Vision to Actual Spatial and Non-spatial Actions**

• **Release development control parameters in SSP level**: to facilitate subsequent discussions of spatial strategies. Constructive evaluation can be made based on shared evidence. This can also ensure strategies in SSP are feasible and manageable for actions; and

• **Prepare an implementation plan together with the strategic spatial plan**: to give out more comprehensive understanding of following strategic actions. This can be done by including implementation time frame and project lead agencies in the implementation plan.

**AOI-8: Insufficient Emphasis on Regular Progress Review**

• **Regularise the monitoring setting of SSP**: to provide status updates on actions to construct mutual trust between the authority and the public by showing accountability, letting the community supervise the promise of the city government; and

• **Form a city observatory**: to formulate coordination with various stakeholders in terms of data and information collection or analysis. In view of the current situation on the lack of data sharing platforms across departments in Hong Kong, this enables authorities and agencies to have better coordination as well as serves as a tool for monitoring the progress of implementation and upcoming trends.
6 Proposed Overall Positioning of SSP

6.1 Overall Positioning

6.1.1 Reviewing the approaches, processes and practices of Strategic Planning in Hong Kong, as well as gaining insights from International Review and Stakeholder Interviews, the Study would like to propose the overall positioning of SSP in Hong Kong, which should be applied not only to the current HK2030+, but also to the future plans. Referencing the analysis from previous chapters, it is suggested a consensus-building significance of SSP in providing foresight in the emerging environment and effectively acknowledging the citizens’ needs and involvement in planning the future of Hong Kong. Whilst, a SSP should emphasise its advisory functions in guiding working tasks in departments especially regarding spatial development, and be optimised its enabling roles in facilitating cross-bureaux collaboration and coordination in both plan-making and implementation process to be well-prepared to future opportunities and challenges.

6.1.2 The following sections detail the corresponding elaboration on SSP’s consensus-building significance, advisory functions and enabling roles, and the full set of recommendations shall then be discussed in Chapter 7.

6.2 Consensus-building Significance of SSP in the Civil Society

6.2.1 SSP is a collective contribution and communication process in pursuit of a widespread agreement for the directions of our city’s future, while incorporating hopes and goals from a wide array of narratives and stakeholders. We negotiate, debate and prioritise the preferable strategies in achieving certain targets during the plan-making process, but more importantly, demonstrate the consensus-building significance in fully acknowledging the strengths and weaknesses of our city with proactive planning to prosper and grow together.

6.2.2 In view of the importance to be inclusive to various aspects and concerns, as well as be welcoming to every citizen in the SSP process, the followings are the proposed recommendations to facilitate the consensus-building practices of SSP:

- Extend the Coverage of Sustainability Strategies and Consideration on Emerging Context (Recommendation 1)
- Restructure the Approaches and Practices of Public Engagement (Recommendation 2)
6.3 Advisory Functions of SSP among Governmental Departments

6.3.1 SSP stressed on strategically formulating spatial planning terms to achieve the vision and overarching goals and objectives, in specific, it is expressed by “a metropolitan business core, two strategic growth areas and three primary development axes” in HK2030+. These spatial planning terms should advise further follow-ups in future spatial development projects in Hong Kong, while they also should imply directions of changes occurred in smaller-scale spatial issues, like land-use zoning, planning parameters and guidelines. Noticing the expanding scope of current SSP practices in Hong Kong, relevant aspatial policies and actions should also take note of the advisory strategic directions proposed in SSP.

6.3.2 In achieving the guiding purposes of SSP to translate vision and goals into spatial and aspatial actions, the following is the proposed recommendation to foster the advisory functions of SSP:

- **Formulate an Action Plan with Regular Evaluation Mechanism (Recommendation 3)**

6.4 Enabling Roles of SSP among Governmental Bureaus

6.4.1 SSP is a rare and precious opportunity to broadly review the existing issues in Hong Kong, as well as to conduct a holistic research and projections for the city prospect at roughly once a decade for current practices. It is critical to grasp the chance to facilitate a more interactive dialogue and collaboration among policy areas, with a forward-looking mindset during the plan-making process and pragmatic concerns for the implementation of strategies. Above all, the process of deliberating over and updating with the latest data and policy directions among bureaux, would be the key outcomes that SSP should enable them to be more smoothened and regularised with the revision on the current institutional setting.

6.4.2 In due consideration to seize the opportunities of SSP to encourage cross-bureaux discussion on upcoming opportunities and challenges, the following is the proposed recommendation to optimise the enabling roles of SSP:

- **Catalyse Coordination and Collaboration among Governmental Agencies (Recommendation 4)**
7 Recommendations and Relevant Actions

7.1 Overview

7.1.1 After the baseline review to investigate the areas of improvement for SSP development in Hong Kong and the lessons learnt from the international cases as well as the opinions from the interviewees, the Team has tried to figure out the recommendations which can suit the local context the most. Although there are numerous examples that we can learn from other cases, not all of them are appropriate to be applied in Hong Kong due to the political, economic, social, cultural, and environmental circumstances of the cities. Hence, we have to deliberate the recommendations carefully to ensure that they are feasible to be implemented in Hong Kong.

7.1.2 With the considerations of the local context of Hong Kong, four major recommendations will be suggested. They are intended to solve the eight major AOIs mentioned in Chapter 4: Major Areas of Improvement (AOIs), which were developed from the four directions in Chapter 3: Baseline Review. The four recommendations, including “Extend the Coverage of Sustainability Strategies and Consideration on Emerging Context”, “Restructure the Approaches and Practices of Public Engagement”, “Formulate an Action Plan with Regular Evaluation Mechanism”, and “Catalyse Coordination and Collaboration among Governmental Agencies”, were also mentioned previously in Chapter 6: Proposed Overall Positioning of SSP. They correspond to the four directions of “Scoping and Approach”, “Public Engagement”, “Action and Implementation”, and “Institutional Setting” respectively.

7.1.3 Each recommendation will start with a description of the AOIs it corresponds to, its purpose, and its actions. Each action will start with an introduction outlining the content generally, followed by “Local Potentials” to demonstrate the potential and feasibility for Hong Kong to take similar actions. It will then be followed by “Duration, Lead Agency, and Partners” to illustrate how long the action will take and who the major participants will be, and then detailed illustrations of the components of each action.
7.2 Recommendation 1: Extend the Coverage of Sustainability Strategies and Consideration on Emerging Context

Responding to AOI 2 and 3

7.2.1 The widened coverage of sustainability strategies and emerging context consideration are closely related to the Scoping and Approach Direction mentioned in Section 3.3. This recommendation can bring improvements to the following issues:

- **AOI 2 – Low Flexibility Considering Future Uncertainties**: The current SSP is inflexible in responding to the emerging contextual changes given a rigid plan on one scenario and the lack of a regular review and monitoring mechanism; and

- **AOI 3 – Reliance on Economic and Grey Infrastructural Development**: The demands, particularly in societal and environmental sustainability aspects, were partially and insufficiently addressed. The conventional approach of prioritising consideration of economic growth over sustainability and the reliance on grey infrastructure with unbalanced consideration of aspatial aspects lead to concerns of the current SSP.

**Purpose**

7.2.2 As illustrated in Section 6.2, strategies in SSP should balance its focus on various aspects including economic, social, and environmental sustainability. When formulating solutions for urban issues, SSP should not only cover spatial infrastructure but also consider the necessary aspatial infrastructure such as legislation and institutional set-up. The content of SSP should also be flexible to respond to emerging demands and contextual changes. Hence, this recommendation...
aims at promoting more proactive and holistic consideration of different aspects of sustainability and keeping track of the contextual changes in the content of SSP.

**Actions**

7.2.3 Three major actions are proposed under this recommendation:

- Benchmark with Updated International Sustainable Guidelines;
- Enhance the Connection between Aspatial Policies and Spatial Framework; and
- Increase Consideration of the Emerging Technological Context

**Action 1.1: Benchmark with Updated International Sustainable Guidelines**

7.2.4 This proposed action is to use international sustainability frameworks as objective checks for the content of SSP. International sustainable guidelines, such as the United Nation Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDG), the UN New Urban Agenda, and the ISO Standard on Sustainable Cities and Communities, provide a holistic framework to achieve sustainable development. Key challenges that the global cities face in terms of economic, social, and environmental sustainability are concluded in these frameworks. Hong Kong may consider using an internationally recognised framework to review its strategies in SSP to ensure a balance of consideration of different sustainability aspects and to advance its strategies to address related issues more proactively according to current international standards.

**Figure 7.2.1 (Left) United Nations Sustainable Development Goals**
Source: United Nations, n.d

**Figure 7.2.2 (Right) United Nations New Urban Agenda**
Source: United Nations, 2017
7.2.5 In Hong Kong’s case, HK2030+ does propose strategies and development principles regarding economic, environmental, and societal sustainability. However, these strategies are criticised for insufficiently responding to the societal and environmental sustainability demands. For instance, despite the fact that HK2030+ focuses on “liveability” and the creation of living spaces (鄒崇銘, 2016), there is a lack of attention to the root issue that there is an inequality in housing (鄒崇銘, 2016). In addition, although the environmental sustainability framework of “Smart, Green and Resilience” is stressed in HK2030+, little is mentioned in terms of the concept of self-reliance, which is referred to as the essence of environmental sustainability within the framework (Girardet, 1990).

7.2.6 Attempts to use an international sustainability framework to review SSP’s sustainability strategies can be found in Hong Kong. A think tank from the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) used the New Urban Agenda as a framework to point out the sustainability issues that require extra attention in HK2030+. For instance, its review document identified that there is a “lack of socio-economic agenda to leave no one behind” and the lack of attention on topics of affordability in HK2030+ (CUHK Urban Thinkers Campus 2.0., 2017). It also mentions the need to develop self-sufficiency in resource management such as water and food supply (CUHK Urban Thinkers Campus 2.0., 2017). This local attempt shows the possibility to use international sustainability frameworks to help identify the areas of improvement in SSP’s strategies and to extend the strategies to respond to non-economic sustainability aspects more proactively.
stage in the short run. When the next cycle of SSP exercise takes place, this proposed action can also be considered in the plan formulation process. Sustainability guidelines can be a framework to help guide public and internal discussion on the strategies needed in different sustainability aspects. No matter if it is for HK2030+ or for future SSP exercise, it is suggested that the PlanD would be the leading agency for this action, partnering with representatives from different sectors to identify sustainability aspects that require extra attention by benchmarking with international guidelines.

**Action Highlights: Cover More Strategies for an Inclusive Society**

7.2.8 Current strategies in HK2030+ respond insufficiently to long-term socio-economic challenges. As mentioned in the UN New Urban Agenda, the socio-economic agenda of leaving no one behind is seen as one of the key measures for sustainable cities (United Nations, 2017). More emphasis should be made on providing affordable housing through utilising the existing land resources and alleviating the income inequalities by promoting a more inclusive economic development model from the perspective of urban planning (for example providing support and space for SMEs and informal economies). International case studies mentioned in Section 5.5 have shown the possibility of SSP to tackle these topics by suggesting strategies on land supply, at the same time considering reforms such as defining and exploring options for affordable housing.
Action Highlights: Cover More Strategies for the Balance of Environmental Conservation and Development

7.2.9 Current strategies and spatial framework in HK2030+ tend to treat environmental conservation as a means to let economic development go ahead, not an end by itself. Analysis of the cumulative impacts of successive engineering projects suggested in HK2030+ on the environment should be highlighted, instead of only focusing on the impacts of individual projects as in the current planning practice. Additional rounds of discussion may be needed for controversial topics such as the option to undergo reclamation beyond Victoria Harbour and the option to utilise the existing land resources. Hong Kong may also consider further exploring the targets and strategies for ecologising the current urban structures by further encouraging community farming, liberalisation of regulation of public space, etc. (Hong Kong Urban Thinkers Campus, 2017).

Action Highlights: Cover More Strategies for Long-term Self-sufficiency

7.2.10 Self-sufficiency is the essence of environmental sustainability (Girardet, 1990), yet related topics and strategies are not sufficiently elaborated in HK2030+. This concept is about minimising resource inputs from the external community and the production of waste outputs internally (Maclaren, 1996). Strategies may include developing targets and plans for self-sufficient long-term water, food, and energy supply through better utilising renewable energy, smart grid systems, rainwater harvesting, recycling, etc. More proactive strategies should be elaborated for the long-term development of Hong Kong by examining the potential of gradually becoming a more self-sufficient city and reducing the reliance on external resources.

Figure 7.2.5  “Smart, Green and Resilience” Framework Proposed in HK2030+
Source: Planning Department, 2016
**Action 1.2: Enhance the Connection between Aspatial Policies and Spatial Framework**

7.2.11 This suggested action is to enhance the alignment between aspatial policy and sustainability objectives with the spatial framework at the macro level. In particular, it is proposed that the HK2030+ spatial framework should be reviewed to reflect the specific economic sectors to be developed in the long term. Policies to reinforce local identity and to conserve old communities should also be reflected in the spatial program at the macroscale in SSP.

**Local Potentials**

7.2.12 Currently, HK2030+ has already proposed the key economic belts, technological axis, as well as the new central business district (CBD3) in East Lantau Metropolis (ELM) (see Figure 7.2.6 below). However, it is criticised that this spatial plan does not reflect sufficiently what key economic sectors Hong Kong aims to develop. For instance, it is not clear as to what industry would be supported in ELM and what the strategies to differentiate ELM from other economic development districts are in HK2030+.

7.2.13 The promotion of local identity and cultural management, which is another key aspatial policy related to societal sustainability, is addressed in current urban renewal projects. URA redesigns old districts under the district-based approach and in reference to its study of local identity of the site (URA, 2018). However, Hong Kong may consider defining cultural identity for both old and new districts across Hong Kong in the spatial framework of SSP and consider the synergy between these entities at a macroscale.

![Figure 7.2.6 Conceptual Spatial Framework in HK2030+](image)

*Source: Planning Department, 2017*
**Timeframe, Lead Agency, and Partners**

7.2.14 The enhancement of the spatial program is suggested to be done at the review stage of HK2030+. The lead agency is suggested to be the PlanD, partnering with the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau, the Heritage Office, and the URA to help align the spatial framework with holistic economic and cultural management at a macro-scale.

**Action Highlights: Review the District Function and Economic Positioning in the Spatial Framework**

7.2.15 The differentiation of economic positioning between the three key development areas (Western Economic Corridor, Eastern Knowledge and Technology Centre, and Northern Economic Belt) and the three CBDs should be further elaborated. Related key infrastructure projects to support the specific economic positioning of the districts should be pinpointed and the synergy between them should be explained in the spatial program in the SSP.

**Action Highlights: Reflect the Local Identity of Each District in the Spatial Framework**

7.2.16 The study of local identity should not only be a practice in urban renewal projects, but should be extended to other areas in Hong Kong. The exercise of SSP should consider studying the identity of each district and the synergy between districts in cultural management at a macroscale. This can provide better guidance to future development with reference to the local identity of each district.

**Action 1.3: Increase Consideration of the Emerging Technological Context**

7.2.17 The importance of technology should be valued more by SSP. The suggestion to increase consideration of the emerging technological context intends to improve the SSP performance in AOI 2 and AOI 3. As AOI 2 is concerned with future uncertainties and technology plays a critical role in determining the future, the suggestion responds to AOI 2 by encouraging the SSP to proactively evaluate and prepare potential responses to future technological impacts in advance. As AOI 3 is concerned with the holisticness of SSP content and technology should be a critical element in future urban development, the suggestion responds to AOI 3 by allocating more effort to considering technology along with more dominant aspects such as economic and land development and hence increasing the comprehensiveness of the SSP.

**Local Potentials**

7.2.18 There have been efforts in turning Hong Kong into a smart city. The Hong Kong Smart City Blueprint produced by OGCIO can be seen as an example of emerging
local potential in taking more consideration of the technological context. In the Smart City @Kowloon East initiative, the government organised various public engagement activities such as focus group and technology showcase (Figure 7.2.7) (Energizing Kowloon East Office, n.d.). Moreover, the Hong Kong Smart City Summit was organised in 2018 for IT entrepreneurs to discuss Hong Kong’s development directions towards a smart city (Compass Offices, 2020). These two examples demonstrate the potential to conduct an envisioning exercise similar to Shenzhen’s (城PLUS, 2017, cited in 規劃中國, 2018; 規劃中國, 2018).

Figure 7.2.7  Public Forum with Technology Demonstration Organised for the Smart City @Kowloon East Initiative  
Source: Energizing Kowloon East Office, n.d.

Timeframe, Lead Agency, and Partners

7.2.19 As this recommendation is concerned with the plan’s content and formulation, the lead agencies will be the Development Bureau and PlanD. Partners include other relevant departments in devising the SSP content and departments concerned with technological development and innovation. Other professionals or the public can also be invited for discussion. Actions directly related to practical plan formulation mentioned below are easier and more direct to implement and are medium-term actions. Others are more abstract and continuous actions, for example, conducting theoretical studies.

Action Highlights: Identify the Scope and Incorporate Content of Hong Kong Smart City Blueprint

7.2.20 There are a number of specific measures to increase responses to the emerging technological context. First, given that the OGCIO has published the Hong Kong Smart City Blueprint (Figure 7.2.8) and Leung (2017, p. 54) argues that the interface between SSP and the Smart City initiative was not carefully considered, the SSP should identify its own scope of actions in response to technology advancement, and decide how to incorporate and integrate the Blueprint’s content into spatial measures
to be proposed in the SSP. This includes developing digital infrastructure (Figure 7.2.9) with more effort as in the case of New York City (The City of New York, 2019, pp. 2-16, 9-3).

Figure 7.2.8  Hong Kong Smart City Blueprint
Source: Office of the Government Chief Information Officer, 2019

Figure 7.2.9  An Example of Digital Infrastructure in Hong Kong
Source: Office of the Government Chief Information Officer, n.d.

**Action Highlights: Produce Responses in and for Technology-related Sectors**

7.2.21 Second, SSP should consider the impacts of technological advancement on economic restructuring, including removing any barrier to technological development and creating rooms for growth of technology-related sectors (規劃中國, 2018). Apart from physical and spatial strategies for facilitating the growth of technology-related sectors, it is equally important to put more effort into formulating supporting aspatial
strategies to respond to the need for technological development, for example nurturing talent and allocating more resources in supporting technological research and development (Lamprou and Vagiona, 2017, p. 9). In this case, collaboration with other departments, spatial and aspatial, is needed (Lamprou and Vagiona, 2017, p. 9).

