

## Appendix H

### Comment form and Gist of Public Forum





**Tung Chung New Town Extension Study  
Stage 2 Public Engagement  
Gist of Public Forum**

Date: 13 July 2013 (Saturday)  
 Time: 2:00pm – 5:30pm  
 Venue: Hong Kong Federation of Education Workers Wong Cho Bau Secondary School Hall  
 Address: Area 10, Phase 3, Fu Tung Estate, Tung Chung, Lantau Island, N.T.

**Representatives from the HKSAR Government and consultant:**

Mr Wilson Y L So, Assistant Director of Planning, New Territories District Planning Division, Planning Department (PlanD)  
 Mr Ivan Chung, District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands, PlanD  
 Mr David KC Lo, Chief Engineer/Islands, Hong Kong Island and Islands Development Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)  
 Dr Daman Lee, Director, Ove Arup and Partners Hong Kong Limited  
 Ms Theresa Yeung, Director, Ove Arup and Partners Hong Kong Limited  
 Mr Vincent Lai Chi Sing, Managing Director and Aquatic Ecologist, Ecosystem Limited

**Expert panel:**

Prof Rebecca Chiu Lai-har, JP, Department of Urban Planning and Design, University of Hong Kong  
 Dr Ng Cho-nam, BBS, JP, Department of Geography, University of Hong Kong  
 Prof So Wai-man, Raymond, Dean, School of Business, Hang Seng Management College

**Facilitator:**

Ms Suzanne Cheung  
 Mr Timothy Peirson-Smith

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
1.	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>1.1 Ms Suzanne Cheung welcomed guests and audience to the community workshop.</p> <p>1.2 Ms Cheung reminded everyone of the simultaneous interpretation (S.I.) service available event.</p>	<p>Two different S.I channels were available at the event:            channel 2 for English and channel 3 for Cantonese.</p> <p>Information packs for</p>

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>1.3 Ms Cheung introduced the rundown and house rules of the event to the audience.</p> <p>1.4 Ms Cheung introduced Government officials and attending guests.</p> <p>1.5 Ms Cheung introduced the contents in the information pack, and invited the audience to use the comment sheets in four different colours to give their opinion on the four main topics of discussion.</p>	<p>Stage 2 Public Engagement, which contained a digest, questionnaire and four comment sheets each were distributed to the audience.</p>
2.	<p><b>Petition from Mr Roy Tam, Green Sense</b></p> <p>2.1 Mr Roy Tam submitted a petition letter to the Government regarding future development of Tung Chung.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Welcoming remarks by Mr Wilson Y L So, Assistant Director of Planning, New Territories District Planning Division, PlanD</b></p> <p>3.1 Mr So thanked the public for their participation in the public forum and Stage 1 and 2 of Public Engagement.</p> <p>3.2 Mr So explained that the proposed development plan is put forward after consulting public opinion and deliberation with different government departments. The Government hoped that more views would be received in Stage 2 Public Engagement.</p> <p>3.3 Mr So hoped the audience would be able to express their views freely and stated that their view will be studied in details.</p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
4.	<p data-bbox="300 169 1536 204"><b>Presentation by Ms Theresa Yeung, Director, Ove Arup and Partners Hong Kong Limited</b></p> <p data-bbox="300 244 1491 316">4.1 Ms Yeung expressed gratitude for the audience attending the activity and hoped for more public views in Stage 2 Public Engagement.</p> <p data-bbox="300 355 584 391">4.2 <u>Study background</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 430 1514 534">4.2.1 Ms Yeung introduced the progress of the Study after Stage 1 Public Engagement, during which more than 2,300 suggestions and proposals were received the same period last year, and the public generally agreed that Tung Chung has the potential to be further developed.</p> <p data-bbox="300 574 1554 646">4.2.2 Ms Yeung stated that the initial land use options were designed with public views taken into consideration.</p> <p data-bbox="300 686 1541 790">4.2.3 Ms Yeung explained the proposed initial land use options for the current Study in Tung Chung. She mentioned that these options were designed to address the housing shortage in Hong Kong through expanding Tung Chung.</p> <p data-bbox="300 829 577 865">4.3 <u>Tung Chung East</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 904 1525 1008">4.3.1 Ms Yeung introduced different aspects of the proposed development in Tung Chung East, which was designed after considerations of nearby large-scale infrastructure such as HKZMB, navigation channels and the ecology in Tai Ho Wan.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1048 1532 1200">4.3.2 Ms Yeung elaborated on the proposed Theme 1: Livable Town of Tung Chung East. She stated that this option is expected to accommodate 110,000 people in 38,000 flats with adequate government, organisational, commercial and recreational facilities such as schools, clinics and a standard sports ground.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1240 1541 1383">4.3.3 Ms Yeung stated that the strategic location of Tung Chung, i.e. its proximity to major infrastructures such as the Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA), Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge (HKZMB), would be utilised to further expand the potential of Tung Chung in various aspects.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1423 1541 1458">4.3.4 Ms Yeung explained the proposed Theme 2: Economic Vibrancy of Tung Chung East with</p>	<p data-bbox="1583 169 1921 240">Visual aids were provided on stage.</p>

