

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1203/15-16
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/DEV

Panel on Development

**Minutes of the special meeting held on
Saturday, 16 April 2016, at 9:30 am
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

Members present : Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS (Chairman)
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-ki, SBS, MH, JP
Hon Alvin YEUNG Ngok-kiu

Members attending : Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS

Members absent : Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP (Deputy
Chairman)
Dr Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP

**Public officers
attending** : **Agenda item I**

Mr Paul CHAN Mo-po, MH, JP
Secretary for Development
(Sessions 1, 3 & 4)

Mr Eric MA Siu-cheung, JP
Under Secretary for Development
(Session 2)

Mr HON Chi-keung, JP
Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)

Mr LAI Cheuk-ho
Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)
Development Bureau

Mr Daniel CHUNG Kum-wah, JP
Director of Civil Engineering and Development

Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP
Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands)
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr LING Kar-kan, JP
Director of Planning

**Attendance by
Invitation**

: Session One

Mr WONG Wai-hung, MH
Vice President
Hong Kong Professionals and Senior Executives
Association

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN
Chief Executive Officer
Designing Hong Kong

Miss NG Chun-wing

Mr Julian KAN Chi-chung

Ir Martin CHEUNG Kin-keung

Mr Ken CHOW
Chairman, New Territories West District Affairs Committee
Liberal Party

Dr David KAM Shui-yung
Chairman
Mui Wo Planning and Development Concern Committee

Miss CHAN Shuk-ki
Member
Tung Chung Resident Group

Miss CHIU Sin-ting
Project Officer
Tung Chung Community Development Alliance

Ms Miranda YEAP
Senior Manager-Council Services
Construction Industry Council

Mr Leo LEUNG Kwok-kee

Miss FUNG Siu-yin

Ms CHU Sau-man

Ms Candy KWOK
Member
Lantau Pop

Miss CHIU Yuk-lin

Mr KWOK Yu-hang

Miss CHEUNG Pui-ying

Mr LAM Wai-yin

Mr LI Kwok-keung
President
Luk Tei Tong Village Office

Miss Helen CHEUNG Mei-yin

Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, BBS, MH
Chairman
Islands District Council

Mr YU Hon-kwan, MH, JP
Vice-Chairman
Islands District Council

Ms Amy YUNG Wing-sheung
Member
Islands District Council

Mr WONG Man-hon
Member
Islands District Council

Mr LOU Cheuk-wing, MH
Member
Islands District Council

Mr Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Member
Islands District Council

Mr TSANG Kin-hung

Mr KWONG Koon-wan
Vice Chairman
Hong Kong Islands District Association

Session Two

Mr Thomas LAM
Vice Chairman, Valuation and Planning and Development
Professional Group Committee, RICS Hong Kong
Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors

Mr LAU Hak-wah
Chairman
Lantau Development Alliance

Ms Enid LOW
Chief Strategy Officer
AsiaWorld-Expo

Mr Dickson WONG Tsz-lok

Mr FAN Chi-ping
Chairman
Tung Chung Rural Committee

Mr FAN Fook-yau

Mr LAW Wai-hung

Mr LAI Ka-chung

Miss WONG Yuk-Ting

Mr WAN Loi-hei

Mr CHOW Cheung-fuk

Mr CHAN Kwok-lam

Miss TSANG King-lai

Mr TAM Ming-fai

Mr LING Ka-leung

Miss KWAN Wing-yee

Mr Jensen LO Shek-kee

Mr TSE Sai-kit

Convener

Save Lantau Alliance

Ms WONG Wai-king

負責人

Tai O Cultural Workshop

Ms LEE Sau-chun

Member

Christian Justice on Earth Concern Group

Miss LAU Suk-han

Director

Tung Chung Safe and Healthy City

Session Three

Miss LIU Ching-yi

Assistant Officer

Tung Chung Youth Association

Ms CHAU Chuen-heung

執行委員會主席

Outlying Islands Women Association

Mr WONG Yuen-lai

Mr YIP Kam-hung

Chairman

Island Youth Association

Mr WONG Fuk-kan
Vice-Chairman
Lantau Island Association of Societies

Mr Kenny TANG Kam-fat
Vice Chairman
Hong Kong Industrial & Commercial Association Limited
Islands Branch

Mr FU Ka-ho
Member
反對香港「被規劃」行動組

Mr SIN Ho-fai
Member
Civic Party

Mr NG Cheuk-wing
Chairman
Tai O Residents' Association

Mr CHIU Wai-kuen

Mr Ken LO Kin-man
代表
仲夏荷花別樣紅、本土行動

Ir CHAN Chi-man
AES Vice Chairman/YES Chairman (Young
Engineers-in-Society)
Association of Engineering Professionals in Society Ltd

Ms HO Loy
Chairperson
Lantau Buffalo Association

Mr CHAN Wing-wah
居民代表
大嶼山拾壆村

Ms CHING Hang-ying

Ms YAU Mei-po

Session Four

Mr CHAN Chung-ming
Conservation Officer, Local Biodiversity
World Wide Fund For Nature Hong Kong

Mr LEUNG Tak-ming
Campaign Officer
The Conservancy Association

Mr WONG Chak-sang

Mr LO Tsz-kin
Member
Defend Hong Kong Campaign

Miss Betty LEE Ri-yee

Mr LAM Man-lok

Mr Andy YIU Chi-sang

Miss WONG Pui-chi

Mr WONG Chiu-man
Chairman
Event, Exhibition & Display Association of Hong Kong

Mr POON Wing-lok
Member
Christian Concern for Earth

Mr John SCHOFIELD
Treasurer
Living Islands Movement

Mr FUNG Kam-lam
Convener
Peng Chau Reclamation Concern Group

Miss LEE Lai-fan

Mr Francis LEUNG Yin-bun

Mr Kwok Chung-man

Ms Fanny WONG Fan

Mr LAI Ming-chuen

President

Green Sense

Ms HO Pu-han

Chairperson

Association for Tai O Environment & Development

Mr TANG Wing-fai

Social Ministry Officer

Hong Kong Christian Institute

Mr Jason YU

Sir Terry FARRELL

Principal

TFP Farrells Ltd. (Farrells)

Mr HON Ka-mo

Chairman

Public Transport Research Team

Mrs CHAN

Clerk in attendance : Ms Sharon CHUNG
Chief Council Secretary (1)2

Staff in attendance : Mr Fred PANG
Senior Council Secretary (1)2

Ms Maggie LAU

Council Secretary (1)2

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant (1)2

Miss Joey LAW
Clerical Assistant (1)2

Action

I Receiving public views on "Proposed Development Strategy for Lantau"