**Action Highlights: Respond to Potential Negative Impacts of Technology**

7.2.22 SSP should prepare for technology-related uncertainties and negative externalities and recognise the increasing urban complexity (規劃中國, 2018). For example, New York City’s SSP responds to the resilience needed concerning cyber threats (The City of New York, 2019, pp. 1-48, 2-16). While Shenzhen also adapts to the technological context by planning for resilience, in addition, it acknowledges the growing complexity of city as internet development has changed the way businesses operate and the demand of urban dwellers (規劃中國, 2018).

**Action Highlights: Explore Ideas in Technology’s Impacts on City**

7.2.23 In the case of Greater Shenzhen Towards 2050 (Figure 7.2.10), a seminar for planning and IT experts and science fiction writers was organised for a discussion on the city’s future (城PLUS, 2017, cited in 規劃中國, 2018; 規劃中國, 2018). The government can make reference to Shenzhen’s practice to invite different stakeholders for discussing and envisioning the urban futures under technological advancement, while ensuring it is within the practical scope of SSP (規劃中國, 2018).

![Figure 7.2.10 Greater Shenzhen Towards 2050](image)

Source: 城PLUS, 2017

7.2.24 While the suggestion in the previous paragraph focuses on reality and practicality in SSP, more bold imaginations are essential when technology is the subject of
A number of avant-garde ideas are conceived by Shenzhen’s scholars, for example, an area in the future city may be designated as a residential area for customised housing to suit the high mobility nature of young people, analogous to the way sea creatures adapt to their habitats (城PLUS, 2017). As futuristic as it is, this example shows how technology can completely change the current form of urban life, and the government can invite scholars and professionals to conduct proactive theoretical studies on future urbanism and mode of living to help increase understanding of the topic (Figure 7.2.11) (城PLUS, 2017; 規劃中國, 2018). The theoretical nature of these studies allows creativity and reserves adequate room for picturing a future city in the long run, implying proactiveness and flexibility, and these studies can serve as a reference for future SSP.

**Figure 7.2.11 Imagination of Future Urbanism**
Source: Wakefield, 2013

### Summary of Recommendation 1

7.2.25 This recommendation suggests three major actions to enhance the content of SSP. The first proposed action of **benchmarking with updated international sustainability guidelines** is for an overall objective check to ensure the SSP balances the consideration of different sustainability aspects. The second proposed action aims at **aligning the SSP sustainability objective with the spatial framework**. The third proposed action aims at **extending the existing SSP strategies to cover the emerging contexts**. Considering the time frame of HK2030+, these three actions to enhance the content of SSP are suggested to be used in the review stage after the final HK2030+ document is published. The revised strategies in the content of SSP require commitment and agreement by other governmental departments and concrete action plans for follow-up actions. More will be discussed in the other recommendations.
Figure 7.2.12 Summary of Recommendations 1  
Source: The Consultant

7.3 Recommendation 2: Restructure the Approaches and Practices of Public Engagement

Responding to AOI 4, 5 and 6

7.3.1 The restructuring of the approaches and practices of public engagement closely relate to the Direction of Public Engagement discussed in Section 3.4. This recommendation brings significant improvements in:

- **AOI 4 – Public with Less Chance to Participate among Different Plan-making Stages:**
  Merely one PE phase was assigned in the middle of the study for the current SSP. PE in earlier stages could not be replaced by opinions collected from the Task Force on Land Supply as a supplement;

- **AOI 5 – Ineffective Communication in PE Activities:**
  A knowledge gap between the professionals and the public has been recognised. Ineffective uses of PE booklet, PowerPoint slides, and PE videos to strengthen the public’s understanding of SSP were also observed; and

- **AOI 6 – Opaque Process on Digesting PE Comments:**
  The late release of the PE report and the reliance on quantitative methods lead to concerns from people in terms of the opaque process of tackling PE comments.
PE ACTIVITIES

1. Public Forum
2. Topical Discussion
3. Thematic Exhibition
4. Roving Exhibition
5. Knowledge Sharing Seminar
6. Guided Visit
7. Questionnaire Survey
8. Meeting with Stakeholders

PE DELIVERABLES

1. Booklet
2. Pamphlet
3. Exhibition Panel
4. Video
5. Website

Figure 7.3.1  Current PE Activities of HK2030+
Source: The Consultant

Purpose

7.3.2 The literature review in Section 2.3 has introduced the function of Element 3: Co-Production in SSP. An SSP should involve diverse actors and engagement activities should begin before the vision is set and be held during the SSP process (Albrechts and Balducci, 2013; Bryson and Alston, 2011). Hence, the purpose of this recommendation is to enrich the scope of the engagement, reduce the knowledge gap between the professionals and the general public, and make the public engagement of SSP in Hong Kong more transparent.

Actions

7.3.3 Four key actions are adopted under this recommendation:

- Implement Parallel PE Practices within and outside the SSP Study Period;
- Utilise Interactive Means to Disseminate SSP Information;
- Incorporate Innovative Platforms into Continuous Engagement Activities; and
- Establish an Accountable Feedback Mechanism

Action 2.1: Implement Parallel PE Practices within and outside the SSP Study Period

7.3.4 The PE of HK2030+ was criticised because only one PE phase was carried out and it was after the formulation of the proposed spatial development framework. More PE activities within and outside the SSP study period could increase the depth and breadth of the collected opinions and help enhance the legitimacy of the plan.
Local Potentials

7.3.5 Referring to past experience in Hong Kong, the study of HK2030 had more PE phases (DEVB and PlanD, 2007). This demonstrates that Hong Kong has the experience to accomplish a more comprehensive PE for SSP. In addition, there have always been different public opinion programmes investigating the fluctuation of public opinions on various issues in Hong Kong, such as the programmes by the Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute. Parallel PE practices can complement the weakness of each other, given that holding too many PE phases in the SSP process will be time-consuming, while no in-depth view can be collected by only relying on general opinion surveys conducted outside the study period.

Figure 7.3.2 Stage 3 Consultation Report of HK2030
Source: PlanD, 2004

Timeframe, Lead Agency, and Partners

7.3.6 Two PE stages within the SSP study period should be held with regular PE activities outside the SSP study period. It is suggested that the lead agency of the action will be the PlanD, while partners will include the Information Services Department and advertising consultancy firms, as they are more familiar with communicating with the public. The universities will also be involved to help analyse the collected information.

Figure 7.3.3 Mr. Robert Chung (Right), the Former Person in Charge of the Public Opinion Programme of The University of Hong Kong
Source: Sing Tao Daily, 2019
Action Highlights: Implement More PE Phases within the SSP Study Period

7.3.7 The new proposed PE phases will be assigned to the beginning and the middle part of the SSP study period: “before the formulation of the vision and focus topics of the study” as well as “after the publication of the draft plan”. The reason is that these two are always the most critical stages. The PE at the beginning stage is to investigate the issues that are most concerned by the public and the development mode of Hong Kong they want, while the PE after the draft plan is to revise the limitations of the plan. Although PE that has more than two phases can help collect more opinions from the public, it is impossible to carry out large-scale PE activities endlessly. Otherwise, the actual plan could never be implemented because there are always areas of improvement. Hence, traditional PE activities would be held in two stages to enhance the participation of the public, and time cost is also taken into consideration.

Action Highlights: Publish Appropriate PE Materials in Different PE Stages

7.3.8 Apart from more PE phases within the SSP study period, suitable PE materials should be provided in different stages because the purposes of the PE activities at the beginning and middle part of the study period of SSP are different. Different forms of materials, including PE booklets, PowerPoint slides, and videos should be provided according to their purposes. More detailed and innovative PE materials will be introduced in Action 2.2 Utilise Interactive Means to Disseminate SSP Information.

Action Highlights: Conduct Regular Engagement Activities

7.3.9 As only limited PE activities can be held during the SSP study period, more frequent PE can be implemented outside the SSP study period to better understand the opinions of the public. More general trends and perceptions from the public will be collected. The regular engagement activities will be discussed more in the later action: Action 2.3 Innovative and Cost-effective Approaches for Continuous Engagement.
Action 2.2: Utilise Interactive Means to Disseminate SSP Information

7.3.10 SSP contents cover a broad range of aspects that are influential to the daily life of each citizen. However, the public may not quickly understand the impacts and significance of the strategies raised in SSP. Furthermore, traditional ways of presenting SSP may not be attractive to the general public’s attention. Therefore, introducing interactive presentation means may help increase the awareness and understanding of SSP information.

Local Potentials

7.3.11 In the case of the “Land for Hong Kong” led by the Task Force on Land Supply, the Force appointed a marketing consultancy firm to assist in designing the concept and various PE materials. Apart from booklet, pamphlet and exhibition panels, various multimedia materials such as blog, video, radio programme, website and social media were prepared. Among them, 36 short videos posted on social media platforms received over 1.5 million view counts (Task Force on Land Supply, 2018). This inspired the Consultant that extensive utilisation of interactive channels to disseminate SSP information may be effective in raising public awareness.

![Figure 7.3.5 & 7.3.6 Screenshot of Videos to Present “Land for Hong Kong”](source: Task Force on Land Supply, 2018)

Timeframe, Lead Agency, and Partners

7.3.12 Cooperating with marketing professionals to design the SSP dissemination materials can produce more interesting and down-to-earth materials to receive more responses and attention from the public. Inviting internet celebrities to produce, share, and comment on SSP materials can help spread the SSP information to the digital generation. These interactive dissemination means can be quickly applied in the promulgation of HK2030+, continuous engagement outside the SSP study period, as well as the PE stages in the next SSP.
**Action Highlights: Promulgate Plan Information in Series of Short Video**

7.3.13 HK2030+ has published an eight-minute-long introduction video on the official website and a 30-second-long PE promotion video on Youtube. The videos were produced by the Information Services Department. However, the videos were presented in bureaucratic tones and less likely to attract citizens’ attention. The Consultant proposes to produce two supplementary video series, with one using animated infographics videos to present the relationship between spatial strategies and other non-spatial aspects such as economic development, environmental protection, and social stability. Another series will focus on visualising the relationship between SSP strategies and the public’s daily life. Interviews with citizens from all walks of life and different stakeholders will help reduce the distance between abstract contents and actual impacts. Each video should be shorter than three minutes to present the essence of each topic. By using common language and real-life situations, the public will have more interest in the content of SSP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT VIDEO</th>
<th>PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTARY VIDEO SERIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-sec TV API Promoting PE of HK2030+</td>
<td>Series of 3-min Animated Infographics Introducing the Effect of SSP on Specific Aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-min video Introducing HK2030+</td>
<td>Series of 3-min Interviews Explaining the Effect of SSP on Daily Life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7.3.8  Comparison of the Current HK2030+ Videos and the Proposed Series**
Source: The Consultant

**Action Highlights: Promulgate Plan Information in Dynamic Digital 3D Models**

7.3.14 Apart from exhibiting the draft and final plan on panels, the PlanD can utilise the 3D spatial data developed by the Lands Department to generate dynamic digital 3D...
models to visualise the influence of SSP on the physical spatial environment. A dynamic model allows the audience to move around and zoom in and out to explore the effects on different scales. Moreover, the model can be developed into two versions. First, it can illustrate the urban form and landscape in specific years such as 2030, 2040, and 2050. Second, the model can illustrate scenarios applying different strategies and actions. The former gives a broad picture of what future Hong Kong looks like and the latter explains the effects of individual strategies suggested by SSP. By constructing the simulation and involvement experience to the audience, it is believed that the public will be more interested to know more about the content of SSP.

**Figure 7.3.9** (Upper Left) Production of 3D Digital Model According to the Building Plans  
**Figure 7.3.10** (Upper Right) Production of 3D Pedestrian and Road Network  
**Figure 7.3.11** (Lower) Digital Map Product Developed by Lands Department  
Source: Lands Department, 2019

**Action 2.3: Incorporate Innovative Platforms into Continuous Engagement Activities**

7.3.15 Over 230 PE events were held for HK2030+ to consult the citizens in a variety of formats, including seminar, workshop and site visit, etc. This traditional consultation process was profound yet time-consuming. Officials in the PlanD were subject to extensive administrative works during the preparation stage of engagement events within a short period of time. Moreover, the general public might be immersed with intricate content, so they might find it difficult to understand the strategies in SSP. By adopting digital tools to distribute the information, specifically promulgating plan information via social media and establishing an online communication platform, public understanding and awareness can be enhanced.
Local Potentials

7.3.16 Hong Kong’s environment is appropriate for developing digital solutions for PE practice. According to the Social Media Usage in Hong Kong which was published by the Research Office in the Legislative Council, more Hong Kong people of different age groups have joined social networking. Over 90% of young people aged from 10 to 24 had used online platforms between 2014 and 2018, while a rapid trend of increasing popularity of social media participation among the adults aged 45 or above had soared from 50% in 2014 to nearly 80% in 2018. Social media has been transforming from a personal sharing platform to a multi-functional channel for online learning and news feeding. As such, it is attractive and reasonable to penetrate into the majority of the public, namely youngsters and grown-ups, by maximising the media coverage of SSP.

![Figure 7.3.12 (Left) Social Media Participation Rates by Age Group, 2014-2018](image1)
Source: The Research Office in the Legislative Council, 2019

![Figure 7.3.13 (Right) The Use of Social Media of the Youths by Activities, 2017](image2)
Source: The Research Office in the Legislative Council, 2019

Timeframe, Lead Agency, and Partners

7.3.17 The digital changes in PE approaches are a continuous practice throughout the plan-making, promulgation, and implementation period, which are mainly conducted by the Development Bureau and PlanD. Skillful manpower and technological support from the Innovation and Technology Bureau is substantially a must. In addition, it will be beneficial for the government to assign certain data collection and analysis tasks to external parties, including a digital consultancy agency.

Action Highlights: Promulgate Plan Information via Social Media

7.3.18 By publicising the simple, clear SSP content on the social media platform, the information can be easily exposed to the public and trigger their interest as they flick through digestible ideas of SSP. It is expected that more participation and curiosity from the public can be aroused.
**Action Highlights: Provide an Official Online Communication Platform**

7.3.19 Adoption of digital communication platforms as an alternative public engagement exercise can facilitate discussion among the public. The communication platform can allow the public to raise their concern and feedback on SSP and other urban issues. The integration of 3D model illustration can further help the users explicate their thoughts and confusion. It is anticipated that quicker clarification and response from planners or other professionals will be the major feature in this flexible forum. Moreover, the topics of public engagement events can be sharpened based on the repetitiveness and social awareness of dialogues.

**Action 2.4: Establish an Accountable Feedback Mechanism**

7.3.20 The public consultation final report of HK2030+ is under preparation and is going to be released in late 2020. In the Working Paper, the Consultant identified the approachable and transparent dissemination of PE information in Melbourne. Melbourne’s PE report comprehensively reflected the concerns and proposals from the public and sectoral stakeholders, thereby providing more perspectives in the planning process and demonstrating a responsible attitude from the authority. By facilitating the transparent feedback mechanism with the invitation of stakeholders’ involvement and the promulgation of a summary report, the process of dealing with public consideration will be clearer. Public opinions can be collected from various sources, including social media, communication platform, search trend, online survey, and stakeholder submission paper, in addition to the typical PE event.

![Plan Melbourne Refresh Summary of Engagement Activities]

**Figure 7.3.14 Plan Melbourne Refresh Summary of Engagement Activities**
Source: DELWP, Melbourne, 2016

**Local Potentials**

7.3.21 As shown in **Figure 7.3.15** and **Figure 7.3.16**, comprehensive analysis of feedback regarding the Task Force on Land Supply was published with transparent data collection and evaluation in quantitative and qualitative methodologies. The consultant of the Task Force has brought together all parts of analysis and has
identified domains of consensus and disagreement. To understand and disclose the findings in the report is challenging yet essential for the government to further consider short and medium-to-long options. The Consultant suggests that Hong Kong has the necessity and capacity to further facilitate mutual communication between the government and the society.

Figure 7.3.15 & 7.3.16 Final PE Report of the Task Force on Land Supply
Source: A-WORLD Consulting Limited, 2018

**Timeframe, Lead Agency, and Partners**

**7.3.22** This recommended action should be chiefly carried out by the PlanD and assisted by full-service communication and management consultancy throughout the whole process of public engagement and final report promulgation.

**Action Highlights: Invite Sectoral Representatives and Academics to Share Insight**

**7.3.23** As one of the major sources of information, stakeholder submission papers and their insights are of paramount importance to the engagement exercise. Professionals in diverse fields, specifically land developers and practitioners from the logistics and port industry, smart infrastructure industry, and financial industry, can provide the government a sophisticated understanding of Hong Kong’s economic development, while scholars can contribute foresighted effort for the planning authority to formulate holistic and just strategies to guide Hong Kong’s development.

**Action Highlights: Provide Preliminary Responses to Public Concerns via Online Channel**

**7.3.24** Prior to the final report promulgation, preliminary and quick response to public concerns gathered from social media and the online communication platform as suggested in **Action 2.3 and 2.4** respectively, as well as typical public engagement
events concerning the drafted plan, can be publicised online. Accordingly, the critical information will be revealed to promote healthy bilateral communication and intensify public confidence towards the responsive government mechanism.

**Figure 7.3.17  Data Sources for Preliminary Response and Official PE Summary Report**

*Source: The Consultant*

**Summary of Recommendation 2**

**7.3.25** Restructuring the approaches and practices of PE involves additional input of resources. This includes organising PE activities before the drafting of the SSP framework and continuous engagement activities. Also, some resources may be required to change the practice from traditional to digital and interactive PE activities including collaborating with external parties. The actions mentioned above focus on facilitating instant and responsive engagement with the general public. To include the voice of far-reaching groups such as the elderly and ethnic minorities, the existing traditional PE activities are needed.

