

## Appendix E

### List of standard submissions, signature campaigns and resident questionnaire campaign

Type	No.	Organisation / Title of submission (if any)	Remark
Standard Submission	1164-1660, 2273-2281, 2481-2652	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 反對香港「被規劃」行動組</li> <li>• 東涌填海關注組</li> <li>• 「東涌陸沉！反對政府硬塞十萬人口及大型跨境基建破壞自然環境生活！」</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request to expand the population only if the quality of the current service of the transportation provisions could be maintained. Object to any development proposal that may overload the overall Tung Chung transportation system</li> <li>• Include other parts of Lantau such as Sunny Bay, Tai Ho and Siu Ho Wan as part of the Study Area and to develop the existing available land in the above mentioned areas. Object to unnecessary reclamation and development of village areas</li> <li>• Avoid building development that would create a “walled effect”</li> <li>• Object to private housing development near the Tung Chung Town Park</li> <li>• Object to marina development in Tung Chung East as it may potentially only benefit the affluent minority</li> </ul>
Standard Submission	893-898, 900-972	/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urge for better development of Tung Chung West and improvement in livelihood of residents from Yat Tung Estate</li> </ul>
Standard Submission	172-173, 183, 198-202, 204-205, 208-209, 211-215, 219-220, 223-225, 227-230, 232-235, 237-248, 250-252, 262-273, 276-277, 281-284, 286, 288-289, 292-296, 300-301, 304-305, 308, 312, 317-319	/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target population is too high</li> <li>• Decrease the area of reclamation in Tung Chung East</li> <li>• Against having private housing around Tung Chung town park</li> <li>• Oppose to the development of marina</li> <li>• Supported full conservation of the Tung Chung Valley</li> </ul>

Type	No.	Organisation / Title of submission (if any)	Remark
Signature Campaign	2430	Prajna Dhyana Temple	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise from the temple activities would be a nuisance to the future residents around the temple and thus create potential conflicts in the neighbourhood</li> <li>• Views from the temple may later be blocked by the potential Tung Chung extension development</li> <li>• Worsening of air pollution due to proposed potential Tung Chung extension development in the area.</li> <li>• The Temple has plans to provide community services such as elderly care and to promote organic farming</li> </ul>
Signature Campaign	2167	Prajna Dhyana Temple	
Signature Campaign	83	梁國洪 (Temple-goer)	
Questionnaire Campaign	2660	Owners' Sub-committee, Tung Chung Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A considerable number of the respondents were against the proposed 14 hectares of reclamation in Tung Chung West as they were concerned about the possible damage to the natural scenery and ecology of the area</li> <li>• Concerned that the existing transportation and community facilities would not be able to accommodate the proposed increase in population</li> <li>• A majority of the respondents also agreed that tourism as a possible direction of development of the area</li> </ul>

Type	No.	Organisation / Title of submission (if any)	Remark
Standard Submission	1164-1660, 2273-2281, 2481-2652	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 反對香港「被規劃」行動組</li> <li>• 東涌填海關注組</li> <li>• 「東涌陸沉！反對政府硬塞十萬人口及大型跨境基建破壞自然環境生活！」</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request to expand the population only if the quality of the current service of the transportation provisions could be maintained. Object to any development proposal that may overload the overall Tung Chung transportation system</li> <li>• Include other parts of Lantau such as Sunny Bay, Tai Ho and Siu Ho Wan as part of the Study Area and to develop the existing available land in the above mentioned areas. Object to unnecessary reclamation and development of village areas</li> <li>• Avoid building development that would create a “walled effect”</li> <li>• Object to private housing development near the Tung Chung Town Park</li> <li>• Object to marina development in Tung Chung East as it may potentially only benefit the affluent minority</li> </ul>
Standard Submission	893-898, 900-972	/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urge for better development of Tung Chung West and improvement in livelihood of residents from Yat Tung Estate</li> </ul>
Standard Submission	172-173, 183, 198-202, 204-205, 208-209, 211-215, 219-220, 223-225, 227-230, 232-235, 237-248, 250-252, 262-273, 276-277, 281-284, 286, 288-289, 292-296, 300-301, 304-305, 308,	/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target population is too high</li> <li>• Decrease the area of reclamation in Tung Chung East</li> <li>• Against having private housing around Tung Chung town park</li> <li>• Oppose to the development of marina</li> <li>• Supported full conservation of the Tung Chung Valley</li> </ul>

	312, 317-319		
Signature Campaign	2430	Prajna Dhyana Temple	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise from the temple activities would be a nuisance to the future residents around the temple and thus create potential conflicts in the neighbourhood</li> <li>• Views from the temple may later be blocked by the potential Tung Chung extension development</li> <li>• Worsening of air pollution due to proposed potential Tung Chung extension development in the area.</li> <li>• The Temple has plans to provide community services such as elderly care and to promote organic farming</li> </ul>
Signature Campaign	2167	Prajna Dhyana Temple	
Signature Campaign	83	梁國洪 (Temple-goer)	
Questionnaire Campaign	2660	Owners' Sub-committee, Tung Chung Crescent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A considerable number of the respondents were against the proposed 14 hectares of reclamation in Tung Chung West as they were concerned about the possible damage to the natural scenery and ecology of the area</li> <li>• Concerned that the existing transportation and community facilities would not be able to accommodate the proposed increase in population</li> <li>• A majority of the respondents also agreed that tourism as a possible direction of development of the area</li> </ul>