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CHAPTER 1  INTRODUCTION

Lantau Island is undergoing rapid changes in recent years. A number of major economic and housing developments are being planned or constructed at north Lantau, such as Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (HZMB) and topside development at Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities Island of HZMB, Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link, Tung Chung New Town Extension, Siu Ho Wan development and the expansion of the Hong Kong International Airport into a three-runway system. All these developments will bring tremendous change to the functions and development potential of Lantau. At the same time, Lantau possesses huge natural and cultural assets that need to be conserved and managed in a holistic manner for public appreciation and enjoyment.

To capitalize on the opportunities, the Lantau Development Advisory Committee (LanDAC) was established in January 2014 to advise the Government on the social and economic development opportunities of Lantau and the policies, measures and specific proposals conducive to the sustainable development and conservation of Lantau.

LanDAC has formulated the vision, strategic positioning and planning principles for the development of Lantau, with initial proposals covering spatial planning and land use, conservation, strategic traffic and transport infrastructure, recreation and tourism, and social development, as well as short-term improvement measures. Details of these vision, principles and proposals can be found in the Public Engagement Digest on LanDAC’s website: http://www.landac.hk/data/filemanager/uploads/miscellaneous/LanDAC_Digest_Submission10_20160125.pdf

LanDAC published its First-term Work Report “Space for All” on 10 January 2016. A public engagement (PE) exercise was launched on 31 January 2016 for three months until 30 April 2016 to gauge the public views on Lantau development proposals with a view to developing Lantau into a smart and low-carbon community for living, work, business, leisure and study while balancing and enhancing development and conservation. A Blueprint for Lantau Development and Conservation will be formulated, taking into consideration the public views collected.

The PE activities included the consultation with the Legislative Council Panel on Development and the Town Planning Board; three public forums attended by about 860 members of the public; five focus group meetings and 24 consultative sessions covering different sectors of society; and roving exhibitions at 16 locations in the territory. An independent opinion survey was also conducted by the Survey and Research Centre of the Department of Journalism and Communication, the Hong Kong Shue Yan University (HKSYU) at the roving exhibition venues. Details of these activities and events are summarized in Appendix.

The PE exercise ended on 30 April 2016. A total of 23,479 feedbacks, including 20,488 signatures/submissions from 10 campaigns organised by the public, were received.
CHAPTER 2  SUMMARY OF FEEDBACKS COLLECTED

Views of the participants provided at the PE activities were recorded and summarized. Feedbacks collected during the PE activities are categorized into different channels as shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1  Breakdown of feedbacks collected by channels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Channel</th>
<th>Number of Feedbacks Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Written Submissions by Groups</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Written Submissions by Individuals</td>
<td>1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Public Forums (attended by some 860 members of the public)</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Public Engagement Events (gist of meetings)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Public Consultative Platform Meetings (gist of meetings)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Legislative Council Panel on Development Special Meeting</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) News Commentary</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Campaigns (10 numbers)</td>
<td>20,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Opinion Survey</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>23,479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All feedbacks collected under Channels (a) to (h) in Table 2.1 above were analyzed based on the comments embedded in the feedbacks, which were subsequently grouped under various comment topics in an Analytical Framework of Feedback. The Analytical Framework was developed to analyse the collected views covering the major development proposals and other related issues on Lantau Development. The structure and order of the framework basically followed those presented in the PE Digest. Since some feedbacks may not show explicit support for or disagreement of a proposal / issue, in order to provide better coverage of the opinions expressed on Lantau Development, the analysis recorded not only support for or disagreement of a proposal / issue, but also those expressing interest, concern or doubt on the development proposals, or those having other development suggestions.