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>an estimated population of 95,000 in 33,000 flats, with a similar concept for government, institution and community land uses as in Theme 1</p> <p>4.3.5 Ms Yeung mentioned that recreational facilities would also be built under this theme, such as a marina that can help boost the economy. She also mentioned that business opportunities would be provided along the waterfront such as outdoor cafes to bring the promenade to life.</p> <p>4.4 <u>Tung Chung West</u></p> <p>4.4.1 Ms Yeung pointed out that the proposed reclamation in Tung Chung West would be limited to 14 hectares and sites with high ecological value would be carefully avoided.</p> <p>4.4.2 Ms Yeung mentioned that connectivity in the area would be improved with the addition of cycle tracks, town park and promenade.</p> <p>4.4.2 Ms Yeung acknowledged the concerns from rural villages regarding development, and stated that development and environmental conservation would be balanced in development plans. She stated the methods that would be employed to preserve the environment of Tung Chung West, such as view corridors, different domestic plot ratios and 35m buffer zone along Tung Chung River. She also mentioned that local culture and heritage in rural villages would be respected.</p> <p>4.5 <u>Transportation and connectivity</u></p> <p>4.5.1 Ms Yeung stated that two more MTR stations are proposed in Tung Chung, one next to Yat Tung Estate in Tung Chung West, another one near the proposed reclamation in Tung Chung East.</p> <p>4.5.2 Ms Yeung explained that the proposed promenade would be used to better connect the entire Tung Chung, and to serve as walkways and as ventilation channels.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Q&amp; A session</b></p> <p>5.1 <u>Introduction</u></p>	52 comments were

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>5.1.1 Ms Suzanne Cheung introduced the rules for the Q&amp;A session and the four main topics of the day, i.e. Topic 1: Initial land use in Tung Chung East; Topic 2: Initial land use in Tung Chung West; Topic 3: Distribution of facilities and Topic 4: Transportation and integration of Tung Chung East and West.</p> <p>5.1.2 Ms Cheung mentioned that the audience could choose to read out their questions on stage or to have it read by the facilitator.</p> <p>5.1.3 Ms Cheung mentioned that, since there were a large number of comment sheets submitted but limited time for the event, the comment sheets that could not be read will still be recorded and counted as written submissions for PE2.</p> <p>5.2 <u>Topic 1: Initial land use in Tung Chung East</u></p> <p><u>Comment (1) from Mr Jeff Lam</u></p> <p>5.2.1 Mr Lam supported Theme 2: Economic Vibrancy of the proposed development in Tung Chung East, but suggested minor adjustments to the Theme.</p> <p>5.2.2 Mr Lam opined that there should be more commercial facilities and job opportunities in Tung Chung.</p> <p>5.2.3 Mr Lam suggested having an MTR exit in Tung Chung North from the proposed new MTR station in Tung Chung East.</p> <p><u>Comment (2) from Ms Lam, read by Ms Suzanne Cheung</u></p> <p>5.2.4 Ms Lam stated that the surroundings of Prajna Dhyana Temple in Shek Mun Kap should be preserved.</p> <p><u>Comment (3) from 余道淨, read by Ms Suzanne Cheung</u></p>	<p>presented under the four different topics during the event.</p> <p>14 comments were presented under Topic 1 during the event.</p>