**7.3.26** Regarding the four actions, **utilising interactive means to disseminate SSP information** will be an immediate and short-term action, since the detailed actions suggested take advantage of the existing materials. **Implementing parallel PE practices within and outside the SSP study period** and **incorporating innovative platforms into continuous engagement activities** can be adopted as medium-term actions because continuous engagement requires sufficient time to expand its reach to the vast audience. **Establishing an accountable feedback mechanism** requires more sophisticated design of analytical frameworks to respond to different stakeholders’ insights and public opinions. This proposal will be regarded as a long-term action.
7.4 Recommendation 3: Formulate an Action Plan with Regular Evaluation Mechanism

Responding to AOI 2, 7 and 8

7.4.1 The formulation of an Action Plan with regular evaluation mechanism has a close linkage with the Direction of Action and Implementation mentioned in Section 3.5. This recommendation plays a vital role in giving improvements for:

- **AOI 2 – Low Flexibility Considering Future Uncertainties:**
  The current SSP is inflexible in responding to changes with merely one scenario and the lack of a review system turns it into a rather rigid plan;

- **AOI 7 – Ineffective Translation of Vision to Actual Spatial and Non-spatial Actions:**
  There is no clear action and implementation setting, so it cannot provide a promising prospect to all the stakeholders, including the public; and

- **AOI 8 – Insufficient Emphasis on Regular Progress Review:**
  The absence of a monitoring mechanism implies a lack of follow-up actions for suggestions in plans, and there is no publicly available record for the progress development.
Purpose

7.4.2 The purposes of this are to provide flexibility in SSP by updating different baseline information and strategies when necessary in order to ensure strategies can best fit the latest context for carrying out implementation. Furthermore, the feasibility and commitment of plans can be ensured through the provision of more tangible guidelines and directions for future actions, bridging SSP together with the real-world policies. The effectiveness of plans can also be reviewed and confirmed by follow-up actions and progress, as well as offering the public the power to supervise the commitment of the government.

Actions

7.4.3 The following three elements are included in this recommendation:
- Formulate an Action Plan;
- Incorporate a Monitoring Mechanism; and
- Adopt a Holistic Regular Review System.

Action 3.1: Formulate an Action Plan

7.4.4 In response to the current weakness in translating SSP strategies into actual implementations, PlanD shall formulate an Action Plan during the SSP process, and publish it with the corresponding SSP as a follow-up action reference. Since the current SSP in Hong Kong serves only as the strategic framework for territorial planning, it will be more effective to translate the spatial strategies into actions and consolidate them into an official document elaborated from the existing SSP.

Local Potentials

7.4.5 Local governmental departments had demonstrated the feasibility of an Action Plan with their past strategic plans. The Public Transport Strategy Study published by the Transport Department in 2017 had included a brief action plan consisting of actions, specific targets, timeframe, and responsible agencies. Consolidated Economic Development Strategy for Lantau and Preliminary Market Positioning Study for Commercial Land Uses in Major Developments of Lantau published by PlanD in 2017 also included actions, timeframe and involved agencies. These two plans show that the application of spatial-related strategies can be translated into tangible action plans. Moreover, the Environment Bureau had released Hong Kong Blueprint for Sustainable Use of Resources 2013-2022 and Hong Kong Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2016-2021 in 2013 and 2016 accordingly. The Department of Health had released the Hong Kong Strategy and Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance 2017-2022 and Towards 2025: Strategy and Action Plan to Prevent and Control NCD in Hong Kong in 2017 and 2018. These four plans demonstrate the feasibility for local government departments to prepare long-term yet achievable and measurable action plans.
Timeframe, Lead Agency, and Partners

7.4.6 The duration of the Action Plan should fit in the overall timespan of the SSP and mid-term review to maximise the continuous effectiveness, hence, the initial Action Plan shall be set for release to cover the first five years following the publication of the SSP, and be replaced by a reviewed Action Plan after the fifth year following the mid-term review of SSP. It aims to balance long-term performance and real-world uncertainty. Moreover, PlanD and the new SSP coordination unit will take the lead agencies’ roles in formulating the Action Plan. Other action-related governmental bureaux, departments, and related organisations are expected to participate as well.

Action Highlights: Specify Tangible Actions

7.4.7 Firstly, the actions included in the proposed Action Plan shall instruct implementation in a more tangible and specific manner, such as listing the potential construction projects or available amendments to local plans. While this requires more preliminary preparation on the prospective SSP implementation, it should allow stronger linkages within the planning hierarchy and address the concerns of limited feasibility in SSP.
Action Highlights: Provide Action Targets and Indicators

7.4.8 Secondly, the actions shall provide corresponding targets and their time frame indicators. Measurable references should be added to benchmark the performance and progress of the SSP implementation. It can avoid actions that remain on non-concrete descriptions but set as the objectives for progress review during the monitoring stage.

Action Highlights: Identify Related Agencies for Actions

7.4.9 Thirdly, actions in the Action Plan shall have their related agencies identified respectively. A comprehensive SSP is expected to involve multi-sector stakeholders. By providing clearer definitions of roles and potential involvement in the Action Plan, it aids the liaison between departmental coordination and delivers an early discussion basis for future follow-ups.

Action Highlights: Include Non-spatial Components for Actions

7.4.10 Lastly, the actions are suggested to include non-spatial components. The translation issue identified in AOI-7 has described the insufficient and ineffective translation in current SSP, in which spatial strategies cannot be fully translated into necessary actions. Aspatial actions such as legislative means, new working bodies or amendments on existing policies can close the implementation disparity where SSP cannot cover entirely through spatial methods.

Action 3.2: Incorporate a Monitoring Mechanism

7.4.11 A monitoring mechanism should be incorporated as a follow-up procedure for items mentioned in the Action Plan. The monitoring framework helps monitor the progress of actions in plans. It can hence bring more emphasis on the feature of regular progress review as well as ensuring the effectiveness of plans by checking the completeness of targets and actions. By the deliverables of this mechanism, the public can be given the power to supervise the commitment of the government in terms of the development progress, which has been a concern among the interviewees as mentioned in the former part.

Local Potentials

7.4.12 Similar local examples can be observed across different departments. For the Hong Kong Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP) 2016-2021 published by the Environment Bureau (2013), annual progress reports had been issued to all citizens, including the review of the progress of the specific actions listed under each item and detailed descriptions of the actions, expected deliverables and progress to date (Figure 7.4.4). A dedicated team had also been established for compiling reports on the implementation progress.
7.4.13 Comparable strategy can also be seen in the Towards 2025 Strategy and Action Plan to Prevent and Control NCD in Hong Kong produced by the Department of Health (2018). The frequency for monitoring for each action, data and information to be collected from other departments for the sources of monitoring, and clear definitions for particular terms and phrases were provided to avoid misleading or misunderstanding (Figure 7.4.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Specific Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Expected Indicators</th>
<th>Description of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Maintain and enhance the management of protected areas</td>
<td>Prepare and implement biodiversity management plans, outlining the approach for biodiversity conservation in country parks, special areas, marine parks and marine reserves.</td>
<td>Adopt a biodiversity management plan for the proposed Robin’s Nest Country Park by 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A NPCD has commissioned a consultancy study on the planning, design and consultation of the proposed Robin’s Nest Country Park. In the later stage of the study, A NPCD will formulate a biodiversity management plan for the proposed Robin’s Nest Country Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Towards 2025 Strategy and Action Plan to Prevent and Control NCD in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Enhanced habitat management measures within marine parks, in order achieve the conservation of habitats and species promoting sustainable fisheries, by 2018.</td>
<td>Enhanced habitat management measures within marine parks, in order achieve the conservation of habitats and species promoting sustainable fisheries, by 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A NPCD has commissioned a consultancy study to review and enhance the current existing management measures in marine parks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.4.4 Progress of Implementation of Hong Kong Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2016-2021
Source: Environment Bureau, 2018

**Supplementary indicators related to youth drinking (of local relevance)**

- Monitoring frequency: every 2 or 4 years depending on source
- Sources:
  1. Survey of Drug Use among Students, Narcotics Division of Security Bureau every 4 years
  2. School-based Tobacco Survey among Students, Food and Health Bureau every 2 years
- Definition: "young people" refers to those aged between 10-24 years, roughly corresponding to primary 4-6, secondary 1-6 and post-secondary students

Figure 7.4.5 Towards 2025 Strategy and Action Plan to Prevent and Control NCD in Hong Kong
Source: Department of Health, 2018

**Timeframe, Lead Agency, and Partners**

7.4.14 To apply to the local planning context, the monitoring mechanism should be carried out annually after the release of the Action Plan for follow-up means. The Development Bureau, PlanD and CEDD are considered as the leading agencies to take part in the monitoring process. The Legislative Council, as a partner, plays a vital role in ensuring the whole process of this mechanism.

**Action Highlights: Monitor and Report Action Progress by Status, Deliverables, and Description**

7.4.15 Vis-à-vis the specified actions stated in the Action Plan, the monitoring framework with action status, expected deliverables and clear progress description should be incorporated in the annual action progress report. The status of actions should be kept on track according to their implementation completeness: (i) Completed/Ongoing; (ii) Progressing; or (iii) In development. Changes of actions can be made if necessary regarding various reasons, such as the timeframe, responsible
parties as well as introducing new actions for plans. An example is shown in **Figure 7.4.6**.

### Key Strategic Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Strategic Direction</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>VC</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting physical and functional integration</td>
<td>a. Walkability</td>
<td>(i) To identify schemes to promote walkable streets</td>
<td>Review the overall walkability status of current streetscape</td>
<td>PlanD</td>
<td>Progressing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expected Deliverable**

1. a(iii), Completion of Walkability Study to identify streets which require improvements by 2023

**Progress Description**

PlanD has reviewed the condition of pedestrian pathways in Kowloon Area

**Notes:**

1. The types of “Timeframe” of Targets are categorised as follows:
   - **Ongoing**: continuing existing programmes;
   - **Short**: targeted completion within 1-2 years (i.e. by end 2022);
   - **Medium**: targeted completion within 3-5 years (i.e. by end 2025);
   - **Long**: targeted completion beyond 5 years

2. “VC” listed includes both leading and supporting bureaux and departments.

3. Descriptions reflect the progress made as at the end of 2020 where appropriate.

**Figure 7.4.6  Action Plan with Monitoring Mechanism Example**

Source: The Consultant

**Action Highlights: Issue Annual Progress Report**

**7.4.16** The Planning Department is responsible for issuing the public-available annual progress report on the official website. Furthermore, representatives from the PlanD are required to report to the Legislative Council to give an explanation of the progress development according to the released report, in which the delay or cancellation of actions can be caused by external factors and help the audience to better understand the situation and avoid misinterpretation between stakeholders.

**Action 3.3: Adopt a Holistic Regular Review System**

**7.4.17** Along with the monitoring system, a holistic regular mid-term review system is proposed as a component of the evaluation system. The review system should keep track of the city’s development, confirm if the strategies proposed in the plan are still necessary, and evaluate if anything is missing. By providing timing to update the SSP in different aspects to fit the latest situation when necessary, it will increase flexibility in the SSP process. Hence, it will bring improvement to AOI 2 and AOI 8.

**7.4.18** There are a number of reasons why a mid-term review instead of a new SSP is conducted. Firstly, an SSP exercise is a long-term exercise in nature, so the cycle should be considerably long, and it cannot respond to new changes quickly. Secondly, updates required may not necessarily be major ones since the plan should be made by justifications and research backup, while regular review and update at a shorter interval also helps reduce the probability for a large change on the plan at a time. Thirdly, conducting a new SSP exercise requires significant time and resources. Lastly, it would be meaningless to re-conduct an SSP so frequently and would reduce
legitimacy and public confidence on the value of SSP. **Figure 7.4.7** and **Figure 7.4.8** below show the differences between a mid-term review and a new SSP and summarise reasons to adopt a mid-term review respectively.

**Figure 7.4.7** Comparison between a Mid-term Review and a New SSP
Source: The Consultant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MID-TERM REVIEW PLAN</th>
<th>NEW SSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller</td>
<td>More Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPONENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unchanged Fundamentals (Vision, Spatial Framework, &amp; Building Blocks)</td>
<td>Starting Plan Making from Fundamentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Specific PE Activities</td>
<td>Suggested 2 Rounds of PE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7.4.8** Reasons to Adopt a Mid-term Review Instead of a New SSP
Source: The Consultant

**Local Potentials**

7.4.19 The mid-term review element had been adopted in other strategic plans in Hong Kong. For example, a mid-term review of the Long Term Housing Strategy was conducted in 1993 (The Hong Kong Housing Authority, 1993). The review recognised areas of the original plan published in 1987 that had been working well while pinpointing problems (Lau, 1994, p. 288). It analysed new trends of homeownership and accordingly revised the projection, objectives, and the public housing redevelopment programme (Hong Kong Legislative Council, Hong Kong, 1994, pp. 2082, 2094; The Hong Kong Housing Authority, 1993, p. 16). This example demonstrates that it is possible and practicable for SSP to include a mid-term review component.

7.4.20 To ensure that the review of the content will be a holistic one, reference to international sustainability frameworks can be made. A local example is The Chinese University of Hong Kong’s review on HK2030+ by identifying discrepancies between HK2030+ and New Urban Agenda (CUHK Urban Thinkers Campus 2.0, 2017, p. 1). An
example of gaps found was the absence of socio-economic measures and historical consideration of our city (CUHK Urban Thinkers Campus 2.0, 2017, p. 2). As such, the review system can also bring improvement to AOI 3, by providing a chance for SSP to identify insufficiency in concerning issues from areas such as social and environmental aspects.

**Timeframe, Lead Agency, and Partners**

7.4.21 This review system will be a regular one adopting a five-year time interval, given that the SSP process will be regularised with a ten-year-long cycle, which is part of Recommendation 4 in Section 7.5. As the SSP is mainly prepared by the Development Bureau and PlanD, they will also be the lead agencies to review and update the content. Different governmental departments will be involved as partners as they can provide updates and feedback. The new SSP coordination unit to be formed, which will be discussed in Recommendation 4, will coordinate the review after its establishment. A panel formed specifically for the review will also be participating in the process. The roles of these partners are further discussed in the following sections.

**Action Highlights: Review the Projections and Context by Quantitative and Qualitative Methods**

7.4.22 The review should be conducted on the baseline and strategies both quantitatively and qualitatively. The inclusion of qualitative method distinguishes the review system proposed here from the response mechanism proposed in HK2030, as the latter mainly relied on quantitative indicators such as population and GDP growth (Figure 7.4.9) to determine whether a deviation from the Reference Scenario had emerged and accordingly the corresponding Response Plan formed in advance would be adopted in response (DEVB and PlanD, 2007, pp. 205-212).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Key Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population/Housing</td>
<td>Usual residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing land supply and take-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Average annual GDP growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment and working population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supply/take-up of offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic flows (domestic and cross-boundary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-boundary person-trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7.4.9  Indicators Adopted in the Response Mechanism of HK2030**

Source: DEVB and PlanD, 2007, p. 206

7.4.23 The proposed review system will adopt both quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative method will include the indicator method adopted in HK2030, which was based on data describing the existing condition, in order to review quantitative baseline projections to see if there is any deviation from the scenario adopted in the original plan, and accordingly update the strategies and initiatives (DEVB and PlanD,
2007, pp. 205-206). For instance, if the overall economic environment is not vibrant, some of the projects or initiatives may be postponed for action. The review system will also include a quantitative prediction on the future to ensure the quantitative analysis will lead to a review that is not just reactive but also proactive.

7.4.24 The qualitative review should be about analysing changes in the urban context, including the social, environmental, and economic aspects, and value that is appreciated by the society. For example, if technological development is more valued by the public, more effort to provide spatial support to technology development may be needed. The qualitative review will be conducted with the aid of international guidelines to ensure the aspects considered in the review will be holistic and proactive to fit the latest context while embracing the future direction.

7.4.25 Accordingly, unlike HK2030 (DEVB and PlanD, 2007, pp. 205-212), no Response Plan will be formed in advance to allow flexibility in response and avoid strictly and rigidly following preset measures that may not be up to date.

7.4.26 The review, quantitative or qualitative, will be supported by a data platform, similar to the case of KLUO in that the database will provide data and analysis results for review on the new urban context (DBKL, 2020, p. 2-27).

**Action Highlights: Review by Considering Other Inputs and Feedback**

7.4.27 Apart from those mentioned above, other sources of input are available for review. First, the review will consider the latest plans from other departments for update and better alignment, as other departments may have released new plans in the period between the promulgation of the SSP and the mid-term review. Since SSP involves the coordination between different bureau and departments, feedback from other departments on the content and strategies of SSP will also be considered in the review.

7.4.28 Second, results from the action progress report will be fed back to the review system. For instance, if the progress of a particular action is slower than expected, some adjustments on strategies and specific actions in the Action Plan may be needed to increase the pace and catch up the progress. This does not mean changing the progress targets to fit the deviated actual progress.

7.4.29 Lastly, a panel formed by representatives from different sectors will also be involved in the review as they will share opinions and knowledge of the latest urban development directions and context and give advice.

**Action Highlights: Produce a Mid-term Review Plan**

7.4.30 The deliverable of the review will be a Mid-term Review Plan open to public access. As the projections and baseline are updated, accordingly strategies and progress setting in the Action Plan will be updated. Therefore, the Review Plan will include
updated projections, strategies, projects, and Action Plan. The changes can be explicitly pointed out for easy reference. After the Mid-term Review Plan is promulgated, it will replace the original plan published five years ago and the monitoring system will work by referring to the Review Plan. Figure 7.4.10 below shows the temporal relationship between the promulgation of the Action Plan, the introduction of the monitoring system and review system, and the regularisation of the SSP cycle.

Figure 7.4.10  Timeline Illustrating the Relationship between the Elements in Recommendation 3 and the Regularisation of the SSP Cycle
Source: The Consultant

Summary of Recommendation 3

7.4.31  To put the recommendation into practice, strong coordination among different institutions is required to formulate cross-departmental actions, track their progress, and provide feedback to the review system. This implies an increase in the requirement of human resources and other resources to keep track of progress and context, produce reports and plans, and report to the LegCo.

7.4.32  The recommendation can help improve the current action and implementation process of SSP, yet there are still some limitations. Regarding the monitoring and review system, quantitative indicators are adopted as tools. However, there are diverse ways to formulate and interpret indicators. Potential difficulties in quantifying outcomes may also be expected. In addition, while the review system involves qualitative review with the aim of reducing the reliance on rigid quantitative indicators, the qualitative element may be seen as less objective.