The responses to the opinion survey in Channel (i) were under separate quantitative analysis conducted by HKSYU. Findings of the opinion survey were adopted in the discussion on key topics of Lantau Development.
CHAPTER 3   DISCUSSION ON KEY TOPICS

3.1 Overall Position on Lantau Development

There were a total of 22,607 feedbacks, of which 2,119 nos. were collected under channels (a) to (g) and 20,488 nos. were collected under 10 campaigns under channel (h) in Table 2.1 and used in the analysis. About 52.4% (from channels other than campaign) and 59.6% (from campaign) of the feedbacks exhibited supportive positions on Lantau Development, while about 13.8% of the feedbacks (from channels other than campaign) were in opposing positions on Lantau Development. There was no relevant campaign with objection positions on Lantau Development. The remaining feedbacks either expressed mixed views on the 20 development proposals outlined in the PE Digest or did not provide any supportive or opposing views on these proposals, or expressed interest/concern or commented on other topics on Lantau Development such as implementation and consultation.

The HKSYU’s opinion survey showed that about 52.2% of respondents agreed with the development proposals while about 17.5% of respondents disagreed with these proposals. Overall, the proposed Lantau Development is considered generally supported by the public.

Furthermore, there was a significant amount of comments (a total of 782 comments from channels other than campaign, and five relevant campaigns (7,924 comments)) focused on other new development proposals not covered in the PE Digest. This could be interpreted as positive expectations on the proposed Lantau Development. Details of such new proposals are shown in Section 3.3.4.

3.2 Vision, Strategic Positioning and Planning Principles

3.2.1 Planning Vision

There were a total of 121 comments from channels other than campaign, and one campaign (4,342 comments) supporting the planning vision of “Balancing and enhancing development and conservation, with a view to developing Lantau into a smart and low-carbon community for living, work, business, leisure and study”, while there were only 15 negative comments from channels other than campaign. There was no campaign opposing the planning vision. It indicated that this planning vision had received very good public support.

A considerable amount of comments, mostly from a campaign organised by five green groups, were concerned about whether a balance could be achieved between development and conservation. These comments expressed concerns on the adequacy of conservation measures to balance development and conservation, and suggested strengthening the land control measures.

3.2.2 Major Planning Principles

Comments on the four major planning principles (MPP) were mostly supportive. For channels other than campaign, the planning principles received the most support comments was traffic and transport, followed by recreation and tourism, economy and livelihood, and the nature and heritage conservation. The results revealed that the public had given traffic and transport a priority in terms of development implementation.
A considerable amount of comments, mostly from a campaign organised by five green groups, raised concerns on the planning principle relating to nature and heritage conservation. These comments questioned whether future proposals would be development-orientated, and whether there would be sufficient protection and preservation of important conservation sites and habitats on Lantau. It is advisable to take note of these concerns in future planning.

3.2.3 Strategic Positioning

There were few comments on the strategic positioning while they were mostly supportive. In comparison, the most supported one was SP1 (to make Lantau an international transport, logistics and trade hub in the Greater Pearl River Delta (PRD) Region).

3.3 Development Proposals

3.3.1 Development Proposal Groups

There were a total of 245 comments from channels other than campaign, and two relevant campaigns (1,180 comments) on this topic. For comments received from channels other than campaign, all DPGs received more support/agree comments than object/disagree comments, with the exception of DPG 4 on recreation and tourism, in which there were more object/disagree comments than support/agree comments, probably due to the concerns on potential environmental impacts and Lantau’s capacity to receive visitors as discussed in Section 3.3.3 (v). The comments received from campaigns were mainly support/agree with DPG 3 on strategic traffic and transport infrastructure and DPG 4 on recreation and tourism.

3.3.2 Overall Focus of the Public

The overall focus of the public, i.e. the development proposals with top five ranking both in channels other than campaign, and in campaign in terms of the number of feedback counts received on such proposals, are the following three items:

- East Lantau Metropolis as long-term strategic growth area (DP3);
- Strategic road system (DP9); and
- Culture and heritage (DP16).

Other development proposals which attracted more attention than others, i.e. the proposals that ranked top five either in channels other than campaign or in campaign in terms of the number of feedback counts received on such proposals, are the following four items:

- Better utilization of natural resources (DP7);
- Other road arrangement and traffic and transport facilities (DP11);
- Attracting talent to match balanced employment opportunities (DP18); and
- Providing suitable internal and external transport connections to meet the needs of future development (DP19).
3.3.3 Individual Development Proposals

Discussions were on the 20 development proposals outlined in the PE Digest, grouped under seven categories, as detailed in the ensuing paragraphs.