(LC Paper No. CB(1)559/15-16(08) —Administration's paper on proposed Development Strategy for Lantau)

Meeting with deputations and the Administration

Submissions from deputations/individuals not attending the meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(28) —Submission from a member of the public (盧念慈)

LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(29) —Submission from Miss LEUNG Wai-kuen (Chinese version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(30) —Submission from Mr Sean NG Wan-lung (English version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(31) —Submission from Miss Angela YAN (English version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(32) —Submission from a member of the public (何佩欣小姐) (Chinese version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(33) —Submission from Mr Wilson TSUI Shiu-hong (English version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(34) —Submission from Mr LEUNG Yu-shun (Chinese version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(35) —Submission from a member of the public (高卓然先生) (Chinese version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(36) —Submission from Mr CHAN Yat-sum (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(37) —Submission from Mr HUNG Tun-kit (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(38) —Submission from Albert YEU (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(39) —Submission from a member of the public (黃煥德) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(40) —Submission from CHAN Chi-yip (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(41) —Submission from Mr Steve TANG Lok-pun (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(42) —Submission from Mr CHENG Chi-chung (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(43) —Submission from Mr HO Ka-leung (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(44) —Submission from Hong Kong Outdoors (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(45) —Submission from Mr CHOW Ka-yun (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(46) —Submission from Mr TAM Hor-bun (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(47) —Submission from a member of the public (梁致輝) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(48) —Submission from a member of the public (高宏景) (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(49) —Submission from Miss LIU Pui-man (Chinese version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(50) —Submission from TSANG Tat-keung (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(51) —Submission from Mr CHOI Chung-hop (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(52) —Submission from Mr Raymond LAW (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(53) —Submission from Esther LO (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(54) —Submission from CHOI Yat-chiu (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(55) —Submission from CHAN Pak-lung (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(56) —Submission from a member of the public (陳健輝) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(57) —Submission from a member of the public (黃良興) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(58) —Submission from CHAN Chun-ho (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(59) —Submission from KWOK Chi-yung (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(60) —Submission from Mr HO Hui-wong (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(61) —Submission from Mr LAM Kai-wah (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(62) —Submission from LO King-fung (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(63) —Submission from Miss Shirley YEUNG (Chinese version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(64) —Submission from Mr Chris WONG Wing-leong (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(65) —Submission from CHING Kit-ming (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(66) —Submission from MAN Kit-chun (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(67) —Submission from LAI Chun-fai (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(68) —Submission from TSUI Ka-wing (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(69) —Submission from a member of the public (鄧錦添) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(70) —Submission from Mr K F HO (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(71) —Submission from a member of the public (余卓明) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(72) —Submission from Mr CHAN Chi-cheung (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(73) —Submission from Mr Samuel CHUNG Chi-kin (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(74) —Submission from Mr LEUNG Kim-pui (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(75) —Submission from Mr NG Shing-on (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(76) —Submission from Mr Simon HUI King-fung (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(77) —Submission from Mr YEUNG Ka-chun (Chinese version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(78) —Submission from Mr CHOW Kim-ching (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(79) —Submission from a member of the public (林嘉倫) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(80) —Submission from a member of the public (劉劍雄) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(81) —Submission from Mr YEUNG Wai-chiu (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(82) —Submission from LEUNG Chung-wai (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(83) —Submission from Mr LEE Ho-wing (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(84) —Submission from TSUI Hoi-bun (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(85) —Submission from a member of the public (羅劍亮先生) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(86) —Submission from Mr HUI Wai-lok (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(87) —Submission from Mr LEUNG Chun-hin (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(88) —Submission from Mr LAU Yuk-piu (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(89) —Submission from Mr WU Ka-hing (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(90) —Submission from Mr LAW Bik-lun (Chinese version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(91) —Submission from TSANG Kai-yin (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(92) —Submission from Mr IP Kam-hung (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(93) —Submission from Mr Joran TANG Chun-nang (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(94) —Submission from Miss LEE Lok-man (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(95) —Submission from Mr WONG Kar-hou (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(96) —Submission from a member of the public (馮先生) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(97) —Submission from Mr James SIU Wui-hang (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(98) —Submission from Miss NG Shuk-wah (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(99) —Submission from Miss KWOK Tsz-kwan (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(100) —Submission from LEUNG Ka-cheong (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(101) —Submission from Mr Y C WONG (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(102) —Submission from Mr MAN Lap-ho (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(103) —Submission from Mr CHEN kwai-lung (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(104) —Submission from Mr WONG Hoi-leong (Chinese version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(105) — Submission from a member of the public (謝 雲) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(106) — Submission from Mr Patrick HO Chung-kin (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)107/15-16(107) — Submission from Mr NG Ka-ho (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(108) — Submission from Alex CHUNG (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(109) — Submission from a member of the public (陳 志 光) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(110) — Submission from a member of the public (廖 育 安) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(111) — Submission from a member of the public (《 吾乃山之子 》 執行長沈容健) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(112) — Submission from CHAN Wing-leung (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(113) — Submission from WONG Kei-kwong (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(114) — Submission from WONG Tsang-hung (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(115) — Submission from Mr MAK Kam-kui (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(116) — Submission from SUEN Wai-ping (Chinese version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(117) — Submission from a member of the public (東涌鄉事委員會委員/壩尾村原居民代表 鄧美聖) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(118) — Submission from Mr KO Chun-wah (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(119) — Submission from Mandy LUK (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(120) — Submission from China Hong Kong Railway Institution (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(121) — Submission from Mr YIM Fung-chin (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(122) — Submission from IP Wing-ching (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(123) — Submission from Belinda FUNG (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(124) — Submission from a member of the public (謝錦昌) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(125) — Submission from Hong Kong Resort Company Limited (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(126) — Submission from a member of the public (黃漢強) (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(12) — Submission from Plaza Premium Group (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(13) — Submission from The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (English version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(14) —Submission from Eve CHING (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(15) —Submission from Paula KOO (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(16) —Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(17) —Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(18) —Submission from Ivy NG (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(19) —Submission from Kaman TSANG (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(20) —Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(21) —Submission from Kara LI (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(22) —Submission from Tracy (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(23) —Submission from Candy LEE (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(24) —Submission from John LEE (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(25) —Submission from Anita WONG (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(26) —Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(27) —Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(28) —Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(29) —Submission from Ms CHEUNG Mei-ha (Chinese version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(30) —Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(31) —Submission from Ms CHENG Yuk-fung (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(32) —Submission from Cannas CHOI (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(33) —Submission from Ms Sammi FU Hiu-lam, Islands District Council member (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(34) —Submission from Joshua MAK (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(35) —Submission from Ngong Ping 360 Limited
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(36) —Submission from Edmund LIU (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(37) —Submission from Mabel LEE (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(38) —Submission from Hong Kong Fishermen Consortium (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(39) —Submission from Winki SHEK (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(40) —Submission from Yasmin CHENG (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(41) —Submission from Virginia CHOW (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(42) —Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(43) —Submission from CHUI Mei-ching (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(44) —Submission from Celia NG (English version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(45) —Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(46) —Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(47) —Submission from POON Chun-hin (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(48) —Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(49) —Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(50) —Submission from Amy WONG (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(51) —Submission from LAW Kwok-yin (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(52) —Submission from a member of the public (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)807/15-16(05) —Submission from Miss Catherine YEUNG (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)807/15-16(06) —Submission from Miss Joice CHOW (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)807/15-16(07) —Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)807/15-16(08) —Submission from Arthur CHEUNG (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)807/15-16(09) —Submission from CHAN Hoi-ki (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)807/15-16(10) —Submission from Mandy LUK (English version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)807/15-16(11) —Submission from Ms Adela LIEW (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)807/15-16(12) —Submission from S W LOW (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)807/15-16(13) —Submission from Vincent OR (English version only))