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>5.2.5 余道淨 suggested having more cycle tracks in Tung Chung, and to extend the existing ones to Shek Mun Kap.</p> <p>5.2.6 余道淨 also suggested having a cycling park in Tung Chung.</p> <p><u>Comment (4) from 馬芷君, read by Ms Suzanne Cheung</u></p> <p>5.2.7 馬芷君 pointed out that there are not enough buses in Tung Chung and they are often very full on holidays.</p> <p>5.2.8 馬芷君 opined that there should not be more high-rises in Tung Chung and should have more cycle tracks.</p> <p><u>Comment (5) from 葉翠文, read by Ms Suzanne Cheung</u></p> <p>5.2.9 葉翠文 opined that the plan of development in Tung Chung should be more comprehensive, and nearby large-scale infrastructures should be taken into consideration.</p> <p>5.2.10 葉翠文 enquired after how the Government will achieve their goal of developing Tung Chung into a livable town.</p> <p><u>Comment (6) from 余素明</u></p> <p>5.2.11 余素明 stated that there should be more recreational facilities for children and parents in Tung Chung, such as cycle tracks.</p> <p><u>Comment (7) from Ms Wu from 東涌填海關注組</u></p> <p>5.2.12 Ms Wu did not support reclamation and stated that, local job opportunities are not guaranteed in the reclaimed areas.</p> <p>5.2.13 Ms Wu opined that there should be more buses in Tung Chung.</p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p data-bbox="300 169 770 201"><u>Comment (8) from Mr Owen Chong</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 244 1469 312">5.2.14 Mr Chong supported development and suggested the Government to further develop Buddhism in Tung Chung.</p> <p data-bbox="300 355 922 387"><u>Comment (9) from Mr Roy Tam of Green Sense</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 430 1391 462">5.2.15 Mr Tam stated that there should be more land for development in Hong Kong.</p> <p data-bbox="300 505 1552 574">5.2.16 Mr Tam was against reclamation as he was concerned with the aquatic life in Tung Chung, particularly the habitat of Chinese White Dolphins.</p> <p data-bbox="300 617 987 649"><u>Comment (10) from Mr HW Lau of AsiaWorld-Expo</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 692 1514 761">5.2.18 Mr Lau stated that hiring Tung Chung residents is hard for some employers as there is a mismatch between the job opportunities available and the abilities of Tung Chung residents.</p> <p data-bbox="300 804 1491 873">5.2.19 Mr Lau hoped that the geological advantages of Tung Chung could be fully utilised to develop Tung Chung into an exhibition hub.</p> <p data-bbox="300 916 1491 984">5.2.20 Mr Lau was in favor of Theme 2: Economic Vibrancy in the proposed development in Tung Chung East.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1027 712 1059"><u>Comment (11) from Mr WK To</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 1102 1391 1134">5.2.21 Mr To stated that the development potential for Tung Chung East is very high.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1177 1514 1246">5.2.22 Mr To enquired after how the Government propose to ensure local employment in Tung Chung.