(i) North Lantau Corridor For Economic, Housing, Entertainment and Tourism Development

There were a total of 361 comments from channels other than the three relevant campaigns. There were more supportive comments than opposing comments on following development proposals:

- Developing North Lantau corridor for strategic economic and housing development (DP1);
- Developing North-eastern Lantau node for leisure, entertainment and tourism development (DP2);
- Optimizing the use of government land and development of cavern (DP5); and
- Attracting talent to match balanced employment opportunities (DP18).

There was general support for developing North Lantau corridor for strategic economic and housing development and North-eastern Lantau node for leisure, entertainment and tourism development. While the public generally supported attracting talent to match balanced employment opportunities (DP18), there were comments suggesting developing new education facilities on Lantau.

According to the findings of HKSYU’s opinion survey, the percentage of respondents agreed with DP1, DP2 and DP5 were about 60.1%, 75.7% and 54.1% respectively, while that of respondents disagreed with these proposals were about 19.4%, 13.0% and 20.4%. The above positive results and findings indicated that the public generally agreed with these proposals.

(ii) East Lantau Metropolis (ELM) as Long-term Strategic Growth Area

There were a total of 269 comments from channels other than the five relevant campaigns. Comments received from channels other than campaign were generally supportive, more than the opposing comments. There were 10 campaigns received on Lantau Development, four of these campaigns agreed with or expressed views in support of the ELM proposal while one campaign, organised by five green groups, opposed to the ELM proposal. Other five campaigns expressed views on various Lantau development proposals other than the ELM.

Supportive comments were received from a range of sectors including a statutory body, advisory bodies, professional institutions, business sector, local community groups, policy research organisations and also individuals, while opposing comments were received from individuals, green groups and interest groups.

The supportive comments considered that the ELM could enhance land supply in the long run to support the future development needs of Hong Kong. The ELM could be developed into the third Central Business District (CBD3) and a long-term strategic growth area, fostering the overall economic growth for Hong Kong; provide land for
new transport corridor linking the Metro areas, Lantau and the north-western part of the territory; and become a portal connecting Hong Kong and the world via the airport and to the PRD via Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, etc. There were other suggestions such as using the ELM as a breeding ground for developing new types of pillar industries; modeling the ELM as a smart and low-carbon city to enhance the living quality of the people of Hong Kong; or by using local construction & demolition (C&D) materials as reclamation fill material for land formation, the ELM could offer opportunity to alleviate the burden of surplus C&D materials in Hong Kong.

The opposing comments were mainly focused on the potential impacts that may be caused by reclamation and the increased traffic flow on the terrestrial and marine habitats and wildlife. Some also expressed reservations to the development need for the ELM, as they opined that the projected population growth of Hong Kong was on the decline, the planned developments in the New Territories should be adequate to provide the required land. Some also doubted about the project’s viability without detailed assessments on its feasibility and impacts.

In addition, there were comments with other views as follows: -

- Request for more information about the scale and plan of the ELM proposal;
- Query on its necessity and the rationale in relation to the changing population forecast;
- Concern if there would be significant environmental impacts; and
- Need to consult the marine trade regarding potential impact on the fairway.

The HKSYU’s opinion survey indicated that 31.6% of respondents agreed with “conducting study to explore developing the ELM and use artificial islands to develop a new CBD” while 51.2% disagreed. HKSYU observed that respondents were more eager to seek further information on the ELM proposal than other proposals. HKSYU considered it unclear whether the above negative attitude was due to the limited information on the ELM proposal in the roving exhibition panels. It could not rule out that those who were against development by reclamation, or damage to the environment, tended to disagree with the ELM proposal.

It is understandable that many of the above comments might be due to the fact that the consultation materials only outline the concept of the ELM development as the long-term strategic growth area but stopped short of more details. To address the above concerns, further studies on the ELM proposal should be conducted to provide the public with information they need for casting an informed view.