7.4.33  A priority order is determined for these three key components to facilitate their implementation. The highest priority will be given to the promulgation of the Action Plan, as it is more urgent to be implemented, and it is the target for the annual monitoring system to work on. The monitoring system will have the second-highest priority, followed by the review system, as the monitoring system is also more direct
than the review system. They will be short-term and medium-term actions respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>LEADING AGENT</th>
<th>PARTNER</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>ACTION HIGHLIGHTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Recommendation 3: Formulate an Action Plan with Regular Evaluation Mechanism | Formulate an Action Plan | Plan Coordination Unit | Action-Related Governmental Bureaus, Departments & Organisations | Immediate | Specify Tangible Actions

Figure 7.4.11 Summary of Recommendation 3
Source: The Consultant

7.5 Recommendation 4: Catalyse Coordination and Collaboration among Governmental Agencies

Responding to AOI 1

7.5.1 The overarching recommendation the Consultant proposes considers the institutional environment within the Hong Kong Government, as discussed in the Direction of Institutional Setting (Section 3.2). This recommendation aims to improve the issues stated below:

- **AOI 1 – Capacity of Institutional Set-Up:**
  Collaboration and communication among the public agencies have been regarded as inefficient, which remain largely at the consultation level as seen from the circulation of departmental comments. Roles set out in the strategic plans for different departments are unclear, and there is a constant mutual understanding deficiency in the bureaucracy.

**Purpose**

7.5.2 Given the guiding function of SSP with it serving as the development blueprint of the city, it is unadoptable to simply reproduce the regular institutional settings that the government is adopting in order to foster collaboration between agencies regarding SSP matters. To examine whether the SSP is successful in performing its functions
or not, the criterion is to see how seriously other departments have treated the SSP in their policies, often reflected in the action plans, implementation plans, or corporate plans of the agencies. For this reason, coordination among and within governmental agencies to be supported by an innovative and responsive institutional environment is an element to facilitate a better SSP process and to enhance the institutional efficiency in governing the SSP and related matters.

**Actions**

7.5.3 A three-step recommendation is proposed to catalyse the coordination and communication among public agencies:

- Regularise the SSP Process Including its Review;
- Construct an Inter- & Intra-departmental Data-sharing Platform for Baseline Study and Plan Formulation; and
- Establish the Strategic Planning Working Coordination Unit under PICO.

**Action 4.1: Regularise the SSP Process Including its Review**

7.5.4 The current SSP practice is that no regular time interval for conducting a new SSP is set, and there is no regularity for the time span concerned by a particular SSP. As such, many ad-hoc tasks, communications, and organisations are created. Regularising SSP and its review implies that every critical stage involved in the SSP will be conducted regularly according to the respective period the Consultant proposed above (for example the mid-term review in the fifth year) and will no longer be kick-started in response to the announcement in the Policy Address.

7.5.5 Meanwhile, the growing emphasis on the integration between spatial and aspatial strategies in SSP brings more departments to be involved, ranging from technical departments to social sector departments including the Home Affairs Department (HAD) and LCSD. The horizon between them in terms of policy planning may be different and unsynchronised. Hence, regularising the SSP can encourage coordination among different functional departments to better align their long-term planning.

**Local Potentials**

7.5.6 From the commencement of SSP practices in Hong Kong in last century to HK2030+, the SSPs were updated roughly around every 12 years, as shown by the time interval in between TDSR (completed in 1996), HK2030 (completed in 2007), and HK2030+ (to be promulgated in 2020) (Ho, 2018; PlanD, 2017). Given that the plan-making body is now more experienced in conducting SSP compared to the time when TDSR and HK2030 were conducted, and technological advancement provides aids to planners, the planning agency is certainly more equipped with the ability and potential to carry out SSP in a regular ten-year interval.
7.5.7 In terms of the extent of regularity, the SSP as a package is recommended to be conducted in a ten-year time interval including the baseline review, drafting, finalisation, and promulgation stages. The Mid-term Review is advised to be completed in a five-year time interval, which is at the fifth year after the plan promulgation. The DEVB and PlanD will be leading the regularisation of the SSP and its review, as they oversee the formulation of plans and establish the SSP respectively. As for partners involved, they are not limited to the development proponent and the plan-making body. In order to facilitate a smooth interface between the SSP and other policies, other governmental departments, under the jurisdiction of DEVB or not, will be acknowledged.

Action Highlights: Propose Regular Time Intervals for Hong Kong SSP Process

7.5.8 In partnering with other technical departments such as Lands Department, Transport Department, and Highways Department, it is possible to synchronise the strategic plans and respective action plans according to the regularised release of SSP and its Review. Thus, spatial policies and development projects can be consolidated under the time frame of the SSP to utilise the resources efficiently for the public good.
Action 4.2: Construct an Inter- & Intra-departmental Data-sharing Platform for Baseline Study and Plan Formulation

7.5.9 The collection of data for the SSP mainly relies on the submission of non-standardised departmental reports which would have different assumptions and projection rationales (DEVB and PlanD, 2017). With a standardised data-sharing platform, the baseline study and plan formulation of SSP can be done more efficiently as related data is shared in a specific platform.

Local Potentials

7.5.10 For Hong Kong, the government has provided related data-sharing platforms to share the data from various departments to the public, such as the Hong Kong Geodata Store, which is a platform provided to the public for exploring and downloading open spatial data. The government is developing the Common Spatial Data Infrastructure (CSDI) as a platform to exchange geographic spatial data (Hong Kong Geodata Store, 2020). However, the data is dispersed for the research of SSP. Hence, additional data platforms for SSP can help conduct baseline study and formulate plans more efficiently.

Figure 7.5.3  Hong Kong Geodata Store
Source: Hong Kong Geodata Store, 2020

Timeframe, Lead Agency, and Partners

7.5.11 The duration and interval, as well as the lead agency and partners, will be similar to those in Action 4.3 the Strategic Planning Working Coordination Unit which would be discussed later. Partners will include the non-governmental institutions and consultant firms invited to contribute their data on SSP to the platform.
Action Highlights: Integrate the Current Data Platform and Technical Resources of Different Departments for the Formation of a Unified SSP Data-sharing Platform

7.5.12 The current data platform and technical resources provided by various departments are useful for the formation of a data-sharing platform for baseline study and plan formulation of the SSP in Hong Kong. The plan-making body can utilise the data from different governmental departments and examine whether the data is related to the SSP, such as the Hong Kong Geodata Store mentioned previously and GovHK, which is the one-stop portal provided by various bureaux and departments. After the integration and selection of related data, a more comprehensive data platform for SSP can be formed, enhancing the efficiency in doing related research for SSP.

Action Highlights: Involve Non-governmental Institutions from Different Sectors

7.5.13 This platform can allow contribution to the database by the non-governmental sectors. As it is difficult and time-consuming to rely solely on the government to collect SSP-related data, different sectors other than the authority, including the academia, economic sector, social sector, environmental sector, etc., are also invited to the construction of the data platform. The coordination between the government and non-governmental fields can supplement one another and deliver a more comprehensive data platform for further SSP study.

Action Highlights: Inspect and Standardise the Shared Data to the Platform

7.5.14 Although both governmental and non-governmental institutions are invited, the standard of their shared data may be different and irrelevant information may be shared to the platform. This may cause operation difficulties in using and managing the platform. Hence, a periodic review of the platform is required to screen out useless information and to arrange the data systematically.

Action Highlights: Announce the Application of Data from the Platform to the Study of SSP

7.5.15 The other highlight of this action is to reveal the data that has been used for the formulation of baseline study and the subsequent plans. The government has to list out what data from the platform is employed and why the data is used for the study to make the research of the SSP traceable, reliable, and accountable.
Figure 7.5.4  Data-sharing Platform proposed in Smart City @Kowloon East
Source: Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO)

**Action 4.3: Establish the Strategic Planning Working Coordination Unit under PICO**

7.5.16  In response to committing an innovative institutional environment while achieving coordination among agencies on strategic planning affairs, establishing a working coordination unit to gather experts from concerned departments and agencies across all disciplines is recommended. This working unit will be established under PICO to leverage the high-status and high legitimacy of the central policy coordinator and act as its “right-hand man” to coordinate policies with regards to SSP and to foster effective communication among agencies across spatial, technical, economic and social disciplines.
**Local Potentials**

7.5.17 DEVB is acquainted in organizing cross-discipline steering and working committees, with Task Force on Land Supply (TFLS) being one of the most fruitful working committees in recent years that is also relevant to HK2030+ (TFLS, 2019). The previous committees display the ability to gather multi-disciplines agencies together to strive for a common goal. The extensive experiences assure DEVB is capable of organizing and coordinating cross-disciplines thematic working groups, however, these are often temporary in nature and operating in task-based. Yet, in the domain of SSP which is perceived as complex and long-term and as the Consultant recommends to regularize SSP and its review, it is essential to commission a regular working coordination unit that operates continuously and is dedicated specially for SSP and related chores.

**Timeframe, Lead Agency, and Partners**

7.5.18 The Strategic Planning Working Unit to be established under PICO will have a similar position to the Council of Advisers on Innovation and Strategic Development (CAISD), which is an external advisory body to the CE on the strategic positioning of Hong Kong and research on global trends and challenges (PICO, 2018). As aforementioned, current cross-agencies thematic working groups are temporary and task-based, the Unit will, therefore, be permanent in nature and working continuously towards the SSP and related businesses. The Consultant advises to invite the Secretary for Development to chair the unit while experts from relevant departments ranging from spatial, technical, economic and social policy disciplines that are concerned with SSP and related matters will be invited to join the unit. Please refer to Figure 7.5.6 for further information.
Figure 7.5.6  Potential Parties Involved in the Working Coordination Unit  
Source: The Consultant

**Action Highlights: Achieve Two Main Functions**

7.5.19 The Unit will serve two major functions, first to act as a channel of communication among departments to achieve mutual understanding and foster communication, thus, to effectively translate the strategies into favourable actions, second to work closely with CAISD to learn about the foresight mindset and collaborative working style.

**Action Highlights: Stimulate Communication and Coordination in the SSP Loop**

7.5.20 Working as a permanent and continuous operating unit, it will be involved across all critical stages in the “current” SSP as well as assisting on the commencement and subsequent stages in the “next” SP following the present. The relationship between the Unit and the SSP process could be summarized as a loop as it will not be absent from any of the steps of the making of the current SSP nor from the action implementation nor from the baseline review for drafting the next SP.

**Baseline Review - Current SSP**

7.5.21 Prior to the actual making of the SP, baseline reviews are conducted extensively to allow the plan-making bodies to understand better the current performances as well as the future challenges and opportunities, often conducted according to different policy sectors and topics. The Unit that gathers experts from different policy arena can advise the plan-making body on the sectoral performances and future challenges and opportunities in a coordinated manner while taking advantage of the Action 4.2: Construct an Inter- & Intra-departmental Data-sharing Platform for Baseline Study and Plan Formulation.
**Preparation - Current SSP**

7.5.22 Succeeding the baseline review, the Unit is able to advise the plan-making body (PlanD) and the policy-maker (DEVB) on some initial priorities which are after policy coordination with the aligned policy schedules and the shared long-term planning horizon. Besides, the Unit is committed to report the capacity of the Unit itself as well as member departments, thus, the plan-worker is supported to write the action plan precisely, which is to be published together with the final report.

**Finalising - Current SSP**

7.5.23 Since the building blocks of the SSP introduces aspatial focuses gradually while the spatial implications will go beyond the development of solely grey infrastructures as compared to previous strategic plans, the Unit can be the one-stop consultant or auditor to provide the final-checking and the pre-coordination services to DEVB and PlanD to finalise the documents.

**Promulgation - Current SSP**

7.5.24 As soon as the final report is promulgated, the Unit can internally coordinate the updated SP with the latest action plans or similar policy guidance from the concerned departments to communicate and liaise on smooth cooperation. The constant coordination among departments with respect to the new SP adopted exhibit the utmost function of the plan, which is to advise and work closely together within the government to strive for an advanced Hong Kong.

**Implementation and Beyond - Current SSP**

7.5.25 It is well-justified for the co-publishment of an action plan during the promulgation, that clearly demonstrates the action needed, the time frame, some responsible parties, and the implementation nature. The Unit that serves as a channel of communication here, can assist in the monitoring and evaluation mechanism, in particular, the mid-term review. The Unit enables the planning agency to track the progress of the implementation of strategies, as contributed by the everyday cross-departmental communication internally.

7.5.26 Meanwhile, examining the global and local trends is one of the key reviewing elements in the mechanism, that as the Unit works under PICO, who is proactively researching on the global strategic trends concerning the strategic positioning of Hong Kong, thus, the unit is able to advise on the suitability of the actions drafted in the action plan against the current performances and the future trends and suggest adjustment where appropriate.

**Baseline Review - Next SSP**

7.5.27 In the completion of the cycle of the current SSP, the Unit will continue working towards the new SSP, starting from the baseline review to derive deeper understanding of the contemporary contexts. In particular, the Unit will make use of the results of the mid-term review conducted to work specifically on the strategies that no longer fit into the current and future context. The changes will be the basis of the baseline review and initial priorities of the subsequent SSP.
Figure 7.5.7  Workflow of Working Coordination Unit
Source: The Consultant

**Action Highlights: Demonstrate Foresight and Adopt a Strategic Mindset**

7.5.28 The second function of the Unit is to inherit a strategic mindset by working closely with PICO and CAISD as they are the pioneers of change in the HKSAR government bureaucracy. A genuinely visionary mindset can bring a significant change in the legitimacy of an SSP because the mindset adopted determines how the government perceives the direction of future development of the city and forms the basis of how they set the agenda of SSP and how they work in the SSP process.

7.5.29 Given that the working unit will be formed under PICO to leverage its status of being at the “centre of the government” that directly reports to the CE, the members in the Unit will be able to learn the innovative and strategic mindset from PICO and CAISD and be trained as the pioneers of change within the bureaucracy to eventually bring the strategic mindset back to their respective departments. Hence, it is hoped that PlanD and other partnering agencies can be influenced to transform the existing bureaucratic, rigid, and inefficient working practice into a new one. Adopting a strategic mindset is necessary to avoid formulating an SSP by simply mixing data and development directions from different departments (黃雲娜, 2018b). It also ensures the implementation of strategies in an SSP will be done effectively and efficiently and avoid actions being hindered by bureaucratic inefficiency (香港01, 2019b; 香港01, 2020).

7.5.30 Nevertheless, it will not be feasible and effective for PlanD and DEVB to formulate the SSP only if the two adopt a foresight and strategic mindset but not the whole-of-government, especially relevant governmental departments and high-level governmental units. If the high-level unit is not doing this, it will not be possible for PlanD to put forth a forward-looking and innovative SSP. This will be a long-term action not limited to the SSP period and requires a fundamental change. Figure 7.5.8 below illustrates the relationship between PICO, CAISD, and the Unit.
Summary of Recommendation 4

7.5.31 Having an extensive network of cross-agency coordination and collaboration as the backbone of the SSP can enhance the institutional capacity of departments, especially the plan-making body. The coordination network is achieved by first regularising the SSP process including the review, followed by standardizing the data available in independent agencies and promoting sharing of inputs, and ultimately establishing a working coordination unit with the aid of readily available PICO. With all these actions put forward together, although some are quick-win and some require fundamental changes, the overall communication within the whole-of-government will be strengthened with the Unit to set a precedent and more importantly to enhance the institutional efficiency, meaning to maximize the benefit with the least resources.

7.5.32 Regarding the three actions, **Regularise SSP and its Review** will be a short term action since the detailed action could be carried out under the jurisdiction of PlanD that requires the least complex communication in the early stage. Likewise, **Construct an Inter- & Intra-departmental Data-sharing Platform for Baseline Study and Plan Formulation** can be taken as a medium-term action as it requires additional technical support and cross-departmental inputs, that will be involving a wider range of parties within and beyond the government. Lastly, the action to **establish the Strategic Working Coordination Unit** is considered as the most fundamental change that is at the same time the most challenging, not only because it is concerned with
the institutional arrangement, but it also involves the whole-of-government approach that is relevant to SSP. The supplementary human resources and administrative inputs have to be taken into consideration, as they may affect the progress of the establishment.

### Figure 7.5.9 Summary of Recommendation 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>LEADING AGENT</th>
<th>PARTNER</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>ACTION HIGHLIGHTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 4: Catalyse Coordination and Collaboration among Governmental Agencies</td>
<td>Regularise the SSP Process Including its Review</td>
<td>OCBD PlanD</td>
<td>Other Governmental Departments</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Propose Regular Timelines for Hong Kong SSP Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct an Inter- &amp; Intra-departmental Data-sharing Platform for Baseline Study and Plan Formulation</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Coordination Unit</td>
<td>Other Governmental Departments</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Integrate the Current Data Platform and Technical Resources of Different Departments for the Formation of a Unified SSP Data-sharing Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish the Strategic Planning Working Coordination Unit under PIDO</td>
<td>Secretary for Development</td>
<td>Other Governmental Departments</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Stimulate Communication and Coordination in the SSP Loop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Consultant
8 Implementation Programme

8.1 Considered Time Frame

8.1.1 The HK2030+ study process commenced in 2015 and according to the interviews, the Consultant noticed the expected time of promulgation of the final report will be by the end of 2020. It implies that, when considering the timing of proposed actions in recommendations, some of them may be the immediate actions that apply to the release stage of the report to alleviate some current inadequacies in SSP.

8.1.2 Considering that the Consultant is proposing a regularised time interval between SSPs and Mid-term Review as stated in Chapter 7, the Mid-term Review shall be conducted in 2025-2026. The next round of preparation of the new SSP is estimated to be starting from 2027-2028 and most of the recommendations should be applicable to the next SSP except some long-term actions with uncertain implementation time frame. Eventually, the next SSP is expected to be promulgated in 2030-2031.

![Figure 8.1.1 Critical Stages and Main Activities in Current Status (May 2020)](source: The Consultant)

8.2 Key Factors of Prioritising Recommendations

8.2.1 First and foremost, the significance of recommendations is much appreciated in sequencing the priorities for various actions. For actions acting as the prerequisites of other actions or can spark changes onwards in some particular arenas or aspects are therefore prioritized.

8.2.2 Secondly, the duration and interval listed in the recommendations and relevant actions will be considered to arrange the best timing for the activities. Especially for actions supposed to be issued at the same time with the final report, or right after the
release, they will be given the highest priority as the final report is about to be delivered this year.