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1289 748 1321"><u>Comment (12) from Mr Wright Fu</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 1364 1312 1396">5.2.23 Mr Fu questioned how the Government could ensure local employment.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1439 1525 1471">5.2.24 Mr Fu enquired if the design of the proposed town park would be similar to the proposed</p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>large-scale theme park in the Lantau Concept Plan.</p> <p><u>Comment (13) from Ms Chong Yin Fong</u></p> <p>5.2.25 Ms Chong agreed that more housing should be developed in Hong Kong, but the population of Tung Chung should not be too dense.</p> <p>5.2.26 Ms Chong opined that Tung Chung could be developed into a tourist attraction with Buddhist characteristics.</p> <p>5.2.27 Ms Chong stated that the transportation in Tung Chung needed to be improved.</p> <p><u>Comment (14) from Ms Ho Loy</u></p> <p>5.2.28 Ms Ho stated that the current policies on population need to be studied first before further planning on Tung Chung development.</p> <p>5.2.29 Ms Ho opined that the expected population in Tung Chung might have to be adjusted before deciding on the general direction of development of the new town.</p> <p>5.2.30 Ms Ho was against the proposed reclamation in Tung Chung.</p> <p>5.2.31 Ms Ho mentioned that the quality of life of current residents in Tung Chung should be considered before new development.</p> <p><u>Expert Opinion of Prof. Rebecca Chiu Lai-har, JP, Department of Urban Planning and Design, University of Hong Kong</u></p> <p>5.2.32 Prof. Chiu agreed that Tung Chung should be developed into a tourist attraction.</p> <p><u>Expert Opinion of Prof. Raymond So, Dean, School of Business, Hang Seng Management College</u></p> <p>5.2.33 Prof. Chiu advised that promotion of Lantau environmental conservation could help with</p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>the government development.</p> <p>5.3 <u>Topic 2: Topic 2: Initial land use in Tung Chung West</u></p> <p><u>Comment (1) from Mr Leung Man Chung</u></p> <p>5.3.1 Mr Leung hoped that the coastline in Tung Chung West would be preserved.</p> <p>5.3.2 Mr Leung pointed out that the vacant land near Caritas Charles Vath College could be developed.</p> <p><u>Comment (2) from Ms Yu Ka Mun</u></p> <p>5.3.3 Ms Yu was concerned that the daily operations of the Prajna Dhyana Temple in Shek Mun Kap might affect the proposed new population in the area.</p> <p>5.3.4 Ms Yu did not support the proposed use of plot ratio 5 on the developments near the Prajna Dhyana Temple.</p> <p>5.3.5 Ms Yu hoped the Government would preserve the environment near the Prajna Dhyana Temple.</p> <p><u>Comment (3) from Ms Sham Fung Kai</u></p> <p>5.3.6 Ms Sham hoped the Government would preserve the environment near the Prajna Dhyana Temple.</p> <p>5.3.7 Ms Sham also hoped the Government would create a development plan with both the housing needs of Hong Kong people and the needs of Prajna Dhyana Temple in mind.</p> <p><u>Comment (4) from 詹子婷</u></p> <p>5.3.8 詹子婷 was concerned with the air quality of Tung Chung.</p>	<p>14 comments were presented under Topic 2 during the event.</p>