(iii) Conservation, Natural Resources and Ecology

There were a total of 283 comments from channels other than the three relevant campaigns. There were generally more supportive comments than opposing comments on following development proposals:

- Predominant part of Lantau for conservation, leisure, cultural and green tourism (DP4);
- Enhancement of conservation (DP6);
- Better utilization of natural resources (DP7); and
- Ecology (DP15).
In addition, there were following observations on DP4, DP6, DP7 and DP15:

**Predominant part of Lantau for conservation, leisure, cultural and green tourism (DP4)**
The opposing comments on DP4 were more than the supportive ones, which were mainly on green tourism instead of the whole development proposal. The public were concerned that green tourism might involve additional supporting facilities, e.g. enhancing access/traffic, that might result in adverse impacts on the environment.

According to the HKSUY’s opinion survey, about 78.5% of respondents agreed with DP4 while about 9.1% disagreed.

**Enhancement of Conservation (DP6)**
According to the HKSUY’s opinion survey, about 85.0% and 87.6% of respondents considered heritage and landscape conservation under DP6 were important while only about 3.8% and 3.0% of respondents considered not important.

**Better Utilization of Natural Resources (DP7)**
The relevant campaign organised by five green groups (4,896 comments) was supportive on DP7. These comments stressed that the proposed eco-tourism should take note of and make contribution to conserving the local ecological, cultural and landscape characteristics.

According to the HKSUY’s opinion survey, about 71.7% and 61.8% of respondents considered enhancing country parks and marine parks under DP7 were important while about 10.5% and 14.8% of respondents considered not important.

**Ecology (DP15)**
While there was a general support for DP15, the public generally did not support the proposed improvement of accessibility to and the provision of viewing deck at Sunset Peak due to potential environmental impact.

According to the HKSUY’s opinion survey, about 79.0% of respondents considered DP15 attractive while about 8.0% of respondents considered this proposal not attractive.

(iv) **Traffic and Transport Infrastructure**

There were a total of 936 comments from channels other than the seven relevant campaigns. There were generally more supportive comments than opposing comments on following development proposals:

- Railway system (DP8);
- Strategic road system (DP9);
- North Lantau Corridor (DP10);
- Other road arrangement and traffic and transport facilities (DP11);
- Water transport (DP12); and
- Providing suitable internal and external transport connections to meet the needs of future development (DP19).
According to the HKSYU’s opinion survey, the percentage of respondents considered the proposals under DP8, DP9/DP10 and DP12 important were about 68.9%, 68.3% and 64.5% respectively, while that of respondents considered these proposals not important were about 17.3%, 14.7% and 13.4%. The above positive results and findings indicated that the public generally agreed with these proposals.

In addition, there were following observations on DP8, DP9, DP11 and DP19:

**Railway System (DP8)**

There were suggestions to build an additional mass transit corridor connecting Tung Chung East, Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities and the Airport Island, to better connect the current and future railway systems with other public transport services to enhance interconnectivity or to build a monorail or light rail between Tung Chung and the Airport Island.

**Strategic Road System (DP9)**

The public generally supported the proposal on strategic road system and considered that the system could connect Lantau with other places in Hong Kong and provide support for the increased traffic demand arising from planned and future developments. The opposing views opined that the new road system might induce impacts on ecologically important sites, and considered that imposing traffic restriction is more desirable for conserving Lantau.

There were a considerable amount of comments, mostly from four campaigns, proposing to build a coastal road between Tung Chung and Tai O to shorten the traveling time from Tai O to Tung Chung and to alleviate the heavy traffic demand mainly from tourists and the congested traffic flow from Tung Chung Road to South Lantau.

There were another considerable amount of comments, mostly from three campaigns, proposing to build a North to South Corridor (Tai Ho/Pak Mong to Mui Wo) linking up Tung Chung with South Lantau to enhance Lantau’s road network as a whole.

**Other Road Arrangement and Traffic and Transport Facilities (DP11)**

There were 150 comments from channels other than the four relevant campaigns. Comments received from channels other than campaigns were supportive, more than the opposing comments. There were 10 campaigns received on Lantau Development, three of these campaigns advocated improving the accessibility to existing restricted roads while one campaign, organised by five green groups, opposed to relaxing driving restriction to the roads in South Lantau.