8.2.3 Thirdly, the **required resources or changes in institutional setting** are considered to be some of the dominant factors in influencing the appropriate timing for recommendations. If any recommendations require much inter-departmental collaboration and resources that are not available currently, such proposals will be designated as medium- to long-term actions.

8.3 **Proposed Implementation Programme**

8.3.1 Four recommendations altogether include 13 relevant actions and the actions will be categorised into four types of implementation priority, namely (1) **Immediate Actions (0-1 year)**, (2) **Short-term Actions (0-3 years)**, (3) **Medium-term Actions (0-5 years)**, and (4) **Long-term Actions (0-10 years)**. All actions, except regularising the time interval of SSP and its Mid-term Review, are not specified with an exact year to be implemented for reserving flexibility in actual practices.

8.3.2 Meanwhile, the minimum implementation time of each type is specified as zero year after the release of this report, so as to reinforce the importance to commence the preparation works for all actions as soon as possible, especially for those long-term actions that are expected to involve more collaboration among bureaux and departments.

**Immediate Actions (0-1 year)**

**Benchmark with Updated International Sustainable Guidelines**

8.3.3 Relating the final deliverables and spatial planning contents of HK2030+ with international sustainable guidelines (i.e. UNSDG) helps improve the public perception in terms of reinforcing the endeavour that the planning authority has made to address sustainability issues in a clearer and remarkable means, and helps ease the difficulty to communicate the concept.

**Utilise Interactive Means to Disseminate SSP Information**

8.3.4 As there are comments regarding the unsatisfactory level of the readability of PE documents of HK2030+, it is urgent to sort out digital solutions to promote the plan content more effectively to show eagerness in achieving a better public understanding and awareness of the latest SSP.

**Formulate an Action Plan**

8.3.5 While the complicated nature of the preparation works for formulating an Action Plan is acknowledged, it is crucial for HK2030+ to at least announce an Action Plan which outlines the subsequent planning activities as soon as possible (namely the launch of Planning and Engineering Study and other subsequent studies planned after HK2030+), in order to show the ongoing progress to the public. The remaining parts suggested to be included should also be supplemented in the short term.
Short-term Actions (0-3 years)

Implement Parallel PE Practices within and outside the SSP Study Period
8.3.6 Aiming at extending the discussion of spatial issues in Hong Kong and enhancing people’s awareness of relevant topics, the issue on how to sustain the practices of listening to people after the promulgation of the final report of HK2030+ is worth consideration.

Incorporate Innovative Platforms into Continuous Engagement Activities
8.3.7 In order to grasp the chance of technological advancement and smart city initiatives, the government should develop and prepare innovative platforms for continuous engagement activities not only solely for the SSP plan-making process, but also for the sake of other policy areas.

Incorporate a Monitoring Mechanism
8.3.8 Following the release of the Action Plan, the proposed annual monitoring should take place as a short-term action to ensure the effective operation of the Action Plan.

Regularise the SSP Process Including its Review
8.3.9 In order to establish an accountable and promising image in front of the general public for the SSP practices, it is the high time to announce the regularised arrangements after the release of HK2030+.

Medium-term Actions (0-5 years)

Adopt a Holistic Regular Review System
8.3.10 Referring to the recommended actions, the regular Mid-term Review should be conducted in the time frame of medium-term actions. It will be practised approximately in 2025-26.

Enhance the Connection between Aspatial Policies and Spatial Framework
8.3.11 At the time to conduct the Mid-term Review, such a connection should be manifested in the review to refill the gap identified in the preparation of HK2030+. This action will also act as a timely review to SSP content with relevant aspatial policies.

Increase Consideration of the Emerging Technological Context
8.3.12 Echoing with the previous actions, the increased concern in the field of technological advancement should be demonstrated at the time when the Mid-term Review is conducted.

Construct an Inter- & Intra-departmental Data-sharing Platform for Baseline Study and Plan Formulation
8.3.13 According to the proposed regularised time interval between SSPs, the preparation works of the new SSP shall be commenced in 2027-28. Therefore, the data-sharing
platform should be available latest by the end of the time frame of medium-term actions.

**Long-term Actions (0-10 years)**

**Establish an Accountable Feedback Mechanism**

8.3.14 If the innovative platforms developed are welcomed by the general public, the government should definitely consider providing preliminary responses to public concerns via online channels, as the platform will be mature enough to be treated as a regular engagement means. Meanwhile, data collected would be of sufficient representativeness to be analysed by sectoral professionals and academics to share their insights and interpretation.

**Establish the Strategic Planning Working Coordination Unit under PICO**

8.3.15 The action to establish the Strategic Planning Working Coordination Unit is considered as the most fundamental change, which is at the same time the most challenging. It is not only because it is concerned with the institutional arrangement, but it also involves the whole-of-government approach that is relevant to SSP.

8.3.16 The supplementary human resources and administrative inputs have to be taken into consideration, as they may affect the progress of the establishment. Therefore, the Consultant cannot guarantee the action would be attainable in short to medium term. However, the Consultant insists the necessity to establish the Strategic Planning Working Coordination Unit as early as possible, as it is heavily related to every part of the approaches, processes and practices in Strategic Planning.
9 Conclusion

9.1 Key Takeaways

9.1.1 The study process started with a theoretical discussion on the origin, intention, and elements involved in SSP and thus, the analytical framework was established as the backbone of the Study and contributed to latter study stages. The baseline review covers the evaluation of four study directions, including Institutional Setting, Scoping and Approaches, Public Engagement, and Action and Implementation of SSP practices in Hong Kong. To crystallise the focus and scrutinise specific issues to propose recommendations, eight major AOSs are further discussed and substantiated with commentaries received from stakeholder interviews. The international case study was then conducted to discover highlights and best practices in other cities and examine if they would imply any local potential in improving the current conditions.

9.1.2 The proposed overall positioning of SSP aims at clarifying the significance, functions, and roles of SSP in Hong Kong that the Consultant suggests to optimise the SSP practice and exert its influence to guide the future development paths of the city. Four recommendations, namely (1) Extend the Coverage of Sustainability Strategies and Consideration on Emerging Context, (2) Restructure the Approaches and Practices of Public Engagement, (3) Formulate an Action Plan with Regular Evaluation Mechanism, and (4) Catalyse Coordination and Collaboration among Governmental Agencies, echo with the four study directions and are supported by relevant actions in detail. The corresponding implementation programmes also consider the status of HK2030+ and so prioritise some actions to gradually improve the status quo.

9.1.3 In conclusion, the Study has reviewed the approaches, processes and practices of SSP in Hong Kong, taking into account local and regional contexts, international experiences, emerging trends and innovations, and eventually provided appropriate recommendations with implementation programmes.

9.2 Study Limitations

9.2.1 The Study was conducted from 20 January 2020 to 18 May 2020. Given that the PE report and final report of HK2030+ had not been promulgated, there was a noticeable limitation for the Consultant to fully analyse the practices in HK2030+, which is that the Consultant has not received the whole set of deliverables of HK2030+ to comment. To cope with the timing issue, the Consultant reviewed existing accessible materials and also invited planners involved in the preparation of HK2030+ to further advise on the practices. Consequently, findings relevant to the deliverables of HK2030+ were presented and concluded as one of the major AOS (Section 4.8 refers) to provide follow-ups and evaluation once the mentioned documents are available.
9.2.2 Another study limitation was that the novel coronavirus epidemic during the commissioned period of the Study affected the arrangement of interviews, resulting in cancellation or changing the format to email replies. The Consultant explored and prepared alternative choices of interviewees under six selected sectors and also for the international case study, and settled communication issues by adopting online conferences for most of the interviews.

9.2.3 Lastly, as there is no definite interpretation of the scope and coverage of SSP, the Consultant mostly relied on the self-developed framework in analysing the approaches, processes, and practices of SSP in Hong Kong. Therefore, the Consultant may have underestimated the relevancy of some aspects involved in SSP.

9.3 Future Pathways

9.3.1 In accordance with the four study directions and eight AOs substantiated with baseline review and stakeholder interviews, the Study has developed a corresponding set of recommendations and relevant actions with due concern of their feasibility and significance. Meanwhile, some possible directions to be explored are filtered out in the Final Report in the light of their complexity and uncertainties in particular areas. Nevertheless, the Consultant acknowledges the potential of these directions in advancing the plan-making process and they are subject to further research.

Institutional Setting
- Investigate the possibility of re-launching the Reengineering Study to review the institutional setting in urban planning and development; and
- Consider the position of LegCo in contributing to the plan-making process more proactively.

Scoping and Approaches
- Study the need for expanding the scope to intervene into more aspatial policy areas; and
- Conduct an in-depth checking of research methodology and reasonings for projections and calculations demonstrated in HK2030+.

Public Engagement
- Review the role of emerging civil and social organisations, think tanks, and research communities in advancing the outputs of SSP; and
- Explore the functions of the District Council in gathering commentaries and proposals at the district level and their translation to the higher-level SSP.

Action and Implementation
- Involve an Independent Commission to provide checks and balances for the plan implementation and monitoring stages; and
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## Appendix 1  Study Targets, Tasks and Outcomes in Study Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Target(s)</th>
<th>Task(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Study</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>1. Define the scope and nature of strategic spatial planning</td>
<td>1. Study theoretical literature about strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Understand the essence of strategic spatial planning</td>
<td>2. Summarize the main ideas of related literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Formulate the framework for analysing the strategic spatial planning of</td>
<td>3. Identify the key elements of spatial strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Understand the contents, approaches and practices of strategic planning</td>
<td>1. Study past and present strategic spatial plans and related document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Identify the evolution and trends of strategic spatial planning of Hong</td>
<td>2. Construct evolution lines based on key elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Analyse the strength and opportunity of strategic planning in Hong Kong</td>
<td>3. Examine past commentaries on strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Summarise the areas for improvement of Hong Kong strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Grasp the worldwide trend and development in strategic planning</td>
<td>1. Understand the stakeholders view on the latest strategic planning of Hong Kong</td>
<td>1. Study the strategic spatial plans of the selected cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Highlight role models in respective aspects</td>
<td>2. Identity the key controversies between stakeholders</td>
<td>2. Compare the differences in approach, process and practice of strategic planning between the cases and Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Extract insights and aspiration for strategic planning</td>
<td>3. Recognise stakeholders’ common desire on strategic planning</td>
<td>3. Identify the opportunities for Hong Kong’s current strategic spatial planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consolidation and Recommendation | Recommendation Assessment | 1. Identify coherent recommendation for Hong Kong spatial strategic planning  
2. Recognise the conditions of recommendations for strategic planning  
3. Suggest implementation steps for recommendations | 1. Identify the most widely accepted approach, process and practice of strategic planning  
2. Analyse the motivations and obstacles from stakeholders’ views  
3. Propose strategies and measures to actualise the improvements |
## Detailed Study Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Duration (Days)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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International Review and Lessons to Learn for HK2030+
## Appendix 3  Scope and Sources of Baseline Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements and Types of Sources</th>
<th>Evolution Directions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Setting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scoping and Approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Structure</td>
<td>Review Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Official Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LegCo Website</td>
<td>Public Engagement Booklet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExCo Website</td>
<td>Plans before TDSR*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scoping and Approach</strong></td>
<td>Engaging Strategies and Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Plans</td>
<td>Official Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Reports</td>
<td>Public Engagement Booklet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Engagement Booklet</td>
<td>Plans before TDSR*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Engagement</strong></td>
<td>Efficiency and Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency and Effectiveness</td>
<td>Official Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Reports</td>
<td>LegCo Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action and Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Translation of Vision to Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Reports</td>
<td>Official Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Website</td>
<td>Official Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans before TDSR*</td>
<td>Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Academic Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Paper</td>
<td>Third-Party Report (HKU Convocation Standing Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-Party Report</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HKPRI and HKV)</td>
<td>Commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Set-up</strong></td>
<td><strong>Methodology and Inter-references between Plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book: Making Hong Kong (2018)</td>
<td>Public Engagement Booklet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans before TDSR*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Planning Approach and Local Positioning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Transfer of Knowledge</strong></th>
<th><strong>Policy Review</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official Reports</td>
<td>Official Website</td>
<td>Official Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Engagement Booklet</td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans before TDSR*</td>
<td>Commentaries</td>
<td>Academic Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentaries</td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Third-Party Report (HKU Convocation Standing Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official websites</td>
<td></td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularity in Plan Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Engagement Booklet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans before TDSR*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Initiatives**

- Article (HKIP)
- Official Website
- Engagement booklet

*Plans before TDSR include sources below:

Books: Ho, 2018 (*Making Hong Kong: A History of its Urban Development*); Town Planning Division, Lands Department, 1984 (*Town Planning in Hong Kong*).

Journal Articles: Taylor, 1987; Wong, 2004

Presentation: Ling, 2016
## Appendix 4  
### List of Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Speciality and Expertise of Interviewees</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Authority</strong></td>
<td>Former Director of Planning of PlanD</td>
<td>A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former Director of Planning of PlanD</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former Assistant Director of Planning of PlanD</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced town planner of PlanD involved in strategic planning</td>
<td>D*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academia</strong></td>
<td>Member of Expert Advisory Panel of HK2030+</td>
<td>E*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholar specialising in strategic planning</td>
<td>F^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholar specialising in regional cooperation</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Profession</strong></td>
<td>Practitioner involved in strategic planning of GBA</td>
<td>H*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town planner in private planning consultancy firm</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience town planner in public sector</td>
<td>J*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Sector</strong></td>
<td>Scholar specialising in property development and surveying</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Sector</strong></td>
<td>Project Director in Social Services Organisation</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Councilor in Tsuen Wan District Council</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Sector</strong></td>
<td>Scholar specialising in sustainable development and natural conservation</td>
<td>N*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Head of Conservation organization</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of Environmental Concern Group</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Interviewee(s) who wish to keep their comments remain confidential, therefore, their comments will not be released and only questions will be shown in the Gist of Interviews to mention the topics covered in interviews.

^ Interviewee(s) who wish study teams to seek for their approval before publishing their comments, therefore, their comments will be released at the Final Report stage and only questions will be shown in this Working Paper.
## Appendix 5  Gist of Interviews

### Interviewee A - Gist of Interview

**Date and Time:** 25 March 2020 (Start at 5pm)  
**Medium:** English  
**Format:** Online Interview  
**Confidentiality Requirements:** Only questions are shown  
**Remarks:** Shared interview with two co-consultants

### Section 1: Vision

- It is observed that there is a paradigm shift since HK2030, as the plan has become more vision-driven and has introduced a more comprehensive public engagement exercise. What are the major rationales and motivations behind these changes? Given the dynamic planning context, how would you comment on the envisioning and capacity of HK2030+ in carrying on with the long-term strategic direction set by HK2030?

- What is the status of HK2030+? Should the major focus of SSP be more infrastructure-oriented or a broader approach in shaping Hong Kong with a better planning schedule?

### Section 2: Inter-departmental cooperation

- When we look into the interdisciplinary recommendations proposed by HK2030, it indeed provided a holistic way to go for Hong Kong. However, noticing the actions proposed by the plan would get a wide array of departments/bureaux involved, how could PlanD coordinate or cooperate with others in the data collection stage and implementation stage? And, what role did PlanD take or is taking in this regard? Is here any mechanism in reviewing the collaboration relationship between departments?

- You were once in the XXX, assisting the XXX in preparing the long term development strategy and population policy. What is the status and role of the XXX, when compared with that of the Planning Department, in the formulation and implementation of SSP in Hong Kong?

### Section 3: Planning Technique and Methods

- When we look into the chapter 15 entitled “Response Mechanism” in HK2030, we see a clear path in directing appropriate intervals for monitoring the situation like setting the checkpoints every two or three year. Did the government do so accordingly? If so, why did the government choose not to publicly publish? And we see the checkpoints are involved only in the population estimates, how should the response mechanism design for a more thorough review?

- Since the Territorial Development Strategy, a wide range of quantitative methods have been adopted in the plan preparation and development stages, but not in the implementation stage. How would you comment on the sufficiency of methods, in terms of both quantity and quality, in deciding rational planning options and monitoring the effective implementation of plans?
- We observed that in the evaluation framework of HK2030, “preferred state” (e.g. higher diversity in economic activities & lower air pollution) is used to indicate various aspects of the objectives. Do you think a KPI with discrete targets and timeframe will be a better evaluation mechanism?

### Section 4: Flexibility in Plans

- Regarding the scenario setting and forecasting tool in strategic plan-making, how would you comment on the change from setting reference scenarios of HK2030 to single-scenario planning of HK2030+? Given that the actual situation may divert from the expected scenario, how can the flexibility of strategic plans be ensured in both the plan-making and implementation processes?

- As there has been increasing concern on future uncertainties in terms of worldwide economic development, especially the current downfall of the global economy. As the HK2030 also experienced the economic downfall in 2003 and then formulated afterwards, how did it consider the flexibility in spatial solutions to cope with the unexpected economic conditions? Like a flexible development scale and size, phasing development for projects, or other flexible options provided for the plan.

### Section 5: Stakeholder Engagement

- As a member of the XXX, how do you see the role of think tanks in influencing the agenda setting of SSP in Hong Kong? E.g. in the advocacy/support for the East Lantau Metropolis proposal? Do you see it as an attempt of the government in absorbing the ideas of the professionals and/or the civil society?

- How did HK2030 address the knowledge gap between the general public and planners in urban planning concepts? Any example of activities, and how were they designed to facilitate better communication and understanding between government works and the general public? And how did that contribute to setting up a more comprehensive plan?

### Section 6: Regional Development

- Hong Kong has been positioning itself as an “Asia’s World City” with an emphasis on sustainable development since HK2030, while at the same time, it is observed with an increasing trend that strategic plans mainly focus on cross-boundary cooperation and connectivity instead of international collaboration. How would regional cooperation at a strategic level facilitate the envisioned positioning of Hong Kong in Asia? While taking advantage of the regional economic development, how could Hong Kong maintain its own competitiveness as a world city?
## Interviewee B - Gist of Interview

**Date and Time:** 20 March 2020 (Start at 5pm)  
**Medium:** English  
**Format:** Online Interview  
**Confidentiality Requirements:** All responses are shown  
**Remarks:** Shared interview with two co-consultants

### Section 1: Coordination of Departments and Plans

- We need a clear target of these inter-departmental offices so as to ensure effectiveness, as well as a correct combination of colleagues (architects, planner, engineer in types), also need to have a visionary statement about the duties of the offices, so to develop a strategy to define how to work.