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>5.3.9 詹子婷 pointed out that there if there are high-rises in Shek Mun Kap, polluted air might be trapped in Tung Chung West.</p> <p>5.3.10 詹子婷 hoped that the Government would decide carefully on an appropriate area in Tung Chung for more housing.</p> <p><u>Comment (5) from 羅維洪</u></p> <p>5.3.11 羅維洪 agreed that there should be more development in Tung Chung, but urged the Government to provide a better development plan, such as better distribution of plot ratios.</p> <p>5.3.12 羅維洪 expressed that the existing vacant lands in Tung Chung could be better utilised.</p> <p>5.3.13 羅維洪 pointed out that there should be more community facilities in Tung Chung West, such as a community centre and a car park near the Caritas Charles Vath College.</p> <p>5.3.14 羅維洪 opined that the transportation in Tung Chung could be improved.</p> <p>5.3.15 羅維洪 believed that privately-owned farmlands should not be included in the proposed green belt in Tung Chung West.</p> <p><u>Comment (6) from Ms Chan, read by Ms Suzanne Cheung</u></p> <p>5.3.16 Ms Chan was concerned that the daily operations of the Prajna Dhyana Temple in Shek Mun Kap might affect the proposed new population in the area.</p> <p>5.3.17 Ms Chan believed that there should not be any high-rises near the Prajna Dhyana Temple.</p> <p><u>Comment (7) from 李志明</u></p> <p>5.3.18 李志明 stated that cycle tracks should be built to connect Tung Chung East and West.</p> <p>5.3.19 李志明 suggested having tuck shops and storage facilities for cycles along the cycle tracks</p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>to create more business and job opportunities.</p> <p><u>Comment (8) from 詹子琪, read by Ms Suzanna Cheung</u></p> <p>5.3.20 詹子琪 believed that there should not be any high-rises near the Prajna Dhyana Temple.</p> <p>5.3.21 詹子琪 was concerned that the daily operations of the Prajna Dhyana Temple in Shek Mun Kap might affect the proposed new population in the area.</p> <p>5.3.22 詹子琪 was also concerned that the possible noise pollution brought by Prajna Dhyana Temple would ultimately lead to social disharmony in the community.</p> <p><u>Comment (9) from Ms Mable Lam</u></p> <p>5.3.22 Ms Lam stated that the ecological value of Tung Chung West is very high.</p> <p>5.3.23 Ms Lam suggested that high-density development should be nearer to the proposed new MTR station in Tung Chung West, so that both convenience and business opportunities could be maximised, while the view near the Prajna Dhyana Temple could also be preserved.</p> <p><u>Comment (10) from Ms Ann Whiteman, read by Ms Suzanne Cheung</u></p> <p>5.3.24 Ms Whiteman expressed that low-rises could be built in Tung Chung West if the surrounding green areas could be preserved.</p> <p><u>Comment (11) from 曾妙和</u></p> <p>5.3.25 曾妙和 opined that there should not be any housing near Prajna Dhyana Temple as he was concerned with the possible noise pollution.</p> <p><u>Comment (12) from 簡卓鏗</u></p> <p>5.3.26 簡卓鏗 believed that community facilities should be planned ahead of housing for low-income families.</p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>5.3.27 簡卓鏗 also believed that economic development should not be the only focus in developing Tung Chung.</p> <p><u>Comment (13) from 黃妙玲</u></p> <p>5.3.28 黃妙玲 was concerned about the planned high-rises near Prajna Dhyana Temple.</p> <p>5.3.29 黃妙玲 believed that the Government should preserve the environment near the Temple.</p> <p><u>Comment (14) from Chong Yin Fung</u></p> <p>5.3.30 Chong Yin Fung believed that there should be less development in Tung Chung and the serenity of the area should be preserved.</p> <p>5.3.31 Chong Yin Fung identified employment as an issue in Tung Chung.</p> <p><u>Response from Mr. Wilson So, Assistant Director of Planning, New Territories District Planning Division, PlanD</u></p> <p>5.3.30 Mr So thanked the public for expressing their opinion and stated that the Government would carefully consider public opinion in development.</p> <p><u>Expert Opinion of Dr. Ng Cho-nam, BBS, JP, Department of Geography, University of Hong Kong</u></p> <p>5.3.31 Dr. Ng believed that the opinion can be used to improve the environment. He stated that the reclamation area has been reduced compared with the PE1. He also mentioned the importance of the planning in the Tung Chung river.</p> <p>5.4 <u>Topic 3: Distribution of facilities</u></p>	<p>10 comments were presented under Topic 3 during the event.</p>