Members noted the following submissions tabled at the meeting:

- (a) Submission from Outlying Islands Women Association (Chinese version only);
- (b) Submission from Hong Kong Islands District Association (Chinese version only);
- (c) Submission from Mr WONG Yuen-lai (Chinese version only);
- (d) Submission from Island Youth Association (Chinese version only);
- (e) Submission from 大嶼山貝澳新圍村村公所 (Chinese version only); and
- (f) Submission from Mr Francis LEUNG Yin-bun (Chinese version only).

(Post-meeting note: The submissions tabled at the meeting were circulated to members vide LC Papers Nos. CB(1)808/15-16(01), (02), (03), (04), (05) and (06) on 18 April 2016.)

Meeting arrangements

2. The Chairman invited members' views on the meeting arrangements. He advised that a total of 52 deputations and 66 individuals would attend the meeting. The meeting would be conducted in four sessions with a lunch break between 1:20 pm and 2:30 pm and each deputation would be given three minutes to present their views. In each session, after the deputations presented their views, he would invite members to express views. The Administration would then respond to the issues raised by deputations and members collectively. Members raised no objection to the meeting arrangements.

Action

Opening remarks by the Administration

3. At the suggestion of the Administration, the Chairman invited the Secretary for Development ("SDEV") to make an opening statement on the proposed development strategy for Lantau.

(Post-meeting note: The text of the opening statement (Chinese version only) was tabled at the meeting. A soft copy was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)814/15-16(01) by email on 18 April 2016.)

4. At different times of the meeting, when a deputation was presenting his/her views, some other deputations/individuals spoke loudly. The Chairman reminded the deputations that when one of them, upon his invitation, was speaking, other deputations should keep silent.

Session One

Presentation of views by deputations/individuals

5. At the invitation of the Chairman, a total of 28 deputations/individuals presented their views on the proposed development strategy for Lantau. A summary of the views of these deputations/individuals is in the **Appendix**.

6. At 9:57 am, some deputations clapped their hands after a deputation had presented her views. The Chairman warned that they should not make noise at the meeting. Mr Albert CHAN expressed dissatisfaction about the warning made by the Chairman. The Chairman asked Mr CHAN to keep silent when it was not his turn to speak.

7. At 10:48 am, some deputations stood up, each displaying a message, i.e. "Death Report", when another deputation was speaking. The Chairman asked them to sit down.

Discussion

Need for the development of Lantau

8. Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that, at the meeting, he had heard no views that were absolutely against developing Lantau. He considered that appropriate development of Lantau would provide an opportunity to take

Action

forward local improvement measures to resolve the problems affecting the local communities, such as substandard roads, illegal parking and the lack of public wet markets. Conservation of the natural habitats in Lantau should not be regarded as an obstacle to land development. It was necessary to increase land supply and provide more housing units to satisfy the housing needs of young people in Hong Kong.

Lantau Development Advisory Committee

9. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed concern that the proposals for developing Lantau, which were similar to those for the North East New Territories New Development Areas ("NENT NDAs"), would arouse public suspicion on collusion between the Government and land developers. He urged that the Administration should work out plans to develop Lantau based on a bottom-top approach. To formulate a development strategy for Lantau that would have taken into account nature conservation and the needs of the local residents, the Administration should increase the transparency of the work of the Lantau Development Advisory Committee ("LanDAC") and enhance its communication with the public. Moreover, the Administration should learn a lesson from the planning of NENT NDAs.

Public consultation

10. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said it was normal for the society to have different views on a subject but she hoped different views would not turn into a confrontation. She called on the Administration to listen carefully to the diverse views of the public when making plans to develop Lantau. She added that she was concerned about some deputations' request for the provision of access roads to some villages in Lantau, given that these roads might affect the scenic environment of Lantau.

Transport infrastructure

11. Mr Michael TIEN opined that the transport infrastructural facilities and train services in north Lantau were inadequate to meet the needs of the residents in the area. He proposed that, to facilitate local employment in Lantau, a light rail system linking up the new railway station in Tung Chung East and the AsiaWorld-Expo station, with stops on the Hong Kong boundary crossing facilities ("HKBCF") island of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge ("HZMB") and the North Commercial District on the Airport island, etc., should be developed. The proposed Lantau Development Office ("LDO") should take the lead in implementing the

Action

development of the light rail system in Lantau. He further suggested that LDO should consider developing the light rail system by adopting the approach of the Energizing Kowloon East Office for developing the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System in Kowloon East.

Development of the fisheries industry in Lantau

12. Mr Steven HO held the view that in developing Lantau, the Administration should pay heed to nature conservation and the aspirations of the fisheries industry and local residents. The proposed development strategy for Lantau should take into consideration the development needs of the fisheries industry.