- We also need to know the position of that organisation in the government hierarchy, it is better to set up at bureau level, as at department level only involves implementation of agreed policies, but to challenge the existing policies, we need a task office at bureau level.

- Implementable action plans are also very important.

- The interrelationship between 9 departments under DEVB is quite close.

- The advice is to include the strategic plan of other departments, SSP is to be published by DEVB, and prepared by PlanD, it is not only happening in Hong Kong, issuing different plans at the meantime is so normal, all these sort of activities are on-going, can’t ask others to stop and wait, it is so dynamic and chaotic in reality.

- Some completed strategic plans then need to take into account, if some are working at the same time, we will keep close connection to them, to share information, interact and discuss to have sort of mutual influences in plans and avoid contradictory outcomes and the corresponding doubt on government credibility and capabilities. Take those completed to absorb their works and mention their recommendations.

- Biggest problem is, those work in parallel. Northern Link in railway development strategy is an example. They insist that to be one of the prioritized projects. How to prepare for those as flexible arrangements? Is to leave windows for them.

- The planning practices are so complicated, and so dynamic, not only among departments, but also within the same department.

- The steering committee consists of members from different departments, advisory groups are mainly outsiders, their views are not translated, but really being taken into account, different kinds of experts.

- The major role of the steering committee is to ensure the plan will not contradict to their departments’ policies. The views of the advisory panel are seriously considered. Generally the proposal is put forward to them as testing ground, to see if it is really implementable.
## Section 2: Public Engagement

- PE is a painful practice, the forever dilemma in planning, those benefit from the proposal are not there today, but the affecting groups are always there, for each proposal, the objecting voice always covers the supporting voice. It is about the professional choice of planners. If you are affected by the stronger objecting voice, you achieve nothing. SSP is so far-fetched and visionary, people don’t know how to comment on plans.

- PE activities are to make the plans more visible to make public can say about the SSP, PlanD will raise some ideas to test their feedback, and relate those ideas into daily examples, useful for strategic planners to understand the general feeling of the public.

- Questionnaires are complicated. It is a very complicated issue, and I hope people go through all of them to help PlanD solicit views. Compared with representation of TPB and questionnaire prepared for HK2030+, other than standard questionnaires may affect the tangible outcomes and views, but SSP is so complicated.

## Section 3: Regional Development

- Hong Kong is the CBD of GBA. We also need to enhance our infrastructure and land provision. Operation costs in HK are very high because they can generate high profits, but we need to lower the cost of operation, especially the rent/land cost.

- Quality of office affects the investment opportunity, we also need to make those sort of office provisions available.

- The Planning Department maintains a very good relationship with the Planning Authority in all cities in GBA. Developed a regular meeting to exchange ideas and learned from each other. These kinds of activities facilitate information exchange. Border control studies are reflecting the results of the communication process and collaboration with departments in the mainland. The liaison takes time, the politics in Hong Kong may also hinder the development and regional cooperation.

- Association of Governments in the San Francisco Bay Area, they do not have real power but a platform to discuss among city governments. This sort of liaison partnership is necessary, to facilitate better collaboration between cities about resources, policies, infrastructure, industry, economic development. Project implementation can be also worked out with regional cooperation.

- For future works about regional context, we need a lot of liaison and collaboration with GBA, especially shenzhen. Several cooperation opportunities: (1) railway connection between HSK and Qianhai, (2) redevelopment of Luohu area and border control point, earliest part developed. Hong Kong can’t survive alone.

## Section 4: Flexibility in Plans

- Conceptual framework no need to wait for other study to complete. Strategic planning formulates vision and influences others. Strategic planning is not a document but an argument, to provide strategic direction, spatial distribution of resources.

## Section 5: Agenda Setting

- Superficial arguments are wasting our time. People enjoy talking but not doing.
Section 6: Plan Implementation

- Strategic planning is yardstick to test the performance of the government

Section 7: Time Frame and Evaluation of Strategic Plans

- Other cities are reflecting the election agenda of certain candidates, as they have limited time, the implementation of such a plan is heavily tied with the mayor. So they have to drive it onwards.

- In mainland cities, they will have a 5-year plan. Strategic planning in Shenzhen, they have strong practices of ensuring the proposals can be implemented.

- So far Hong Kong is a bit different, it is produced by a single bureau, only a policy guidance, government is not quite efficient in putting forward that. The execution capacity in Hong Kong is diminishing. We are less capable of developing and putting forward things.

- It makes it difficult to set a rigid timeframe, when we have a strategic plan, we will come up with a development project one or two plans later. The territorial development strategy, like the current one, those detailed projects will have further follow-up in P&E study. HK 2030 endorsed in 2007 followed by 10 infrastructure projects, each having its own schedule. This is Hong Kong style, while the efficiency has to speed up.

- That is a way (Reviewing plans annually) to implement the plan, but it is not our tradition and hard to fit in our system. London has an action plan including more than 100 action items, doubtful if it is a good way to monitor implementation.

- The way of doing so needs to be based on the socio-political status of cities. If we formulate ELM and NTN timeline, like shown in the study report, it is not strictly comparable among cities. Bigger projects will lead its own process.
Interviewee C - Gist of Interview

**Date and Time:** 30 March 2020 (Start at 10am)  
**Medium:** Cantonese (Translated version is as below)  
**Format:** Online Interview  
**Confidentiality Requirements:** All responses are shown  
**Remarks:** Shared interview with two co-consultants

**Section 1: Discussion of SSP Background**

- Strategic in nature, is not about details, therefore, is not only territorial planning, but also district planning, i.e. circulation and access strategy. It can be based on certain subjects as well.

- Strategy planning is not just the whole HK but the district planning, circulation/abstract strategy. Territorial planning is more suitable for this project, not site planning.

- Don't have that in the US gov (no setup, office), even at the state, county level. SSP is not done in the whole world. Like in the US, major transport structure, environment/country park protection are having a topical plan. And in the UK, there are 3 levels of planning responsibility: central government, county, district. UK exercise is different as there is conflict between the district level and county level. In 2004, the UK government almost canceled all the structure systems.

- Modern territorial planning in HK started in the 1980s, as before 1981, it was at a very low level for planning, under the Lands and Works Branch. De-facturization of government department Unit: strategic planning unit, hired one responsible. 1982: real setup - starting to have territorial planning processes.

- A concept: how to make the land use and transport system match with each other - Land use transportation optimization model.

- Plans are useless but planning is essential. It is useless to ask for a not-changing map, we need to review.

- TDSR was done in plan D, with lands and works branches absorbed. A good example as the process was seen as the negative example of planning against planning theories we have learnt.

- Comprehensive planning approach, this assumption is outdated and it is the reason for cancelling structure plans. The Process is too long, and it creates contradictions in interest.

- 1990s launched HK2030 study, only participated a little. The study didn't want to analyze from the start but looking at key issues (cross boundary infrastructure). Several aspects looking back can be picked up now.

- Transparency of the process eg. objectives (government versus public)

- The Government likes to do public consultation, the public gave a lot of comments. But it seems the Government is not listening. A responsible approach/process is that the
government should respond to the public.

- There is a law to regulate the PE in the UK. We should have public consultation and required responses to be documented. If you think the response is not reasonable, can ask you to change the plan. Does a public consultation report be the ONLY one way that responds to the public comments?

- Singapore Year X --- capacity planning (the capacity could be changed according to the kinds and types of public investment) and bureaucratic planning.

- HK does not have land shortage. Even if so, it is the Government’s poor regulation and management on land-use. The government has been misleading people.

### Section 2: Nature of SSP

- The intention of SSP is not development infrastructure driven.

- Political decisions are sometimes intended not to consider all aspects. In 2000, planD did a sustainability study (evaluation tool developed), to guide how we should evaluate three domains of sustainability. But the tool is sort of general questions only. By that time, all projects need to do a sustainability assessment as agreed by ExCo. But no one knows how they conduct the study.

### Section 3: Scenario Setting

- Not so familiar with that part

### Section 4: Methods for Decision-making

- Doubt the ELM reclamation is based on rational analysis.

- All decision making is a political process. (Report handed in to Bureau → steering committee → ExCo)

- Planning in gov is low level, planners in department level not bureau. Planning is a low-tier /low-level government activity → solely for reference purpose

- LDPC (dismissed in 1997) land planning development committee. Chaired by CS, directors of different department are members of this committee, to discuss on the land and planning issues → the directors were able to submit their departmental policies for discussion → had policy support

- Now → no policy support (based on existing policies) → policies from different departments come out of nowhere → able to alter the policies and get policy support? No authority unlike London chaired by mayor

- Now , taken to Policy Committee → have to be agreed by Secretary prior to CS → all turned down

- PlanD had a Re-engineering study in 1999, it suggested that we should enhance the position of PlanD and to relaunch the LDPC to enhance the authority/power of PlanD or planning as a public activity

- However, it was disagreed by lots of people in government as they think you want to
bypass them to directly discuss CS. All in all, Decision making is a political process.

**Section 5: Methods and Techniques for Decision-making and Implementation**

- Monitoring the effectiveness of plans: planning in PlanD did a lot of things. Like investigating a lot of different aspects. But we don't even have the mechanism to implement/conduct the studies Implementation.

**Section 6: Flexibility in Plans**

- Plans are useless but planning is essential. Planning process is more important than planning as a document as once finished the proposal will be followed.

- We should have an attitude: plan flexibly to change/adjust/amend the plans. There are strong objections to ELM because it cannot be changed. Flexibility should be a criterion for plan evaluation.

**Section 7: Evaluation**

- When asking for an evaluation, tailor-made evaluation criteria can get the outcome. Subjective. But the objectiveness of the evaluation criteria should undertake a consultation process. Wide spread of public consultation as we cannot do something without societal consensus.

- Planning consultation can be treated as inspiration progress, consensus building process to reach and understand the interests and concerns of different parties.

- If a proposal doesn't have a proposal, you are just doing nothing constructive.

- Evaluation and monitoring can be directional also time frame, but does not have to specify and shouldnt be irreversible once it's written.

- Monitoring mechanism should not be a fixed one, it should be a process for implementation, and can be changed.

**Section 8: Capacity of PlanD and Institutional Setting**

- Interdepartmental steering committees are indeed very low level. Sustainable development: 講到好勁.

- If you really think about planning to be high level, like in London, it is done by the mayor.

- PlanD is only conducting departmental level activity for current planning. TPB does not have legitimacy.

- In the UK → Joint Planning Committee, enacted by 2004 Government Act → a very high level of steering committee, chaired by high-level officials.

**Section 9: Public Engagement**

- Process needs to be shortened. Don't take up a long long time to finish.

- PE as a type of advocacy → To guide and listen to public views
- PE is a political process. Not a sole professional process. Need to show credibility, let others be confident and feel respectful

### Section 10: Regional Development

- Most worried. In foreign countries, less collaboration but more competition between cities. Thin line for collaboration and cooperation. You might collaborate today but compete tomorrow.

- So the planning of the area needs to depend on its profit. Planning in HK has to be benefiting HK but not for others and in helping others. Should not take the name of regional development and being planned by others and harm the benefits and planning merits of HK.
## Interviewee D - Gist of Interview

### Section 1: Public Engagement Practices

- How would the Planning Department incorporate the opinions of different stakeholders in the drafting process of strategic plans? In terms of collaboration with different stakeholders, how would the Planning Department prioritize the input from some important stakeholders, e.g. MTR? To take HK2030+ as an example, how do steering committee and task groups work together to address different issues eg. transport, infrastructure and conversation?

- Acknowledging there are Knowledge Sharing Seminars and Guided Visit in the public engagement period of HK2030+, who were actually the main audience of these activities and what are the purposes or goals of these activities? How were those activities targeted to clarify the concepts or illustrate the ideas proposed in HK2030+ to the audiences? And it has been a while since the public engagement period of HK2030+, when and how will the Planning Department disclose those opinions received in the whole public engagement to the public?

- From your personal view, what can be improved to address the mismatch of strategic plan development to public understanding? What would be the key factors in constituting as a "successful" strategic plan-making process?

### Section 2: Inter-departmental Collaboration

- What challenges have you faced in facilitating interdepartmental collaboration for the formulation of the draft strategic plan? Each department has their own concerns and, sometimes, competing interests. conflicts of views. How are they compromised?

- As the spatial solutions and overall strategies mentioned in HK2030+, are multi-disciplinary that oftens involve other departments. On the one hand, it needs collaboration between departments for tangible spatial infrastructure projects, on the other hand, to achieve a livable, competitive and sustainable city, it even requires coordination between departments covering a wide range of duties and policy scope. How would the existing institutional setting facilitate the two kinds of cooperation and what role is PlanD taking in the actualization stage given it is the leader in the plan-making process?

- Do you think the resources currently allocated for the formulation of SSP to PlanD is sufficient? If not, how can the institutional capacity of PlanD be enhanced to make even better plans?

### Section 3: Regional Cooperation

- In recent years, regional cooperation between Hong Kong and Southern China seems to be a prevailing trend. What strategies have Hong Kong adopted to maintain our
competitiveness in GBA given the rapid development of other cities in the region? How would you describe the role of the Planning Department in terms of regional strategic planning and collaboration? What are the difficulties of such regional cooperation?

- Are there any formal and informal cooperation relationships with the mainland counterpart in the formulation of HK2030+? Are there institutional changes and differences in planning intentions after the release of the GBA national agenda?

**Section 4: Flexibility in Plans**

- As there has been increasing concern on future uncertainties of Hong Kong and questioning whether future economic development can support the ELM, will the HK2030+ consider the flexibility in spatial solutions to cope with the unexpected economic conditions? Like a flexible development scale and size, and even allowing the government to pause or stop the projects.

**Section 5: Plan Implementation**

- How would the Planning Department ensure an effective and efficient implementation for strategic plans? To take HK2030+ as an example, NDAs are proposed for new town housing development but the government faced difficulties in the land assembly process. How would the strategic plans provide flexibility and certainty to guide local implementation?

- Some strategies stated in HK2030+ are already in action, e.g. the NDAs. Given the continuous progress and dynamic nature of these plans, what are the major tools HK2030+ uses to monitor, and what elements of considerations are used to evaluate whether these plans are in line to achieve the SSP visions?

- What do you think HK2030+ has made its biggest improvement from the previous HK2030? And why is such a change emphasized and put into actions?

- Why adopt a “beyond 2030” approach to avoid setting the time frame of a plan?
**Interviewee E - Gist of Interview**

**Date and Time:** 20 March 2020 (Start at 2:30pm) and 23 March 2020 (Start at 4:30pm)
**Medium:** English
**Format:** Online Interview
**Confidentiality Requirements:** Only questions are shown
**Remarks:** Shared interview with two co-consultants

### Section 1: Expert Advisory Panel

- As you are the member of the Expert Advisory Panel in HK2030+, may we know which department, bureau or who was in charge of recruiting the Advisory Panel? What is the criteria of the government to choose the members? And to what extent the Advisory Panel could make an influence on the proposed HK2030+?
- As a part of the expert advisory panel for HK2030+, how would you comment on your role in the strategic plan-making process? How would the panel collaborate with government departments, steering committees and task groups taking part in strategic planning?
- Does the expert committee involve in the envisioning process to derive the general directions of goals and objects? Or more on how to achieve Will the advisory role continue for monitoring purposes upon the promulgation of the final report?

### Section 2: Institutional Setting

- Is PlanD equipped with the necessary capacity to deliver HK2030+? What are some of the challenges in implementation of mega projects?

### Section 3: Liveability Concerns

- The liveability enhancement is one of the three components in the vision of HK2030+. However, it is observed the plan focuses on improving the external environment such as greening and the increase in open space. Is it possible for Hong Kong to set a standard on internal living space like the practice in London?
- For the first building block of HK2030+: Liveability, is setting targets and guidelines like the London Plan a good way to achieve it? (London set up KPI to monitor planning) How more can be done in HK2030+ for e.g. an age-friendly community?

### Section 4: Planning Techniques

- We notice that HK2030+ adopted a single scenario setting, while the previous HK2030 proposed multiple planning choices and development options based on two scenarios to ensure flexibility towards future uncertainties. Was it moving a step backward? How would you comment on this change?

### Section 5: Plan Evaluation

- At the moment, HK2030+ cannot provide sufficient documents and action plans on the timeframe of implementing projects mentioned. There is also a lack of regular review procedures to oversee committed planning projects. How would you comment on this?

### Section 6: Housing Provision
- Given that the private housing and public housing affairs are in charge by different bureau, to what extent do you think strategic plans can guide policies in striking a balance between these two? How would the government regulate the private developers to bring predictable outcomes?

- In HK2030+, strong emphasis has been placed on the housing provision, as well as the improvements on public facilities provision. Yet, issues on quality of housing, affordability and equity were less covered. In what way could strategic planning contribute to these aspects?

**Section 7: Policy linkage with other sectors**

- Enhancing liveability is not only about housing, but also involves transport and policy aspects. How would you comment on the policy linkage between different sectors? How can the cooperation between sectors be further enhanced to facilitate the efficient and effective implementation of housing policies?

**Section 8: Stakeholder Engagement**

- In terms of public engagement exercise, HK2030 tried to involve the public from the beginning stage such as setting up vision, while HK2030+ skipped the earlier stages and only held public consultation after the semi-completed version of the plan. What could be the possible rationale or reasons behind? Which approach would you prefer more?
**Interviewee F - Gist of Interview**

**Date and Time:** 25 March 2020 (Start at 2:30pm)  
**Medium:** English  
**Format:** Online Interview  
**Confidentiality Requirements:** Only questions are shown (All responses will be available after interviewee’s checking towards the gist of comments)  
**Remarks:** Shared interview with two co-consultants

### Section 1: Agenda Setting

- The government has adopted various quantitative analysis methods to examine the land demand and different land development options. To what extent do you think these approaches and methods would facilitate rational decision-making throughout the strategic planning process? How would you comment on the values behind all sorts of objective measurement by the planning authority?

- In your comparative study of SSP in Hong Kong, Singapore and Shenzhen, what is the difference in terms of major planning intention between the three cities which Hong Kong could take reference from? Could you describe more about the path-dependent power relationships? Is it related to the pro-market approach and path in the case of Hong Kong?