According to the HKSYU’s opinion survey, 62.0% of respondents considered improvement of South Lantau Road under DP11 important while 15.5% of respondents considered that not important. About 56.4% of respondents considered visiting South Lantau attractive if South Lantau Road would be improved while about 20.1% of respondents considered not attractive.
It is considered that study on Lantau’s capacity to receive visitors and suitable land control measures should be implemented to address the above concerns on DP11.

Providing Suitable Internal and External Transport Connections to Meet the Needs of Future Development (DP19)

Some comments included short-to-medium term proposals to improve point-to-point transport connection by reorganising public transport services around Tung Chung and the Airport. These proposals included rationalizing bus routes, increasing frequency, providing special departure service, introducing Green Mini-bus, and providing non-franchised feeder bus services.

According to the HKSYU’s opinion survey, transportation is the most important factor with highest percentage of respondents (about 56.7%) considering attractive for them to live in Lantau.

(v) Recreation and Tourism

There were a total of 272 comments from channels other than the relevant campaign. There were generally more supportive comments than opposing comments on following development proposals:

- Recreation and outdoor activities (DP13);
- Splurge and indulge (DP14); and
- Relaxation (DP17).

According to the HKSYU’s opinion survey, the percentage of respondents considered the proposals under DP13 and DP17 attractive were about 56.6% and 60.4% respectively, while that of respondents considered these proposals not attractive were about 20.1% and 18.2%. The above positive results and findings indicated that the public generally agreed with these proposals.

Some observations on DP13, DP14 & DP17 are presented below:

Recreation and Outdoor Activities (DP13)

There were comments proposing to build cycle track around Lantau and explore the possibility of expanding the cycle track network. Some comments suggested providing facilities for international recreation/sports events. There were also comments expressing concerns on the potential environmental impacts of the development proposals in Shui Hau.

Splurge and Indulge (DP14)

There were more supportive comments than opposing comments from channels other than campaign. However, according to the HKSYU’s opinion survey on DP14, about 30.6% of respondents considered the proposals attractive while 37.9% of respondents considered these proposals not attractive. It is considered that the respondents might not be familiar with the examples quoted in the PE Digest regarding splurge and indulge, such as MICE tourism, marina and international standard ice rink, while other
splurge and indulge facilities quoted in the opinion survey questionnaire, such as shopping, dining and hotel facilities, were generally present in other areas.

Relaxation (DP17)

Some comments expressed concerns that the provision of spa and resort facilities at Soko Islands would induce impacts on the proposed marine park.

(vi) Culture and Heritage

There were a total of 189 comments from channels other than the two relevant campaigns. There were more opposing comments than supportive comments. However, according to the HKSYU’s opinion survey, the percentage of respondents considered the proposals under DP16 attractive were about 69.7%, while that considered not attractive were about 10.0%.

A considerable amount of comments objected to the idea of extending cable car from Ngong Ping to Tai O. They proposed to construct a coastal road from Tai O to Tung Chung instead. Other expressed concerns on the potential environmental impacts of the proposed cable car extension.

There were also considerable amount of comments concerning the capacity of Tai O to receive more visitors arising from further tourism development.

There were comments proposing to remove the Zen Conservation Zone idea from the development plan, due to the concern that these measures would attract visitors for visiting the area as a scenic spot.

(vii) Catering for the Needs of Rural and Remote Areas in Lantau (DP20)

There were a total of 58 comments from channels other than the two relevant campaigns, which were all supportive with no opposing comment. The comments were mainly on provision of local facilities such as access footbridge, connecting road to villages, sewage treatment facilities, river conservation, and communication infrastructure, etc, satisfying the needs of local residents.

According to the HKSYU’s opinion survey, after transportation, the top three factors with highest percentage of respondents considering attractive for them to live in Lantau were as follows:

1) Low-carbon living environment (about 46.7%);
2) Preservation of rural characteristics (about 44.4%); and
3) Community facilities (about 40.9%).