Response by the Administration

13. At the invitation of the Chairman, SDEV gave a consolidated response to the views expressed by deputations and members. He said that:

- (a) The proposed initiatives for developing Lantau were not meant to be "plundering or sacrificing the natural and cultural resources of Lantau" (in the words of some deputations). North and northeastern Lantau would remain as the focus of major developments, whereas the predominant part of Lantau, including south Lantau, would be for conservation, leisure, cultural and green tourism. This concept had been clearly expressed all along by the Administration. The Administration would continue to demonstrate that the cultural and natural assets of Lantau would be treasured in its future work.
- (b) The proposed development strategy for Lantau had been formulated for the overall interest of Hong Kong. The identities of the landowners to be affected by the development proposals were not factors for consideration in the planning process.
- (c) The Administration noted deputations' concerns over the possible adverse impact of the proposed recreation and tourism facilities in the rural areas of Lantau. The development of such facilities would be subject to further studies and assessment as well as the views of the public. The Administration had no pre-determined stance on the implementation of the proposed recreation and tourism facilities.

Action

- (d) The development of the Tung Chung New Town Extension ("TCNTE") aimed to increase housing supply and job opportunities, as well as to improve community and educational facilities and the transport connectivity of Tung Chung. A site in Tung Chung East had been reserved for tertiary education purposes.
- (e) There was an urgent need to establish LDO, which would be a multi-disciplinary office dedicated for the development of Lantau. The office would take forward the proposals to enhance the existing and planned traffic and transport infrastructure in Lantau, including conducting an overall traffic and transport study for Lantau with consideration of Mr Michael TIEN's suggestion of developing a light rail system in north Lantau. The Administration also noted the grave concerns of local residents on the road safety of Tung Chung Road and Keung Shan Road, and had been carrying out short-term improvement works for some road bends.

14. At 11:29 am, some deputations displayed a message, i.e. "Death Report", when SDEV was speaking. The Chairman advised those deputations that, according to the "Note for members of the public attending meetings in conference rooms or observing meetings in public galleries in the Legislative Council Complex", they were required not to display any message in the conference room.

Session Two

Presentation of views by deputations/individuals

15. At the invitation of the Chairman, a total of 21 deputations/individuals presented their views on the agenda item. A summary of the views of these deputations/individuals is in the **Appendix**.

Discussion

Need for the development of Lantau

16. Mr CHAN Kam-lam shared the views of some deputations that in developing Lantau, the Administration should take measures to protect the natural habitats and improve the transport and other services for the local

Action

communities. He held the view that the proposed development initiatives for Lantau would bring benefits, such as local employment opportunities, to the existing and future population of Lantau. The development of Lantau would increase land supply for public housing to meet the housing demand of young people. He called on the parties opposing the development of Lantau to consider the overall interest of Hong Kong people.

17. Mr CHAN Han-pan opined that while nature conservation was important, the proposed development initiatives would bring about local employment opportunities and improve the infrastructural and community facilities for the local communities.

The proposed "One-hour Intercity Traffic Circle"

18. Mr Alan LEONG said that the Administration's proposals to carry out some major development projects in Hong Kong, such as HZMB and the Liantang/Heung Yuen Wai Boundary Control Point, were to dovetail with the development plans in the Mainland. He held the view that the Administration should allay public concerns that the proposal to develop Lantau's "One-hour Intercity Traffic Circle", which would cover Zhuhai, Hengqin, Qianhai and Shekou, as referred to in the public engagement digest for the proposed development strategy for Lantau, was only to support the economic development of the Mainland.

19. Mr CHAN Kam-lam opined that the economic integration of the Mainland and Hong Kong should be strengthened so as to facilitate the long-term development of Hong Kong.

Planning concept for the development of Lantau

20. Miss CHAN Yuen-han considered that it was important for the Administration to carefully study both the opposing and supporting views expressed by the public with regard to the proposed development strategy for Lantau and to work out a generally acceptable development plan. The Administration should draw on the successful experience of other development projects. She supported the concept of "conservation first, development later" in drawing up a development plan for Lantau. She called on the Administration to step up efforts to develop Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West into a low-carbon community.

Action

Public consultation

21. Mr Alan LEONG said there were comments that the Administration had made arrangements deliberately for views supporting the proposed development strategy for Lantau to be dominant at the public forums collecting views on the proposed strategy. He requested the Administration to clarify whether the public engagement exercise for the proposed strategy had been conducted in an open and fair manner to allow the public, regardless of their affiliations and standpoints, to give views.

Transport infrastructure

22. Mr Michael TIEN opined that the development of Lantau would bring benefits to Hong Kong as a whole in the long run. He said that the parties opposing land development in Lantau should take into consideration the interest of the whole community when they hoped their aspiration for nature conservation would be fulfilled. While expressing support for appropriate development of Lantau, he stressed that the conservation of south Lantau should be strengthened. He proposed that a fifth harbour-crossing tunnel with a railway system connecting North West New Territories ("NWNT") with the Hong Kong Island via north Lantau and the proposed artificial islands in the central waters should be developed. However, construction of a railway station at Mui Wo was undesirable as this would affect the preservation of the natural ecology of south Lantau.

23. Referring to his suggestion of developing a light rail system connecting Tung Chung East with the Airport island, Mr Michael TIEN urged the Administration to consider granting development rights to the MTR Corporation Limited as a funding support, so that no capital injection from the Administration would be required for the proposed light rail system. In his view, the light rail system would be less competitive than the Airport Express Line, in terms of the travelling time and convenience. The patronage of the Airport Express Line would not be affected by the operation of the proposed light rail system.

24. Mr CHAN Han-pan said that he was a member of LanDAC but he had no personal interest in the development of Lantau and did not operate any business in Lantau. He was concerned that, despite the short distance between Tung Chung and the Airport island, some residents of Tung Chung working on the Airport island had to take a long time to commute between home and workplace every day. He said that, to meet the transport demand of the new population of TCNTE, some community groups, including the

Action

Lantau Development Alliance, had proposed that a light rail system should be developed to link up TCNTE and the HKBCF island of HZMB via the Airport island, with a number of stops along the route. The proposed light rail system would not only facilitate the daily commute of residents of Tung Chung, but would also alleviate the problem of air pollution in the area.

Needs of the local residents in Lantau

25. Mr CHAN Han-pan said that residents of villages in Lantau, such as Pak Mong, had all along supported the Administration's development projects in Lantau in the past, however, the Administration had not yet addressed the request of indigenous villagers for improvement of infrastructural facilities, such as access roads and sewerage facilities, in the villages. He suggested that the Administration should establish a conservation fund to provide compensation to landowners affected by conservation works, and formulate a policy on the operation of home-stay lodgings to facilitate the sustainable development of the rural villages.