### Section 2: Institutional Setting and Status of Plans

- In the sustainable framework from New Urban Agenda, effective implementation would serve as a key component in urban development. Given that strategic plans have the role to guide local plans, how would you comment on the “urban planning in Hong Kong as the sum of departments” affecting the transparency and institutional cooperation in the actual strategic practice?

- What is the status of Strategic Spatial Planning in Hong Kong? It seems that HK2030+ are mostly driven by infrastructural mega projects like NDAs and ELM, but as a territory-wide strategic-level planning document, it also concerns broad concepts such as liveability that have implications beyond the built environment. Should HK2030+ be positioned as a plan guiding spatial development or an integrated plan that addresses both spatial and non-spatial goals and objectives?

### Section 3: Translation of Vision to Actions

- Strategic plans in Hong Kong like HK2030 and HK2030+, or those plans in other cities, are now covering more than spatial and infrastructural projects, like adding more focus to the liveability and equity issue. To translate the vision and objectives into workable actions, it becomes more difficult, which are less straightforward and more “invisible”. How would you comment on the performance of HK2030+? And especially when the plan is criticized for its limited engagement with the public, do you think the government has distorted people’s wants into its own intentions?

### Section 4: Public Engagement

- In the typical urban planning process, we always question “whose needs?”, “whose visions?” and “who decides?”. How would you describe the role of professionals and citizens at the strategic plan-making process? From your perspective, what can the
government do to address the mismatch between the planning ideology and public expectations on the strategic plans?

- From the community engagement perspective, public participation in Hong Kong would still remain at tokenism level. Given that citizens would have diverse views toward strategic issues, how should Plan D balance the views of different stakeholders at the strategic level? What can be done to actualize citizens’ rights in strategic plan-making? With reference to the case in Singapore, do you think Singapore has a better public engagement practice at strategic level?

- Since HK2030+’s first public engagement happened after the spatial plan was out, many commented that the visions were not shared among the public. Do you think co-visioning with the public in the early stage of SSP is workable in Hong Kong? What do you think is the major constraint in the co-visioning exercise?

**Section 5: Plan Evaluation**

- What do you think are the significance of KPI in strategic spatial plans? Apart from check and balance, does it also serve as a tool for better public understanding? Do you think population/job opportunities projections of individual mega projects (e.g. NDA, ELM) are sufficient?

**Section 6: Strategic Planning in Shenzhen**

- We observed the government in Shenzhen regulated and stipulated the form, contents, and procedure of master plan formulation in Shenzhen to ensure the legal status of all plans from the strategic level to the local plans. What could explain such a decision to be put forward by the Shenzhen government? And can you see the possibilities for the Hong Kong government to legalize the strategic plan?

- We noticed that in Shenzhen, they encountered the problem of having a large “invisible” population. It is almost a “mission impossible” to plan for the social amenities and infrastructure required by that population. How did Shenzhen cope with this problem via strategic planning and other planning tools in these years? How could Hong Kong learn from them in terms of increasing the flexibility of our strategic plan instead of a single-scenario solution adopted in HK2030+?

- Community planner is always treated as a method to facilitate better communication and understanding between government works and the general public. Shenzhen has taken a step forward to practice the idea for years, how would you comment on their practices? And what has prevented Hong Kong from officially actualizing this idea?
## Interviewee G - Gist of Interview

### Date and Time: 24 March 2020 (Start at 11am)

**Medium:** English  
**Format:** Online Interview  
**Confidentiality Requirements:** All responses are shown  
**Remarks:** Shared interview with two co-consultants

### Section 1: Economic Development

- I think HK2030+ provides a direction. How effective is the plan? As a well conceived plan, definitely it has a direction and is effective, and in terms of implementation too. How can it be improved?

- I think this is more a conceptual direction when talking about strategic level. I want to introduce the notion of 3C: Coordination, collaboration, and cooperation. These 3Cs are going to be important to jumpstart the whole development towards the direction.

- Reindustrialisation and smart city may not necessarily be the same thing. It can be reindustrialisation without smartness. Whether or not HK is able to grasp the opportunity and tap the potential of the GBA?

- When talking about untapped opportunities of GBA, it is whether or not it is a holistic one. Sometimes this type of development (e.g. smart) may not be concrete in another aspect, e.g. environmental. They may not work out in a harmonious manner. Whether or not we have the adequate human resources for reindustrialisation and promotion of smart production? Attract foreign labour? It will open up the labour market. How these potentials are being read in the industrial context?

### Section 2: Flexibility in Plans

- A commonly asked question since ELM is raised. The phasing development for projects: are you talking about the projects identified in 2030+? Or ELM? If you mean ELM, I think it is very very vague. What we can clearly know is that it will provide housing to people. Others are not specific.

### Section 3: Evaluation and Monitoring

- Policy making in HK has good transparency already. Who is going to identify the monitoring standards?

- Monitoring takes a lot of forms, mass media can also play a role, on the other side, one would expect some sort of response to the comments. Questioning whether or not the monitor can be an effective one,

### Section 4: Positioning of Hong Kong

- In terms of the GBA area, normally we talk about One Country Two Systems, but there are also 3 tariff regions within the GBA area. And convertibility of RMB. HK’s position as a financial centre is secured in this context.

- Two directions / angles we can consider: Institutional setup, how will it be possible (9+2
within/before the GBA); how and in what way the HKSAR Government can plan beyond? It is built on existing infrastructure, rather than advocating some initiatives outside the jurisdiction of Hong Kong.

- The possibility of social integration, it has been happening even long before the 2030 document. Either the market or the public already sees this potential of social integration. Another example is about residential development. You are very much aware that there are many residential projects in Shenzhen, Dongguan, Zhuhai, western side of Zhongshan for retirees of HK. Under the One Country Two Systems there may be institutional setup that may occur as an obstacle. You can see how Singapore works closely with Malaysia and Indonesia.

- Hard/ soft power: can HK make best use of SSP? To what extent do you want to build and attract? People would argue the need to change the cage (phoenix and net). World trend about this wisdom depends on what you want to build and who the target audience is.

Section 5: Regional Institutional Setting

- No doubt about that, be proactive, try very best to take to counter parts of delta areas. But it is not the end of the story when the plan is out, as Plan D cannot directly influence policy making, a lot of process to identify the details project by project.

- When saying what level and type of working relationship will work best for Hong Kong’s planners, I would say not only planners, they are vehicles to facilitate the journalists. It is not only the responsibility of planners for this collaboration, planners from HK are capable and able to work well with specialists in addressing pollution in a strategic manner.

- Need to be very critical. No two cities are identical, even NY and London. All we need is to have cross-learning, and also need to argue with its ability to transform itself in a very challenging time. The frequency of challenges increases rather than decreases. Think whether or not the cities face similar challenges. Within 40 years Shenzhen turned from a town to a large city, infrastructure attracts talented people, this perhaps provides some fruit of thought for investigation to see how Shenzhen turned from a town to a large city.
Section 1: Regional Cooperation and Competition

- Since the Greater Bay Area initiative provides an inevitable trend for cities in Guangdong and Hong Kong to cooperate in terms of economy and development, do you think Hong Kong will be shaped into a solely financial city, with all less profitable industries relocated to Guangdong in the long run? If yes, do you think it is a visionary strategy for Hong Kong itself as a sustainable or self-supporting city?

- As a follow-up to the previous question, can you suggest how the Hong Kong government and entrepreneurs can balance between the needs of Hong Kong to be a self-sufficient city and a collaborative city in GBA?

Section 2: Information Technology Development

- We all know, the information industry will be more dominant in the coming future. A city which does not take actions to strengthen the IT sector will be less competitive. Hong Kong spends a lot of money on building IT infrastructure to push it forward, but the outcome is way behind Shenzhen. So apart from technical aspects, in which aspect, e.g. governance and financial, do you think HK is not ready to take up this trend? And what are some possible solutions for Hong Kong to embrace the opportunity?

Section 3: Flexibility in Plans

- We noticed the Greater Shenzhen Towards 2050 is adopting a scenario-planning approach to support the city’s further growth amid future uncertainties. When comparing with the single-scenario setting in HK2030+, how would it facilitate a better planning practice in Shenzhen and any other scenario-planning practices in other Shenzhen’s strategic plans, like a flexible development scale and size, phasing development for projects, or other flexible options provided for the plan.

Section 4: Institutional Setting

- In order to make planning more important in guiding future regional cooperation and urban growth, institutional setting is crucial in determining the capabilities of government units to coordinate and implement. As you mentioned institutional reform and some experimental approaches will be the solutions to identifying and formulating strategies for a city, how would you comment on the difference between Shenzhen and Hong Kong in terms of institutional flexibility?

Section 5: Public Engagement

- How would you comment on and compare the public engagement practices between Shenzhen and Hong Kong, especially in terms of communicating those difficult concepts to the general public and deciding when to get the public involved for plan-making?
**Section 6: Economic and Spatial Planning**

- We notice that master planning in Shenzhen is combining economic strategic planning and spatial strategic planning together to achieve a complementary but not overlapping industry policy, for instance, the 18 片區發展 mentioned in 《深圳市城市建設與土地利用十三五規劃》. Do you think it is a must to link the two together in order to facilitate a seamless connection and cooperation between economic development and land requirements?

**Section 7: Status of Plan**

- As the strategic plans are also made statutory in Shenzhen, implying that all spatial plans are statutory, why do you think the government and planners value OZPs (法定圖則) more than other plans and see them as the core of planning and other tiers of plans as supplementary? As such, why do you think Strategic Plans have to be statutory then? Do you see any possibilities of legalizing Strategic Plans in Hong Kong like in Shenzhen?

**Section 8: Action and Implementation**

- The impressive growth of Shenzhen in these 3 decades also indicated the ability and capability of Shenzhen in terms of grasping the development opportunities in a very efficient response. What do you think about the performance of Shenzhen in terms of turning vision into actual spatial actions and also the regular progress review for their plan implementation?

- Infrastructure-led planning is common in the early development of cities. However, many of them turned to a more balanced planning approach at certain times. Has Shenzhen experienced such a change in planning approach? If yes, how and when did the planning authority realise the need for the change?
### Interviewee I - Gist of Interview

**Date and Time:** 15 March 2020 (Start at 10:30am)  
**Medium:** Cantonese (Translated version is as below)  
**Format:** Online Interview  
**Confidentiality Requirements:** All responses are shown  
**Remarks:** Shared interview with two co-consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1: Public Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Statutory plans are low transparency in terms of documents accessed by the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Strategic planning → more abstract &amp; not legally binding but no statutory guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● How much of the comments are considered in the plan-making, it is about the mentality rather than discussing the format or methods they used in public engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Consultation during Land Debate is suspicious as suppose we should be consulted during HK2030+ already, is that consultation made to convince the public or interpret as some sort of consensus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The HK2030+ is not responding to the current challenges, like unused land, and absence of strategies towards inclusion with the global world. The indicators are there, like the increase of open space per citizen, but we cannot see the government showing their follow-up actions in doing so, it will be less convincing towards the public as even current problems are not yet solved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● It is not about the times of conducting public forums, but like the practices in non-strategic parts, TPB at least will consider each comment and give out their reasons for accepting or noticing those comments. In view of that, we see the difference between legalising the engagement process or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● In fact, when you are open to the public, somehow will improve the efficiency as the public are more understanding of the plans put forward by the government, or else, the public will use every method they can think of to stop you from implementing the plan. Any mitigation mechanism is possible between the administrative officials and public?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● PE is a two-way communication, professionals should be the medium between two and even the government should allow trial in smaller-scale community planning projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The SSP in fact links to many policies, economic planning and regional inclusion. The basis of these policies is sure to be unchangeable, but people would like to look into the vision and very beginning of these policies. It depends on whether the government has that kind of &quot;sincerity&quot; to listen at least voices from people without premises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● At the end, we all hope to help mitigate the vigorous public views and the government, at least achieve mutual understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2: Development Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ● What the government considered is more on the political side, like which option will be
less difficult to do when it comes to negotiation with different parties. That’s why they would love to propose a virgin land without settling the land ownership issues. But when reclamation is no more the same as in the old days, like the increasing cost and difficulty (when you want to build in the middle of the sea).

- Is there anything within the administrative procedure or institutional setting? LegCo is supposed to be the second goal-keeper that manages the funds that would not blindly support the government.

### Section 3: Data Consolidation and Transparency

- We cannot see a transparent process for the government to do the review or publish the data. Like even some studies are pushed by the general public, then the government commissioned consultants to work on that. Even when the study is completed, they refuse to give out a usable file for the general public, but a low-quality photo.

- It shows the government stopping the professional, the public and the information technology sector to do something good for our society. Even government got the data, they are also not in a full picture of the whole issue.

### Section 4: Action and Implementation

- I am not sure if it will be good to legalise the plans and implementation. But I cannot see the government will actively propose amendments towards the controversial ordinances, like EIAO.

- Even in daily matters, government departments are working so discretely. No matter in what stage, I believe the SSP should review and consider the institutional setting.

### Section 5: Role of Professionals

- We normally do the district-based projects, and it depends on whether an individual planning professional is willing to join and help, we treat it as the voluntary job. But like in Hong Kong, there are Legal Aid Schemes for people in need, how about in the planning field? How to assist and empower the public during the plan-making process?

- Professionals are given some briefing sessions as part of the PE practices from the government, however, the submission from these institutions are just one of the tremendous entries, like no one ensures whether the government should listen to who and to what extent they listen.
## Interviewee J - Gist of Interview

**Date and Time:** 27 March 2020 (Start at 2:30pm)  
**Medium:** English  
**Format:** Online Interview  
**Confidentiality Requirements:** Only questions are shown  
**Remarks:** Shared interview with two co-consultants

### Section 1: Urban Renewal in Hong Kong

- It is known that urban renewal is not a major strategic focus in the strategic plan, how would you comment on the positioning of urban renewal in Hong Kong? Given that strategic planning in Hong Kong is focused on supplying raw land for development, how would you comment on the government's attitude and support to renewal issues (especially rehabilitation, preservation and revitalization) at a strategic level?

- URA is not in the governmental organization hierarchy, but regarded as a statutory body to be responsible for all renewal issues. Entrusted as an unique status, how would the URA collaborate with the government departments and public stakeholders in the strategic plan-making process? How would URA make reference to the government's strategic plan to the urban renewal strategy?

### Section 2: Role of Professionals

- It is claimed that Singapore’s planning culture is a collaboration between politicians and professionals. How would you describe the role of professionals taking part in the government structure? In terms of public engagement, the public consultation in Singapore focuses on the exchange of views between different stakeholders. Particularly for focus groups as a key component in the strategic plan-making process, how could professionals contribute to the long-term planning of different issues? How is it different with the practices in Hong Kong?

### Section 3: Housing Issues

- It is noticed that Hong Kong will have a declining population (expected peak at 8.22 million) and demand for housing starting from 2043. Yet, HK2030+ maintains planning for a larger projected population (9 million), which the creation of development capacity set out. From your planning experiences for housing, what do you think are the major considerations underlying this projection? What recommendations would you give to ensure that long-span plans for housing are kept consistent?

### Section 4: Regional Development

- While there is a rising trend of regionalism, as seen in the case of Hong Kong which has been working on closer integration and cooperation with other cities in the Greater Bay Area, inter-city rivalry, especially with neighbouring countries like Singapore and KL, is intense. How does the way Singapore’s planning authorities approach regionalism different from Hong Kong? Any lessons we can learn from Singapore’s SSP experience in developing a strong local economy while tapping into the opportunities from nearby regions?

### Section 5: Kuala Lumpur - Flexibility in Plans
As there has been increasing concern on future uncertainties in terms of worldwide economic development, especially the current downfall of the global economy. Have the Kuala Lumpur Structure Plan 2040 considered the mechanism or flexibility in spatial solutions to cope with the unexpected economic shortfall? Like a flexible development scale and size, phasing development for projects, or other flexible options provided for the plan.

**Section 6: Singapore - Flexibility in Plans**

- Given the statutory status of Concept Plan and the detailed land use zoning of Master Plan, is there any formal or informal mechanism in Singapore to buffer unpredicted external factors, in order to allow flexibility in plan making and delivery?

**Section 7: Kuala Lumpur - Plan Implementation**

- The KL plan includes two major plans: structure plan and local plan. Do you think this segregation of plans could facilitate better implementation of SSP? In a similar vein, how do you view (i) the hierarchy of development plans in Hong Kong and (ii) the translation of the SSP's visions to local plans?

**Section 8: Kuala Lumpur - Institutional Setting**

- Kuala Lumpur Structure Plan 2040 has a section describing how the plan coordinates with some global commitment made by the country (i.e. Paris Agreement), as well as some national and local commitment (i.e. Economic Transformation Plan and Low Carbon Society Blueprint 2030). There must be a huge difficulty to align with these numerous commitments and plans. How do government departments in KL coordinate to achieve this? Moreover, we notice how influential the mayor of KL could be in the plan-making process from your presentation. So how can KL design its institutional setting to ensure the plan can be carried even if there is a change of mayor?

**Section 9: Kuala Lumpur - Public Engagement**

- As you introduced in your lecture, the public engagement practice of Kuala Lumpur Structure Plan 2020 was distorted and even ended up with issuing a completely unconsulted plan. How does the Kuala Lumpur Structure Plan 2040 learn from the previous flaws, especially in these aspects (1) transparency of participation process and information, (2) deciding to get people involved in which stages and (3) handling of participation outcomes?

**Section 10: Kuala Lumpur - Evaluation**

- In the document of Drafted Kuala Lumpur Structure Plan 2040, we notice a section which evaluates the implementation of the previous plan entitled Kuala Lumpur Structure Plan 2020. It looks into whether policies are implemented as well as if those policies are still relevant and require improvements. To what degree do you think this kind of review of the previous plan would help the city take a step forward in preparing the new plan?
## Interviewee K - Gist of Interview

**Date and Time:** 18 March 2020 (Start at 1:30pm)  
**Medium:** Cantonese (Translated version is as below)  
**Format:** Online Interview  
**Confidentiality Requirements:** All responses are shown  
**Remarks:** Shared interview with a co-consultant

### Section 1: Public Engagement

- Had been commissioned a consultancy project to assist planD in reviewing their PE practices, we had these 3 concluding remarks: (1) Unchangeable plan to do public engagement, and abandoned the conflict feedback; (2) not enough promotion to public, and tell representative only; and (3) not enough quantity of engagement.