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p data-bbox="300 172 645 204"><u>Comment (1) from 鄭智殷</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 252 1249 284">5.4.1 鄭智殷 suggested building a standard sports ground in Tung Chung.</p> <p data-bbox="300 331 1406 363">5.4.2 鄭智殷 expressed his disagreement on the proposed reclamation in Tung Chung.</p> <p data-bbox="300 411 645 443"><u>Comment (2) from 釋傳般</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 491 1496 555">5.4.3 釋傳般 mentioned that the Prajna Dhyana Temple had plans to build a nursing home in Tung Chung West.</p> <p data-bbox="300 603 645 635"><u>Comment (3) from 金文豪</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 683 1182 715">5.4.4 金文豪 suggested developing Tung Chung into a livable town.</p> <p data-bbox="300 762 1496 794">5.4.5 金文豪 opined that more higher education institutions should be set up in Tung Chung.</p> <p data-bbox="300 842 1496 874">5.4.6 金文豪 also suggested improving the transportation from Tung Chung to Lantau island.</p> <p data-bbox="300 922 645 954"><u>Comment (4) from 陳啟珍</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 1002 1563 1066">5.4.7 陳啟珍 mentioned that there should be more community facilities in Tung Chung, such as a Vegetarian nursing home near the Prajna Dhyana Temple.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1114 1541 1177">5.4.8 陳啟珍 also mentioned that the Government should cooperate with Buddhist organisations to build more facilities and create local job opportunities.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1225 757 1257"><u>Comment (5) from Ms Yu Ka Mun</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 1305 1541 1369">5.4.9 Ms Yu stated that the Government should avoid having constructions near Prajna Dhyana Temple in order to maintain serenity in the area.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1417 734 1449"><u>Comment (6) from Mr Wright Fu</u></p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>5.4.10 Mr Fu stated that the lack of facilities in Tung Chung would affect the local community negatively.</p> <p>5.4.11 Mr Fu opined that existing land should be better utilised.</p> <p><u>Comment (7) from 鄭盼林</u></p> <p>5.4.12 鄭盼林 stated that Tung Chung needs to be better connected with the other parts of Hong Kong by having more modes of transportation.</p> <p>5.4.13 鄭盼林 suggested the Government to consider different factors such as transportation and facilities before more people move in to Tung Chung.</p> <p><u>Comment (8) from Mr WK To</u></p> <p>5.4.14 Mr To stated that the water sport area at the Tung Chung river will be affected by the proposed reclamation.</p> <p>5.4.15 Mr To suggested building more recreational facilities such as an indoor sports ground.</p> <p>5.4.16 Mr To mentioned that housing and commercial activities could be developed in Tung Chung East.</p> <p>5.4.17 Mr To stated that there should be space between Prajna Dhyana Temple and new housing development in Tung Chung West.</p> <p><u>Comment (9) from Mr Yip Pui Kei</u></p> <p>5.4.18 Mr Yip mentioned that there should be more community facilities in Tung Chung West e.g. post-secondary education institutions.</p> <p>5.4.19 Mr Yip hoped that more local employment opportunities would be provided in Tung Chung.</p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p data-bbox="300 204 663 240"><u>Comment (10) from 梁世傑</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 284 1532 357">5.4.20 梁世傑 suggested having more institutions for higher education and training facilities for hospitals to attract non-local students.</p> <p data-bbox="300 437 1541 507"><u>Response from Mr. Wilson So, Assistant Director of Planning, New Territories District Planning Division, PlanD</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 549 1451 619">5.4.21 Mr So stated that different government departments would cooperate to build more community facilities in Tung Chung.</p> <p data-bbox="300 730 1272 767">5.5 <u>Topic 4: Transportation and integration of Tung Chung East and West</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 810 649 847"><u>Comment (1) from 譚雪兒</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 890 1496 963">5.5.1 譚雪兒 mentioned that the transportation in Tung Chung was inadequate and suggested having more Lantau taxis and minibuses.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1007 645 1043"><u>Comment (2) from 林家希</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 1086 1518 1160">5.5.2 林家希 expressed that it would be impossible to increase the frequency of trains on MTR Tung Chung Line due to the limited capacity of the current transportation network.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1203 757 1240"><u>Comment (3) from Ms Ng Yu Bing</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 1283 1433 1340">5.5.3 Ms Ng suggested building community facilities in Tung Chung before increase the population of the new town.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1383 1496 1420">5.5.4 Ms Ng also mentioned that housing should not be built near the Prajna Dhyana Temple.</p>	<p data-bbox="1583 240 1906 347">14 comments were presented at the under Topic 4 during the event.</p>