26. Mr Steven HO urged the Administration to accord high priority to the implementation of road improvement works in Lantau. To make financial resources available for villagers to preserve the cultural heritage of their villages, the Administration should promote economic activities in the villages.

27. The Chairman said that, in view of deputations' and members' requests for enhancing the traffic and transport infrastructure in Lantau, and improving the infrastructural facilities in the villages, the Administration should work out relevant short- and medium-term measures.

Conservation initiatives

28. Mr Alan LEONG queried why there were less conservation initiatives in the proposals put forward by LanDAC, compared with those in the Concept Plan for Lantau released in 2004 and the Revised Concept Plan released in 2007.

[At 1:11 pm, the Chairman directed that Session Two of the meeting be extended for 10 minutes to 1:30 pm to allow more time for discussion.]

Action

Impact of the development of Lantau on the fisheries industry

29. Mr Steven HO expressed concern about the adverse impact of the proposed reclamation projects in Lantau on the operation of the fisheries industry. He opined that unnecessary reclamations should be avoided. Instead of making one-off compensation arrangements for the fisheries operators affected by reclamation projects, the Administration should formulate measures to facilitate sustainable development of the fisheries industry before taking forward reclamation proposals. He urged the Administration to consider carefully the needs of the local residents and the fisheries industry in the planning of Lantau.

Lantau Development Advisory Committee

30. Mr Alan LEONG said that many of the Administration's proposals on large-scale development projects had created unnecessary conflicts in the society. He urged the Administration to respond to the doubts expressed by the public about the proposed development strategy for Lantau. In addition, the Administration should allay public concerns about possible conflicts of interest between LanDAC members and the proposals of the Committee.

Response by the Administration

31. At the invitation of the Chairman, Under Secretary for Development gave a consolidated response to the views expressed by deputations and members. He said that:

- (a) Various sectors of the community should consider the proposed development strategy rationally. The proposals put forward by LanDAC were preliminary and subject to further studies. The Administration had no pre-determined stance and would carefully consider all public views collected before drawing up a blueprint for developing Lantau.
- (b) The development strategy proposed by LanDAC broadly followed the principles set out in the Revised Concept Plan for Lantau released in 2007. Under the proposed development strategy, a vast area of land in south Lantau would be preserved, while economic and housing developments would be carried out in north Lantau with a view to leveraging the opportunities brought by the enhanced traffic and transport infrastructure in the area.

Action

- (c) The proposed planning vision for the development of Lantau aimed to bring benefits to Hong Kong as a whole. The proposed improvement of the traffic and transport network in Lantau would make the existing and planned recreation and tourism facilities more accessible to the public, hence facilitating public enjoyment.
- (d) Due to the overwhelming response to the two public forums on the proposed development strategy for Lantau, the Administration had conducted an additional forum. The three public forums had been attended by over 850 participants. The Administration would maintain communication with the stakeholders holding different views on the proposed development strategy.
- (e) As regards the development of TCNTE, the detailed design of the project would be carried out in the next stage. TCNTE was a key source of land supply for housing developments to meet the aspiration of the community, in particular the young people. Under the development of TCNTE, community facilities would be enhanced to meet the needs of the existing and future population of Tung Chung. Land had been reserved in Tung Chung East for tertiary education purposes to enable local residents to receive tertiary education in Lantau, as well as for commercial developments to generate more job opportunities. Street frontage shops would also be promoted in TCNTE to encourage small enterprises to start their business.
- (f) The Administration would ensure that the implementation of new traffic and transport infrastructure in Lantau, including the proposed railway stations in Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West, would dovetail with the timing of the population intake for TCNTE in future. The Administration would also explore ways to improve the public bus services in Lantau.
- (g) To address the concerns of the residents of rural villages in Lantau, the Administration would continue to carry out improvements of the infrastructure for these villages, such as access roads and sewerage facilities.

Session Three

Presentation of views by deputations/individuals

32. At the invitation of the Chairman, a total of 16 deputations/individuals presented their views on the agenda item. A summary of the views of these deputations/individuals is in the **Appendix**.

Discussion

The proposed "One-hour Intercity Traffic Circle"

33. Mr Alan LEONG reiterated his view that the Administration should allay public concerns about the purpose for developing Lantau's "One-hour Intercity Traffic Circle". He said the public were worried that the proposals for developing Lantau only aimed to complement the economic development of the Mainland.

Public consultation

34. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that the development of Lantau would have an impact on the long-term socio-economic development of Hong Kong. She was supportive of the development of Lantau provided that the Administration would take measures to conserve Lantau's natural resources. She said there were doubts among the public about the Administration's commitment to nature conservation under the planning principle of "north Lantau for development, south Lantau for conservation". She opined that, in addition to the three public forums, the Administration should organize more public engagement activities to collect views from the public. The Administration should also conduct thorough discussions with the District Councils, local community groups and green groups on the proposed development strategy.

35. Mr CHAN Han-pan opined that land development and nature conservation could be compatible with each other. The public would support appropriate and well-planned developments in Lantau. He said that those opposing the proposed development strategy should give concrete suggestions on how to improve the proposals.

36. Mr YIU Si-wing opined that, to achieve a balance between land development and nature conservation, the Administration should study carefully the diverse views on the development of Lantau. He considered that land development in Lantau would create an opportunity to improve the

Action

living environment for the local communities by developing new infrastructural and community facilities.

37. Mr Alan LEONG requested the Administration to clarify whether some members of the public had been refused admission to the public forums held by the Administration on the proposed development strategy for Lantau. He suggested that the Administration should conduct the public engagement exercise in an innovative approach, such as enabling open and interactive discussions on the subject on a dedicated website.

38. Mr Albert HO opined that, in taking forward the planning of land developments in Lantau, the Administration should work out the planning parameters with due regard to conservation of biodiversity, which was a key natural asset of Lantau. The Administration should conduct in-depth focus group discussions with different sectors of the community. The views of the existing residents of Lantau on how to improve their living environment should not be neglected.

Lantau Development Advisory Committee

39. Mr Alan LEONG stressed that it was important to achieve public consensus on the proposals to develop Lantau. He reiterated his request that the Administration should allay public concerns about possible conflicts of interest between LanDAC members and the proposals of the Committee.

Conservation initiatives

40. Mr YIU Si-wing opined that, in view of the public concerns about developing the land in the country parks, the Administration should clarify whether it had any plan to release some sites in the country parks in Lantau for development.

41. Mr Alan LEONG said that, in comparison with the Concept Plan for Lantau (released in 2004) and the Revised Concept Plan (released in 2007), there were less conservation initiatives in the proposals put forward by LanDAC. He enquired about the reasons.