3.3.4 Other New Development Proposals (NDPs)

Apart from comments received on the above 20 development proposals as mentioned in the PE Digest, there were various new development proposals (NDPs) received from the public on Lantau Development, which could be broadly divided into three groups:

Group 1 : Development Proposal Groups (DPG)-related NDPs
Group 2: Location-specific NDPs on community facilities
Group 3: Miscellaneous ideas / comments

(i) Group 1--DPG-related NDPs

There were a total of 501 comments from channels other than campaign, and three relevant campaigns (5,131 comments) received on Group 1 proposals (DPG-related NDPs). Most of the comments were on NDP1 to NDP3 as follows:

(a) Spatial planning & land use (NDP 1)

The suggestions include, but not limited to:
• Limiting the flats in South Lantau to small individual houses;
• Using the lands in country park area for housing;
• Developing Ngong Ping as middle-class residential and commercial area; and
• Developing brownfields, or use the hillsides, rather than reclamation in Sunny Bay.

(b) Conservation (NDP 2)

The suggestions include, but not limited to:
• Creating more buffer zones and restricted areas in conservation areas and acquiring wetland from private land owners to conserve buffalos;
• Creating a database with land status, habitats, topography and ground features, etc. for better environment and ecology planning and management;
• Providing a marine education centre at Shui Hau and an archaeological center at Luk Keng Tsuen (鹿頸村考古中心);
• Designating offshore water of Tai O and Yi O for conservation; and
• Creating a conservation fund.

(c) Strategic traffic & transport infrastructure (NDP 3)

The suggestions include, but not limited to:
• Providing electric car charging stations;
• Encouraging walking and cycling to reduce traffic; and
• Providing helipad.

(d) Others including recreation & tourism and social development (NDP 4 & NDP 5)

The suggestions include, but not limited to:
• Developing medical tourism; and
• Providing casino.

(ii) Group 2--Location-specific NDPs on community facilities

There were a total of 265 comments from channels other than campaign, and four relevant campaigns (2,793 comments) received on Group 2 proposals (Location-specific NDPs). Most of the comments were on NDP7 to NDP10:
(a) Enhancing Tung Chung’s community facilities (NDP 7);  
(b) Enhancing Tai O’s community facilities (NDP 8); and  
(c) Enhancing Northern and Southern Mui Wo’s community facilities (NDPs 9 and 10).

(iii) Group 3-- Miscellaneous ideas / comments

There were 16 comments received on Group 3 proposals (miscellaneous ideas/comments), such as providing sufficient support to fishermen, doubt on effectiveness of Lantau Development to achieve one-hour intercity traffic circle, and avoid developing giant commercial facilities.

3.4 Implementation

Most of the comments received on implementation were on following four topics.

(a) Future blueprint / further studies

There were 179 comments from channels other than the relevant campaign on this topic. A considerable amount of comments, from a campaign organised by five green groups, suggested conducting more planning studies; implementing conservation measures in the Revised Concept Plan for Lantau in 2007; and revising the Lantau’s Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and strengthening the Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan, with a view to enhancing the land control measures in conserving South Lantau.

(b) Priority

There were 57 comments from channels other than the relevant campaign on this topic. A considerable amount of comments, from a campaign organised by five green groups, raised concern and suggested that conservation measures and proposals should be implemented prior to any other development proposals. Other considered that transportation-led planning was of strategic importance to Lantau Development.

(c) Mechanism: Dedicated Office for Lantau Development/District Liaison Group

There were 16 comments from channels other than one relevant campaign on this topic. Majority of these comments supported setting up the dedicated office for Lantau Development or District Liaison Group to maintain close liaison with the local residents.

(d) Timeline/Timeframe

There were 163 comments from channels other than the two relevant campaigns on this topic. Majority of these comments supported earlier or faster implementation of development proposals. Some suggested that development proposals with consensus or planning studies should commence first to speed up the process.
3.5 Consultation Structure and Process

Most of the comments received on consultation structure and process were on following topics:

(a) LanDAC’s composition and operation

There were 50 comments on LanDAC’s composition and 21 comments on its operation over the openness and transparency.