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>5.5.5 Ms Ng hoped that the Government would pay attention to the need for more community facilities in Tung Chung.</p> <p><u>Comment (4) from 曾妙和</u></p> <p>5.5.6 曾妙和 questioned if there would be any transportation to connect the rural villages to the proposed new MTR station in Tung Chung West.</p> <p>5.5.7 曾妙和 agreed that the current transportation network could be improved, and more cycle tracks could be built in Tung Chung..</p> <p><u>Comment (43) from Mr Lau</u></p> <p>5.5.8 Mr Lau hoped there would be a wider crawler lane on North Lantau Highway and more noise barriers along the Highway, especially near Caribbean Coast.</p> <p><u>Comment (5) from Mr Roy Tam</u></p> <p>5.5.9 Mr Tam did not support the proposed increase in population of Tung Chung .</p> <p>5.5.10 Mr Tam hoped that the current transportation system could be improved.</p> <p><u>Comment (6) from Ms Chau Chuen-heung</u></p> <p>5.5.11 Ms Chau mentioned that the connectivity between Tung Chung East and West could be improved by adding more Lantau taxis and minibuses.</p> <p>5.5.12 Ms Chau also mentioned that past accidents on the North Lantau Highway were proof that the connectivity between Tung Chung and other parts of Hong Kong could be improved.</p> <p>5. 5.13 Ms Chau was concerned about the possible traffic congestion brought by the addition of two new MTR station in Tung Chung.</p> <p><u>Comment (7) from 梁文俊</u></p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>5. 5.14 梁文俊 pointed out that Yu Tung Road is the only road connecting Yat Tung Estate with Tung Chung city centre.</p> <p>5.5.15 梁文俊 urged the Government to consider the capacity of existing roads while planning for development..</p> <p><u>Comment (8) from 劉健宏</u></p> <p>5.5.16 劉健宏 stated that cycle tracks could be built to connect Tung Chung East and West.</p> <p>5.5.17 劉健宏 expressed that more parking spaces should be provided to cyclists.</p> <p><u>Comment (9) from 陳啟華</u></p> <p>5.5.18 陳啟華 supported the building of elderly homes in Tung Chung as the elderly is a large part of the current population in Tung Chung.</p> <p><u>Comment (10) from Ms Chau Chuen-heung</u></p> <p>5.5.19 Ms Chau was concerned with the proposed ratio of public to private housing.</p> <p>5.5.20 Ms Chau hoped to see more community facilities in Tung Chung West, such as sports grounds and government offices.</p> <p>5.5.21 Ms Chau was against reclamation in the Southwest of Tung Chung.</p> <p><u>Comment (11) from 伍啟池</u></p> <p>5.5.22 伍啟池 thanked the Government and experts on their efforts in Stage 2 Public Engagement.</p> <p>5.5.23 伍啟池 hoped that the Government would honour their promise on developing Tung</p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>Chung into a livable town.</p> <p><u>Comment (12) from 楊淑賢</u></p> <p>5.5.24 楊淑賢 opined that the transportation in Tung Chung could be improved.</p> <p>5.5.25 楊淑賢 hoped for more variety in the community facilities in Tung Chung, such as elderly homes and kindergartens.</p> <p>5.5.26 楊淑賢 suggested the Government to cooperate with charitable organizations such as Prajna Dhyana Temple in developing Tung Chung.</p> <p><u>Comment (13) from Mr Gabriel Lau</u></p> <p>5.5.27 Mr Lau believed that there should be more recreational facilities for young people in Tung Chung such as sports facilities in different scales.</p> <p>5.5.28 Mr Lau urged the Government to cater to the different needs of the racially mixed population in Tung Chung.</p> <p><u>Comment (14) from 林家希</u></p> <p>5.5.29 林家希 expressed that improvements could be made on the community facilities and transportation network in Tung Chung. Bearing in mind to balance between the old and new and needs of different stakeholders.</p> <p>5.5.30 林家希 urged the Government to ensure the livability of Tung Chung by monitoring and preventing pollution.</p> <p><u>Response from Dr Daman Lee, Director, Ove Arup and Partners Hong Kong Limited</u></p> <p>5.5.18 Dr Lee stated that there would be further studies on the connection between Tung Chung and Hong Kong International Airport.</p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p data-bbox="300 204 1505 276"><u>Expert Opinion of Prof Rebecca Chiu Lai-har, JP, Department of Urban Planning and Design, University of Hong Kong</u></p> <p data-bbox="300 316 1536 387">5.5.19 Prof Chiu opined that that the clash between the need for environmental conservation and development was basically solved.</p> <p data-bbox="300 427 1469 467">5.5.20 Prof Chiu explained the importance of satisfying the needs of different stakeholders.</p> <p data-bbox="300 507 1435 547">5.4.48 Prof Chiu stated that there is a need to increase local employment in Tung Chung.</p>	
6.	<p data-bbox="300 616 1469 687"><b>Closing remarks by Mr David KC Lo, Chief Engineer/Islands, Hong Kong Island and Islands Development Office, CEDD</b></p> <p data-bbox="300 727 1189 767">6.1 Mr Lo thanked participants for actively participating in the event.</p> <p data-bbox="300 807 1480 911">6.2 Mr Lo stated that the opinions collected in Stage 2 Public Engagement would all be considered carefully and taken in consideration while planning for the development of Tung Chung.</p>	
7.	<p data-bbox="300 951 483 983"><b>End of Event</b></p> <p data-bbox="300 1023 1552 1126">7.1 Ms Suzanne Cheung reminded the audience that Stage 2 Public Engagement would conclude on July 21 and encouraged the audience to submit their views on Tung Chung development to the Government.</p>	