Transport infrastructure

42. Mr Michael TIEN opined that, while the growing aging population of Hong Kong would become a financial burden for the Government in future, development of the transport infrastructure in Hong Kong would enable

Action

labour productivity to maintain at a steady level, which, among others, would contribute to a sustainable economic growth. He said he would not support the proposed development projects in NWNT, unless a fifth harbour-crossing railway connecting NWNT and the Hong Kong Island would be developed to address the transport needs of the increasing population of NWNT. He urged the Administration to seek funding approval expeditiously for conducting strategic studies for developing artificial islands in the central waters.

43. Mr TIEN further opined that it was necessary to improve the services for public transport between Tung Chung and the Airport island. He stressed that he would object to the proposed development projects in north Lantau if the Administration had no plan to develop a light rail system to facilitate residents of Tung Chung to commute to and from their workplaces on the Airport island or, in future, on the HKBCF island of HZMB. He reiterated his view that the proposed LDO should consider developing the light rail system by adopting the approach for developing the Environmental Friendly Linkage System in Kowloon East.

Rural villages in Lantau

44. Mr CHAN Han-pan expressed dissatisfaction on the lack of the Administration's efforts in addressing the concerns of residents of the villages in Lantau, including Pak Mong, Ngau Kwu Long and Tai Ho, about the inadequacy of infrastructural facilities, such as access roads and sewerage facilities. He suggested that, to facilitate the smooth implementation of the development initiatives for Lantau, the Administration should consider establishing a conservation fund to provide compensation to those villagers who had to discontinue agricultural practice on their farmland which had been zoned as conservation areas.

Development of tertiary education institutes in Tung Chung

45. Mr YIU Si-wing opined that developments in Lantau would generate more job opportunities for young people. Noting that a site in Tung Chung had been designated for education purposes, he sought information about the Administration's plan to develop tertiary education institutes in Tung Chung.

Action

Response by the Administration

46. At the invitation of the Chairman, SDEV gave a consolidated response to the views expressed by deputations and members. He said that:

- (a) The "One-hour Intercity Traffic Circle" concept had been introduced taking into account the situations and changes in the surrounding areas in future, including the commissioning of HZMB and the development of residential, commercial and logistics areas in Hung Shui Kiu.
- (b) In response to public concerns on the composition of LanDAC, the Administration had appointed additional members from various sectors, including conservation, sports, innovation and technology, to the new term of LanDAC. Further increase in the number of LanDAC members would affect the efficiency of the work of the Committee. LanDAC had all along maintained a high transparency in its work. All discussion papers for its meetings and minutes of meetings were uploaded to LanDAC's website for public access. An established mechanism, which was more stringent than those of other committees, was in place to require LanDAC members to declare interests. Information on the interests declared by LanDAC members had also been uploaded to LanDAC's website for public access.
- (c) In addition to the three public forums held for the proposed development strategy for Lantau, the Administration had conducted a number of focus group discussions with different sectors of the community. The Administration was committed to considering views from the public on the development initiatives for Hong Kong. The proposed low-density development in Tung Chung West was an example to show that the Administration had adopted public views on the development of TCNTE. The Administration had already set up a dedicated website to collect public views on the development of Lantau.
- (d) To pursue a good balance of development and conservation, enhancement of nature conservation and better utilization of natural resources would be two of the major directions for taking forward the conservation concepts in the planning of Lantau. Major developments at sites of high conservation value

Action

and their surrounding areas would be avoided. Tree plantation programmes would be implemented to enhance the ecological value of the country parks in Lantau. The purpose of providing supporting facilities in country parks under the proposed development strategy was to enhance public enjoyment and safety. Conservation of sites with built heritage would be strengthened.

- (e) To provide a basis for public discussions, a list of initial recreation and tourism proposals had been put forward by LanDAC based on the suggestions given by the consultants and members of the public. However, the Administration had no pre-determined stance on the adoption of any of the proposals. The aim of the initial recreation and tourism proposals was to facilitate visits to the rural areas of Lantau for the enjoyment of Hong Kong people. In taking forward the development of recreation and tourism facilities in Lantau, the Administration would take into account conservation needs, the receiving capacity of Lantau and the provision of traffic and transport infrastructure on the island.
- (f) In the light of the planned development projects in north Lantau, such as the North Commercial District on the Airport island, the three-runway system of the Hong Kong International Airport, the topside development at HKBCF island of HZMB, TCNTE and the reclamations at Siu Ho Wan and Sunny Bay, it was important to enhance the traffic and transport infrastructure in Lantau. The establishment of a dedicated multi-disciplinary LDO was necessary to take forward the tasks related to the traffic and transport infrastructure and services in Lantau. Consultancy studies on the overall traffic and transport infrastructure for Lantau would be commissioned to examine the transport linkage options, including Mr Michael TIEN's suggestion of developing a light rail system in north Lantau. Given that residents of Tuen Mun and Yuen Long accounted for 40% of the employees who worked on the Airport island, the Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link under construction would be important for improving the traffic connectivity between NWNT and north Lantau.
- (g) The Administration would ensure adequate provision of community facilities such as public markets, elderly and child

Action

care centres and sports grounds, etc., to meet the needs of the existing residents of Tung Chung as well as the planned population of TCNTE. Land had been reserved in TCNTE for tertiary education purposes. The relevant bureau would follow up on the courses to be offered. To improve the traffic and transport infrastructure in Lantau, two new railway stations were proposed in TCNTE. Improvement works for the road bends at South Lantau Road and Keung Shan Road had been taken forward to improve driving safety.

47. During SDEV's speech, a deputation spoke loudly in his seat. The Chairman warned the deputation that he would be ordered to leave the meeting room if he persisted in speaking loudly when it was not his turn to speak.

Session Four

Presentation of views by deputations/individuals

48. At the invitation of the Chairman, a total of 23 deputations/individuals presented their views on the agenda item. A summary of the views of these deputations/individuals is in the **Appendix**.

Discussion

Lantau Development Advisory Committee

49. Dr KWOK Ka-ki opined that the Administration should not pursue the recommendations of LanDAC, which comprised members biased towards the Administration. To avoid further divisions in the society, the Administration should work out plans to develop Lantau based on a bottom-top approach and listen comprehensively to public views.

50. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung criticized that LanDAC members did not represent local interest and were biased towards the interest of the powerful. He asked about the criteria for selecting the members for LanDAC. He said that the wife of Mr Andrew LAM Siu-lo, member of LanDAC and Chairman of the Antiquities Advisory Board, was a Chief Town Planner of the Planning Department, and she could disclose confidential information of the Planning Department to Mr LAM. He opined that the Administration should set up another advisory committee for the development of Lantau.

Action

The new committee should comprise members representing local community groups to better reflect public views and concerns.

51. Mr CHAN Han-pan said that LanDAC members had no pre-conceived positions on the development of Lantau when they gave views on the development strategy. The proposed development strategy for Lantau was a consolidation of the views of LanDAC. The Administration was seeking public comments on the proposed strategy.

Public consultation

52. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that the Administration had already started a number of studies relating to the development of Lantau, such as the feasibility study on spa and resort development at Cheung Sha and Soko Islands and the technical study on transport infrastructure at Kennedy Town for connecting to the proposed East Lantau Metropolis ("ELM"). These studies were funded by the block allocations under the Capital Works Reserve Fund. He was worried that the commencement of feasibility studies would mean that the relevant development proposals would go ahead without proper public consultation. He held the view that the Administration should not start any formal studies on land development proposals for Lantau before it had collected public views and secured public support for the relevant proposals.

53. Mr CHAN Han-pan opined that exchanges of views on the pros and cons of the development proposals would bring benefits to the development of Lantau. To ensure a coordinated and balanced development in Lantau, the Administration should consider the views and concerns of both the supporting and the opposing sides.

Conservation initiatives

54. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that illegal dumping activities took place at some areas in Lantau which were not covered by Development Permission Area Plans. He cast doubt on the Administration's commitment to conserving the natural environment. He said members of the public were suspicious that the Administration's purpose for putting up proposals for developing Lantau was to achieve integration between the Mainland and Hong Kong. He queried whether there was public consensus on developing a bridgehead economy in Lantau. He opined that the Administration should support local nature and heritage conservation activities in Lantau, rather than implementing large-scale development projects. He expressed

Action

dissatisfaction on the inclusion of studies for developing ELM on artificial islands in the central waters in the list of development proposals for Lantau.

Needs of the local residents in Lantau

55. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen called on the Administration to adopt an open attitude towards the diverse views expressed by the deputations/individuals at the meeting and to conduct thorough public consultations on the proposed development strategy for Lantau. In his view, as a pre-requisite for further developing Lantau, the Administration should coordinate cross-departmental efforts in pursuing effective measures to address the existing problems relating to transport services and community facilities in Lantau.

56. Mr CHAN Han-pan urged the Administration to take the opportunity of developing Lantau to take measures to address the concerns of the local residents about the lack of public sewerage facilities and access roads in the villages in Lantau, such as Pak Mong, Ngau Kwu Long and Tai Ho. In addition, the Administration should facilitate the operation of home-stay lodgings in the rural areas in Lantau.

[At 6:11 pm, the Chairman directed that the meeting be extended for 5 minutes to 6:25 pm so as to allow sufficient time for the Administration to respond to the views given by members and deputations.]

Response by the Administration

57. At the invitation of the Chairman, SDEV gave a consolidated response to the views expressed by deputations and members. He said that:

- (a) The Administration would take into consideration the views expressed by members and deputations/individuals at the meeting when formulating the blueprint for developing Lantau.
- (b) The development strategy for Lantau had been proposed by LanDAC in the overall interest of Hong Kong. The proposed planning vision was to balance and enhance development and conservation, with a view to developing Lantau into a smart and low-carbon community for living, work, business, leisure and study. Although the public engagement for development of Lantau was still underway, the Administration had received

Action

substantial amount of diverse views from the public. Among the 140 written submissions received by the Panel, over 90% of them reflected positive views on developing Lantau.

- (c) The proposed development of ELM was a new concept which was not in the Revised Concept Plan for Lantau released in 2007. The Administration had started the study "Enhancing Land Supply Strategy: Reclamation outside Victoria Harbour and Rock Cavern Development" in 2011 and investigated the feasibility of reclamation outside Victoria Harbour. During the two-stage public engagement exercise, there had been broad support from the public for studying the feasibility of developing artificial islands in the central waters. The proposed development of ELM was an elaboration of this initiative and would be one of the major sources of land supply beyond 2030 to meet the housing, social and economic development needs of Hong Kong in future. Moreover, the connectivity of Lantau to the Metro area and West New Territories would be strengthened with the proposed strategic traffic and transport infrastructure. The proposed ELM would therefore have potential to be developed as Hong Kong's third core business district besides the Central district and East Kowloon, as well as a new development area accommodating a population of several hundred thousands. This would also result in a more evenly-distributed spatial planning for Hong Kong. Therefore, there was a need to conduct the strategic study on the feasibility of developing ELM.
- (d) In the light of the changing needs of Hong Kong, the Administration had taken forward the study "Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030" ("the HK2030+ Study") to examine feasible options for overall spatial planning and future land supply. The Administration planned to conduct a public consultation exercise as part of the HK2030+ Study in the second half of 2016.
- (e) The Administration would strive to enhance nature conservation and better utilize the natural resources on the island. Major developments would concentrate in north Lantau, while the predominant part of Lantau, including south Lantau, would be for conservation, leisure, cultural and green tourism.

Action

Major developments at sites of high conservation value and their surrounding areas would be avoided. The Administration would take into account conservation needs, the receiving capacity of Lantau and the provision of traffic and transport infrastructure on the island in taking forward the development of recreation and tourism facilities. Preservation of historic buildings, including monasteries, would be strengthened.

- (f) Conducting preliminary studies for some proposed development projects did not mean that the projects would definitely go ahead. The list of recreation and tourism proposals for Lantau was a summary of the suggestions of the consultants and members of the public, subject to further studies and consultation. The Administration had no pre-determined stance on the individual proposals.
- (g) The comments made by Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung regarding Mr Andrew LAM Siu-lo, non-official member of LanDAC, and his wife, staff member of the Planning Department, were unfair.
- (h) Among the various development proposals for Lantau, the development of TCNTE, on which public views had been collected, would be implemented as a priority. The other development/conservation proposals would need time to study. Public consultation would be conducted for individual proposals before their implementation to allow the public to express their views. The Administration hoped that the public would consider the proposals and share their views in a rational manner.

58. Director of Planning expressed regret that Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung had made groundless criticisms and insulting remarks against a staff member of the Planning Department. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said it was true that the wife of Mr Andrew LAM Siu-lo had access to some of the confidential documents of the Planning Department.