(b) Consultation mechanism and information

There were 301 comments from channels other than one relevant campaign on this topic. Some comments requested for more planning details, while other comments proposed to arrange more briefings and engagement to consult the public on Lantau Development.
CHAPTER 4  CONCLUSION

4.1 Overall Position on Lantau Development

Both the feedbacks collected in the PE activities and findings of the HKSU’s opinion survey revealed that there is a clear broad support for Lantau Development. Overall, the proposed Lantau Development is generally supported by the public.

4.2 Vision, Strategic Positioning and Planning Principles

There were general supports for the planning vision and the four major planning principles proposed for Lantau Development. Although there were few comments on the strategic positioning, they were mostly supportive. The most supported one was SP1 (to make Lantau an international transport, logistics and trade hub in the Greater PRD).

4.3 Development Proposals

4.3.1 General

There was general support for all the proposal groups except the one on recreation and tourism, probably due to the concerns on potential environmental impacts of the proposals and Lantau’s capacity to receive visitors. The major comments/concerns on individual development proposals are set out in paragraph 4.3.2.

4.3.2 Individual Development Proposals

4.3.2.1 North Lantau Corridor for Economic, Housing and Entertainment Development

There were general supports for developing North Lantau corridor for strategic economic and housing development and on North-eastern Lantau for leisure, entertainment and tourism development. While there was general support for attracting talent to match balanced employment opportunities, there were suggestions to develop new education facilities in Lantau.

4.3.2.2 East Lantau Metropolis (ELM) as Long-term Strategic Growth Area

The supportive comments said that the ELM could enhance land supply in the long run to support future development needs of Hong Kong. The ELM could be developed into a long-term strategic growth area, fostering overall economic growth for Hong Kong; provide land for new transport corridor between the Metro areas and the north-western part of the territory; and become a portal connecting Hong Kong and the world via the airport and to the PRD via Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, etc.

The concerns and reservations to the ELM proposal were mainly on the need for the ELM, its technical feasibility, and the potential impacts on the environment and traffic/transport facilities. Many sought more information about the ELM proposal. These indicated that there was insufficient technical information provided on the ELM.
proposal and that further studies on the proposal should be conducted in order to provide the public with the information they need for casting an informed view.

4.3.2.3 Conservation, Natural Resources and Ecology
While there was strong support for conservation and better utilization of nature resources, the public expressed strong desire for sustainable development by balancing conservation and development needs. There were concerns that green tourism might involve additional supporting facilities. Also, there were concerns on the lack of clear commitment and concrete proposals towards conservation and the public requested for strengthening the land control measures.

4.3.2.4 Traffic and Transport Infrastructure
There was general support for the proposed railway system, the strategic road system, the Road P1 at north Lantau and the greater use of water transport. There were new proposals from the locals for additional road links within Lantau. There were also concerns about relaxing driving restriction to the roads in South Lantau that would induce excessive tourism and possible environmental impacts to South Lantau.

4.3.2.5 Recreation and Tourism
While the recreation and leisure development proposals were generally supported by the public, there were concerns on the capacity of Lantau, particularly Tai O, to receive visitors. Study on the capacity to receive visitors should be conducted. The public expressed general concerns on the environmental impacts of the proposals, for example, they did not support the proposed improvement of accessibility to and provision of viewing deck at Sunset Peak and expressed reservation towards provision of spa and report facilities at Soko Islands, etc. Meanwhile, there were suggestions to further explore the possibility of expanding the cycle track network.

4.3.2.6 Other Aspects
The public expressed objection to the proposed cable car extension from Ngong Ping to Tai O before improvement in road connection. Other expressed concerns on the environmental impact of the proposed cable car extension. There was general support for all the proposals on social development.

4.4 Others

4.4.1 Other New Development Proposals (NDPs)
There were some suggestions for more community facilities in Tung Chung, Tai O, Mui Wo and south Lantau satisfying the needs of local residents.

4.4.2 Implementation
There were suggestions on conducting more planning studies and giving higher priority to conservation proposals. Some other comments considered that transportation-led planning was of strategic importance to Lantau Development. The public also generally requested for faster implementation and closer liaison/coordination mechanism.
4.4.3 Consultation structure and Process

The public generally requested for more planning details, more briefings and consultation on Lantau Development.