- Even tried to convince planD to change the engagement process as an experiment, let say the public can take part in formulating planning directions.

- Had a few chances to directly ask gov officers. Like there are only 2-3 advisory reports for 2030+, unlike the previous practices in HK2030. The planning basis is very weak. 2030+ is a plan not based on scientific research. But more of consensus among different departments and bureaus, which is seen as a combination plan in spatial language only.

- Planning is a pyramid based on 3 layers:  
  - Science: this is the basis (e.g. ppl dont understand what sustainability, science gives good foundation)  
  - Professional (planners, professionals, they carry out plans)  
  - Politics (government): HK2030+ is purely a political plan

- The reason of writing the 民間替代方案: to advise public engagement process and tell gov to form a ideal plan through stated method and procedure.

- Take reference from Singapore, they have better consistency than HK. Hong Kong always threw away old things and then do it all over again. E.g. ELM, it was from 1980s. But threw away between 1980s - 2010s. And then suddenly pops up again in 2030+. Singapore does it every 5 years, to maintain its consistency. Public can also review the city development process.

- In Hong Kong, citizens don't embrace the same values as the government. But the planning system doesn't work that way. The consultation directly skip to the last step. But ignoring the steps in the middle. Society needs consensus on visions, values.

### Section 2: Forecasting and Quantitative Analysis

- Time series analysis, non stationarity test, no related professional review of consultancy report. Wrong method, wrong assumption, wrong check and balance.

- 7-10% GDP Growth: false assumption
Unsound foundation, absence of review from externals and single scenario approach

Scenario: range of flexibility if the economy falls, and that's the international practice.

Hong Kong property exchange value always keeps growing?

“Better more than less” concept is no more suitable as this will only be the case when there are infinite resources and it does not require us to consider environmental protection.

External factors play an important role when the economy goes well. But it won’t go forever, recession will come someday, like we must plan and learn to face the difficult times in case they arrive, cannot always look at the positive side.

Section 3: Plan Implementation

HK still heavily relies on policy benefits from British Colonial Government, like the HK2030+ mentioned country parks and marine parks, and those were policies before 1997.

Like the BSEEP (Buildings Sector Energy Efficiency Project) Conference, similar with many international conferences that the HK government signed, for the projects proposed, they did not follow the standard.

But the HK gov is economy-first, for instance, when they realise there’s ageing population, and they focus on the decrease of working population so to plan for importing labour force from other regions instead of considering age-friendly policies.

PlanD has a very low position in the government, others departments or bureaus always ask PlanD to accept something and put them into plans, and then PlanD has no choice.

Other cities follow the mayor, in HK, PlanD just technical departments.

The real solution is the a democratic political system so that it increases the monitoring part by the public.

Section 4: Institutional Setting

Government doesn't need to respond Legco, just say noted

The formation of Legco and Exco do not respect public view at all, and officers will not have any incentive to amend, or change their mindset as no restriction imposed on the government administration.

Advisory panel is the helping hand of the government. Suppose they should facilitate stakeholders interactions in the middle, between the public and government, rather than discussing with doors closed. But HK gov even use them as an excuse to claim they listen to the public view and professional view properly. We should, on the other hand, assign professionals to solve the query from the public to facilitate the discussion.

Section 5: Scope of Strategic Plans

They (the government officials) are used to the traditional old model. The existing society
relies on traditional models. It happens in different countries across the world

- Western countries don't follow this traditional economic growth approach since there will be lots of unemployment if boom happens, their society will be unstable.

Section 6: Regional Relations

- Insufficient Internationalization, HK is already a globalized city, hard to align with the principle of Regionalization, there will be conflicts, and resist HK to act as a global city, wasting the effort spent over the past hundred years.

- HK should strengthen its uniqueness with the surrounding region, but not fusion

- There is no environmental protection mitigation no matter regionalization or not.
**Interviewee L - Gist of Interview**

**Date and Time:** 20 March 2020 (Start at 4pm)  
**Medium:** Cantonese (Translated version is as below)  
**Format:** Online Interview  
**Confidentiality Requirements:** All responses are shown

**Remarks:**

**Section 1: ELM Controversies**

- We read HK2030+ and noticed the current deficit of social welfare facilities, therefore, we mainly focus on the distribution of land use, as well as a fair allocation of land to ensure affordable housing for grass-rooted levels. Therefore, in HK2030+, it should better address and deliver how these issues can be related to the citizens.

- We rather concern the fairness and equity issue when it comes to land issues.

**Section 2: Public Engagement**

- We won’t object to those wordings on the plan as many of those are conceptual statements, you would not, they are bad and agree with those, but normal people cannot tell the detailed picture in their mind of how the government would do to achieve those big statements. It makes us, as from the social service sector, find it so difficult to discuss as we barely anchor ourselves as it may even not be relevant to land use and distribution of facilities.

- We do not know their reference point for different statements, like where they will put those into practices, therefore, we mostly would like to discuss the HKPSG, but we cannot see the translation from the strategic level to HKPSG, and implementation. But it is necessary to have these to facilitate a better understanding and discussion.

- PlanD has reached our organisation, as when we do not know some of the content, they will come and communicate with us. They prepare to do the PE with us in the form of holding seminars and then group discussion, but we don’t know how to continue the discussion without much guidance. PlanD might think our opinions are too detailed. On the other hand, people remain questionable toward their framework.

- All in all, none of us know whether our opinions are heard as they were three years ago and no simple or detailed replies at all.

- We understand and feel the sincerity of PlanD. But just like what I mentioned, it is difficult for us to discuss. As how I observed in the roadside exhibitions they had, people do not feel necessary to know and interact, as they also do not know how it will be related to them, and it is not interactive as well.

**Section 3: Power of Externals**

- Some initiatives or advocacy that the government has not accepted yet, we, the social service side, mainly use the mass media to bring impact and discussion within the society. Once it becomes more dominant, the government then reacts and offers help. Given the weak position of the government, it relies on “third parties” to help and collaborate with some new policy trials.
Interviewee M - Gist of Interview

Date and Time: 1 April 2020 (Start at 8pm)
Medium: Cantonese (Translated version is as below)
Format: Online Interview
Confidentiality Requirements: All responses are shown
Remarks:

Section 1: Role of District Council

- Something that we should have in mind is that, the role of district council within the institutional setting. According to the ordinance, District Councils are not given much power, except some small-scale district projects. Therefore, there is no obligation for government officials to listen to the District Council.

- The consultation of strategic plan in the District Council is not preferable. Each councilor only has 3 minute to deliberate their views, it is impossible to deliver an in-depth opinion to the government officials. Workshops should be even better than such practices.

Section 2: Focus in Strategic Plans

- You may notice a quite different coverage of topics and issues in the HK2030+, therefore, I would say the broad direction is correct, however, when it comes to policy making stages, will it really be the guiding principles of documents and policies?

- All in all, I would not regard this plan as one having vision as they should a thematic vision bringing to our people, rather than pinpointing problems only.

Section 3: Public Understanding

- Perception is the most crucial crux in the whole strategic planning. There is a big problem in PE practices, that is the government not necessarily telling people whether they have considered their opinions. PE is just PE in terms of a process. Indeed, the government does not need to listen to everyone, but it is not a wise practice that the government put forward PE and each time receive backlash from the general public.

- We should change the mode of conducting PE, in a more active way instead of just doing large-scale project consultation. To increase people’s awareness, the government should start from the things most near and concerned by the people, but not something very difficult to understand. Let say we can do the community planning from districts, try to do it area by area, and PlanD can oversee these small plans to make it a consistent plan. It may change people’s perception that people are being listened by the government.

- For instance, we can have an annual meeting with government officials for each area of a district, together studying some subjects happening around, and explore solutions, so that people would cherish such methods and channels to express their view and increase their incentive to participate in community issues.

Section 4: Monitoring

- People think the HK2030+ is like nothing happened after that six-month consultation, it failed to show the government’s commitment in accomplishing large-scale development
and territorial policies. You cannot refuse to make decisions and actions after a wide discussion. At least a time frame would help illustrate government approaches and give confidence to the people.

- Talking about indicators, I think it is difficult to have a KPI, but for policies, we should have some sort of directions heading to, and most importantly, a department that is really accountable for that policies from the beginning to the end, so to ensure it will be implemented and launched to the public, but not just some empty promises.
**Interviewee N - Gist of Interview**

**Date and Time:**
- English

**Format:**
- Email reply

**Confidentiality Requirements:**
- Only questions are shown

**Remarks:**
- Shared interview with a co-consultant

### Section 1: Vision of Plan

- HK2030+ has a vision to make Hong Kong to be a livable, competitive and sustainable “Asia’s world city”. Therefore, the government makes every endeavour to put forward the East Lantau Metropolis and New Development Areas in New Territories, in order to produce more land for development. But some scholars argue the planning rationales are weak and the traditional land production method is unsuitable for the future anymore. What do you think?

- To take HK2030+ as an example, how would you interpret the vision of “to become a liveable, competitive and sustainable Asia’s World City” with its 3 building blocks, especially for balancing development and conservation capacity?

- To what extent do you think the vision was translated to the 3 building blocks and spatial framework as proposed?

- Do you think the content of HK2030+ really translates those best wishes stated in vision and building blocks into real actions? Or whether HK2030+ is intended for implicit explanation to the public about the predetermined stance behind the plan?

### Section 2: Approach and Methodology

- As many experts pointed out HK2030+ used an over-projected population in order to support and justify the need and planning basis for infrastructure projects (e.g. East Lantau Metropolis). Do you think it was intentional and why did they interpret data that way?

- In addition, in terms of the strategic plan-making process, how would you comment on the governmental approaches and methods in drafting environmental policies? How can it be improved to enhance effective implementation on strategic environmental plans?

### Section 3: Plan Effectiveness

- In general, for example in 2030+, do you think that the development capacity overwhelms the conservation capacity in Hong Kong? (i.e. the Hong Kong government tends to compensate for the loss caused by development at a later stage instead of doing development and conservation at the same time). Do you think the strategic plan has provided effective guidance to the environmental conservation of Hong Kong in the long term?

- How could the development control mechanism support the plan implementation?

- After reading your article mentioning the master planning in Chengdu, it comes to our question that while one of the building blocks in HK2030+ is to create capacity for
sustainable growth, can environment capacity be actually “created”, as the loss of natural resources are irreversible? How would you comment on the way that HK2030+ puts its emphasis on environment protection? And do they really suggest something new, or just copying the good works from the colonial government?

● How capable is the existing institutional setting in facilitating the conservation directions proposed in HK2030+?

● As there has been increasing concern on future uncertainties of Hong Kong and questioning whether future economic development can support the ELM, do you think the HK2030+ consider the flexibility in spatial solutions to cope with the unexpected economic conditions? Like a flexible development scale and size, and even allowing the government to pause or stop the projects.

Section 4: Public Engagement and Stakeholder Engagement

● As an activist and advocate of environmental issues, how would you describe the multi-stakeholder collaboration within the government and the green advocacy groups?

● Do you think the government has conducted sufficient consultation in the strategic plan-making process?

● To what extent do you think that public aspirations are considered in the overall vision of the strategic plans?

● It is observed that public engagement activities in the strategic plan-making process would usually be held at the final stage of the overall process. How would you comment on the readability of participation outcomes and transparency of information? During the public engagement process of HK2030+, we see the release of some lengthy engagement digest filled with sophisticated words and jargons. Do you think they hinder the communication with the general public?

● How could the government take a step forward to facilitate the common understanding of the general public?

Section 5: Regional Cooperation

● As the strategic plans in Hong Kong are for the long-term, how would you comment on the lack of focus in the government considerations for regional/global environmental challenges, such as air pollution from the Pan Delta area and rise of sea level (global climate change)?
**Interviewee O - Gist of Interview**

**Date and Time:** 27 March 2020 (Start at 2:30pm)
**Medium:** English
**Format:** Online Interview
**Confidentiality Requirements:** Only questions are shown
**Remarks:** Shared interview with two co-consultants

### Section 1: Vision in Plans

- Noticing the pressing need towards housing demand, providing affordable housing is indeed the responsibility of our government. However, in terms of the considerations toward conservation and social factors, the government should think in detail for people. SSP may not necessarily touch on these.

- For the ELM, the government should think into details that you cannot do the reclamation first then to think what are the uses, currently I don't see the need for such a large scale of reclamation and any population estimation or land use proposal for these areas.

- A long-term strategic plan should have an appealing vision, and now HK2030+ fails to do so. Why are there so many people arguing this plan? It is because it is not a vision of us, and we spent much time debating on these.

- Natural conservation is indeed very crucial, climate change is happening, but HK2030+ is rather reactive toward defined changes, but a successful, visionary strategic plan should be proactive, like proactively turning the threats into opportunities, instead of defining many problems and tackling them one by one orderly.

- Absence of some breakthroughing, ambitious, exciting components in HK2030+

- The HK2030+ is also not far-reaching enough, like in the future, information and technology will be the most dominant changes. Like identifying the objectives, visions and explaining how we could solve problems with technology. We need time to develop these options and initiatives, but why did the HK2030+ not mention these?

### Section 2: Environmental and Industry Policies

- Now the role of the environment in development is rather passive, like only concerning and addressing by reducing or mitigating the environmental impact for developments. However, why can't we proactively launch projects for our environment and bring good impact via developments? For instance, agricultural land issues.

- The plan just assumed HK as a financial and logistic center, but in fact not all 7 million people will be working for such industries. We cannot see how the government diversifies industrial development. The government cannot think these by themselves, but they should definitely seek opinions from different industries.

- I would not say HK2030+ is doing very bad, the basics of SSP, research, data collection, visions and topical paper are here as elements of it, and only the government is capable of the cost to collect data for the above planning activities. But HK2030+ fails to bring concepts and ideas together.
Section 3: Public Engagement

- PlanD consulted relevant committees, they also did many types of PE activities, like seminars, exhibitions and focus group meetings. Suppose the collaboration between departments is strong, I guess.

- However, the engagement should be conducted in earlier plan-making stages. Government always takes out the draft plan for consultation, and definitely would receive many different opinions that make the government find it so difficult to conclude major opinions and directions to carry on. Therefore, they are always proposing three solutions and turn out to choose the middle one.

- But if you look into cases in other countries, they are more active to engage the public in an earlier stage, to think of the vision and objectives together first, it may be a bit time-consuming, but definitely worth the time as you start the convincing and persuading job much earlier in that sense.

- But don’t consult a single party or sector at a time, try to put conflicting groups together, and then all stakeholders can listen to others’ points of view, and easier to consolidate all opinions and reach consensus. It also facilitates easier implementation as well. So I think the current practices of PE are not effective enough.

- However, different government departments react quite diversely toward public comments. So doing the PE earlier, that allows changes to happen.

Section 4: Interdepartmental Collaboration

- Like the HK2030+ and BSAP are issued by two departments, however, they are not quite in line with each other. Hong Kong is not that big, departments should also consider other areas as many issues are cross-topic, highly related.

- I agree that Hong Kong should have an overarching institution to lead departments to do.

Section 5: Monitoring

- EIA in HK already in practice for over 20 years, but there is no review towards that, but when the EIAO can’t pass for some projects, the spatial part allows no flexibility but to do it no matter how expensive the alternative solution will cost, just like the LMC line. We should consider jumping out of the box, from project-based EIA to strategic EIA. It is the mentality issue of government officials.

- HK2030+ is a long term plan that may seem a bit difficult to do the monitoring and evaluation, as they are not in very detailed things, however, as the world changes so fast, we should review the plan every several years.
## Interviewee P - Gist of Interview
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### Section 1: Flexibility in Plans
- HK2030+ is not like a planning as it solely puts forward plans by population estimation and land area, planning should not be that kind of singular driver-driven.
- Single scenario is not acceptable.

### Section 2: Projection and Data Collection
- The projection of future population is over-projecting as always, the peak of population has been always postponing.
- Three consultant reports are not related to each other, the ideal way to do SSP should be having a strategic plan, then overlaying the spatial plan, which HK2030 was doing so.

### Section 3: Action and Implementation
- Three steps involved in the launching of a project, for instance, Policy Address, Feasibility Plan and Planning Study, are all not consulting or allowing the public to participate. In other cities, there should be a due diligence institution to review by project base to see how well these projects are in their implementation. But in HK, there is not something like that supervising the progress of projects.
- The HK2030+ is like justifying Lantau Tomorrow then they decide to do a strategic planning rationalising the scheme in 2016; when the government said they want to have ELM earlier in 2014. This is not analysing but justifying, like no one can stop this from happening already. It is a rather top-down driven process without strong reasoning from research. We need an independent institution to do the holistic review of these projects instead of just allowing councilors or the public asking questions in LegCo for 4 minutes.

### Section 4: Economic Planning and Spatial Planning
- Spatial planning should be led by economic plan or follow it to ensure the future economic development matching with geographical location, like the case in Shanghai. However, we cannot see any positioning on ELM, and its relationship towards GBA. Even the government keeps persuading us there are many economic opportunities in GBA, we don’t even see how our government is leading us to grasp the chance in the plan.
- Cannot see the regional and international positioning of HK from the plan.

### Section 5: Development Mode
- If it is the third world country, we certainly need the traditional development model on infrastructure. However, HK is no longer a developing city, therefore, infrastructural-led
development to boost the economy is not suitable for HK anymore. The government lacks the creativity in solving the issues and promoting a new path for HK.

- However, the vested capital is too powerful in HK, it is hard to change the political direction that is led by construction and the property market. And also Hong Kong has a great pressure in terms of political background. Hong Kong is also rather lucky that we always had the easiest way out throughout the years, however, it makes HK have no foundation to go to the next level as we do not have techniques to develop other new industries. Now we rely on tourism and finance, but can’t see how we can get away from this trap.

Section 6: Public Engagement

- Consultations in particular related to land are so vital, we should definitely allow people to choose and raise opinions, other than just giving out 8-9 options for people to choose among them.

- When the government is digesting the comments, they must be honest to interpret the data, like during the consultation, it is clear that many people oppose ELM development, but they kind of distort people’s opinion and selectively choose the results.

Section 7: Checks and Balances

- Are there any departments entitled that can push back the government's decision? Who is the real boss behind? Or as long as LegCo has enough votes supporting the government's proposal, then they do not care any opposing view?