###
Appendix: Summary and Details of Public Engagement Activities

1. Engagement Events and Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Number of Forums / Meetings / Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Kick-off event in Mui Wo Children Playground on 31 January 2016</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Public Forums</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Public Engagement Events</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus Group meetings</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rural Committee meetings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Group engagement meetings</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Public Consultative Platform Meetings</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Legislative Council Panel on Development meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- District Councils</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Heung Yee Kuk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Town Planning Board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Legislative Council Panel on Development special meeting (conducted in the form of public hearing)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Roving exhibitions in different locations</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Public Forums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. HKFEW Wong Cho Bau Secondary School, Tung Chung</td>
<td>20 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. City Gallery, Central</td>
<td>28 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Boys’ &amp; Girls’ Clubs Association of Hong Kong, Wan Chai</td>
<td>13 March 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Focus Group Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group by Sector</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recreation, Sports and Tourism</td>
<td>30 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional Institutions</td>
<td>30 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Development and Youth</td>
<td>31 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Green Groups</td>
<td>8 April 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Rural Committee Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mui Wo Rural Committee</td>
<td>15 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South Lantau Rural Committee</td>
<td>18 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tung Chung Rural Committee</td>
<td>18 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tai O Rural Committee</td>
<td>7 April 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5 Group Engagement Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hong Kong Institute of Planners</td>
<td>7 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lantau Development Alliance</td>
<td>24 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hong Kong Institution of Engineers</td>
<td>29 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Discovery Bay residents</td>
<td>2 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Forum jointly organised by Designing Hong Kong, Living Island Movement, Tung Chung Community Development Alliance and Environmental Life Science Society of University of Hong Kong Students' Union</td>
<td>9 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tung Chung Residents</td>
<td>13 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fishermen Associations</td>
<td>14 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Living Islands Movement</td>
<td>15 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lantau Volunteer Unit</td>
<td>19 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Save Lantau Alliance - “Save Lantau Arts Fair cum Civil Hearing”</td>
<td>24 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hong Kong Mountain Bike Association and The Cycling Association of Hong Kong</td>
<td>25 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lantau Buffalo Association</td>
<td>28 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hong Kong Hiking Association#</td>
<td>5 May 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Arranged before 30 April 2016.
### 6. Public Consultative Platform Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Body</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Legislative Council Panel on Development (general meeting)</td>
<td>23 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. District Council: Islands</td>
<td>1 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. District Council: Hong Kong (Central &amp; Western, Eastern, Southern, Wan Chai)</td>
<td>17 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. District Council: all Chairmen and Vice-chairmen</td>
<td>18 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. District Council: Kowloon (Kowloon City, Kwun Tong, Sham Shui Po, Yau Tsim Mong and Wong Tai Sin)</td>
<td>1 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Heung Yee Kuk</td>
<td>19 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Legislative Council Panel on Development (general meeting)</td>
<td>26 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Town Planning Board#</td>
<td>6 May 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Arranged before 30 April 2016.

#### Legislative Council Panel on Development (Special Meeting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Body</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Council Panel on Development (special meeting) (conducted in the form of public hearing)</td>
<td>16 April 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Roving Exhibitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. G/F, Tung Chung Municipal Services Building</td>
<td>11 – 14 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. External Venues of Fu Tung Estate Shopping Centre, Tung Chung</td>
<td>20 – 26 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lai Shuk Ying Memorial Square, Yat Tung Estate, Tung Chung</td>
<td>27 February 2016 – 3 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ngau Tau Kok Rest Garden</td>
<td>7 - 13 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Atrium, 1/F, Amoy Plaza Phase 2, Ngau Tau Kok</td>
<td>11 – 13 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hong Kong MTR Station</td>
<td>24 – 31 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tai O Rural Committee Square</td>
<td>1 – 8 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Atrium, Level 1, Metro City Plaza Phase II, Tseung Kwan O</td>
<td>2 – 4 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Central Pier 8</td>
<td>9 – 14 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Youth Square, Chai Wan</td>
<td>15 – 21 April 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>