Concluding remarks

59. Concluding the meeting, the Chairman said that the Administration should carefully consider the views expressed by members and deputations on the proposed development strategy for Lantau. He thanked the deputations for giving views on the subject.

Action

II Any other business

60. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:24 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
27 September 2016

Panel on Development

Special meeting on Saturday, 16 April 2016 at 9:00 am
Meeting to receive views on "Proposed Development Strategy for Lantau"

Summary of views and concerns expressed by deputations/individuals

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
<u>Session One</u>		
1.	Hong Kong Professionals and Senior Executives Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(01) (Chinese version only)
2.	Designing Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(02) (English version only)
3.	Miss NG Chun-wing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)815/15-16(01) (Chinese version only)
4.	Mr Julian KAN Chi-chung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The natural environment and biodiversity of Lantau should be protected from land development. The Administration should not develop Lantau into a business and service hub. ● The Administration should promote the hiking trails, organize eco-tours, culture and heritage tours, and provide camp sites in Lantau to enhance the understanding of local and overseas visitors on the characteristics of Lantau. ● The proposed development strategy for Lantau was suspected to be a by-product of collusion between the Government and the business sector.
5.	Ir Martin CHEUNG Kin-keung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Papers Nos. CB(1)767/15-16(01) (English version only) and CB(1)800/15-16(03) (Chinese version only)
6.	Liberal Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The road between Mui Wo and Tai O narrow and posed threat to the safety of road users when buses, hikers and cyclists used the road on public holidays. The Administration should provide passing bays, road shoulder areas and railings, and widen the pedestrian walkway along the road. ● In view of the large population of Tung Chung New

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<p>Town Extension ("TCNTE") in future, the Administration should consider providing a railway station in Yat Tung Estate and improving the public light bus services in north Lantau.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given that the Hong Kong International Airport ("HKIA") and the Hong Kong boundary crossing facilities ("HKBCF") of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge ("HZMB") were in the proximity of north Lantau, the Administration should develop a logistics park in north Lantau to capitalize on the locational advantage of the area.
7.	Mui Wo Planning and Development Concern Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(03) (Chinese version only)
8.	Tung Chung Resident Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing wet markets in Tung Chung were operated by the Link Asset Management Limited, therefore residents of Tung Chung had to buy daily necessities at high prices. The Administration should reserve sites in TCNTE for the provision of public markets operated by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department. There was a lack of sports and recreation facilities in Tung Chung. The Administration should provide more information to the public on the scale of the sports facilities to be provided in TCNTE and the implementation timetable.
9.	Tung Chung Community Development Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to mistakes in town planning in the past, many Tung Chung residents, who were in the low-income group, had to go to other districts for work or studies every day. The proposed large-scale development for Lantau would bring in a lot of visitors from the Mainland to Lantau, hence adversely affecting the daily life of the local residents and increasing the conflicts between visitors and residents. Air pollution was a serious problem in Tung Chung. Many residents of Tung Chung were affected by air pollution and displayed symptoms of allergy. The Administration should conduct a study to assess community needs and social capital in a bottom-top approach before planning the development of Lantau.

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
10.	Construction Industry Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(04) (Chinese version only)
11.	Mr Leo LEUNG Kwok-kee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(05) (Chinese version only)
12.	Miss FUNG Siu-yin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)807/15-16(04) (Chinese version only)
13.	Ms CHU Sau-man	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed "plundering" development for Lantau, which was a way to seize the precious natural resources of Lantau, was objectionable. The proposal put forward by the Lantau Development Advisory Committee ("LanDAC") would lead to the devastation of Lantau. The Administration should withdraw the proposal, which would otherwise become a "Death Report" of Lantau. ● The proposal was lacking in details and plans for the provision of ancillary facilities in Lantau. ● The implementation of traffic relaxation measures to allow more vehicles to access the closed roads in south Lantau had resulted in more illegal parking and caused danger to the villagers who lived in the areas.
14.	Lantau Pop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)815/15-16(03) (Chinese version only)
15.	Miss CHIU Yuk-lin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposal put forward by LanDAC was objectionable. There were many sites with rich natural resources in Lantau, such as Lantau North Country Park, Lantau South Country Park, Pui O, Sunset Peak and Lantau Peak, where the public could enjoy beautiful scenery for free. The Administration should not develop large-scale recreation and tourist facilities in Lantau. These facilities would likely to be managed by large enterprises. ● According to the Hong Kong Population Projections 2015-2064 released by the Census and Statistics Department, the population was projected to decrease at an annual rate of 0.2% from 2043 to 2064. There would be a drop in the demand for private housing in future, hence it was not necessary to develop Lantau, including TCNTE. ● Buffer zones should be provided in Lantau to protect

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		the ecologically sensitive areas. The Administration should conduct cumulative environmental impact assessments on the sites with high conservation value before planning the development of Lantau.
16.	Mr KWOK Yu-hang	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed "plundering" development for Lantau, which was a way to seize the precious natural resources of Lantau, was objectionable. The proposal put forward by LanDAC would lead to the devastation of Lantau. The Administration should withdraw the proposal, which would otherwise become a "Death Report" of Lantau. ● The Administration should consider developing organic farming in Tung Chung Wan by making reference to the experience of Taiwan. Food waste generated from the airport and hotels in Lantau could be recycled for use as compost. ● Traffic restriction measures, similar to those implemented in Ma Wan, should be introduced in Lantau to control vehicular access. ● The Administration should take measures to mitigate the adverse impact of the reclamation works on Tung Chung East.
17.	Miss CHEUNG Pui-ying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Due to the lack of kindergarten places in Mui Wo, many young children had to travel from Mui Wo to school by bus every day along Tung Chung Road, which had sharp bends and steep gradients. The Administration should improve Tung Chung Road to enhance the safety of the users. ● The Administration should increase the frequency of ferry services between Mui Wo and Central, and reduce the ferry fare. The ferry fares for holidays and non-holidays should be the same so as to attract more visitors to go to Mui Wo.
18.	Mr LAM Wai-yin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed "plundering" development for Lantau, which was a way to seize the precious natural resources of Lantau, was objectionable. The proposal put forward by LanDAC would lead to the devastation of Lantau. The Administration should withdraw the proposal, which would otherwise become a "Death Report" of Lantau. ● The proposed reclamation in the central waters for

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<p>the development of East Lantau Metropolis ("ELM") would cause a rise in the sea level and worsen the climate change problems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration should work out a proposal to preserve the unique features of Lantau by making reference to the preservation of Greenbelt, a permanently protected area of green space located in Ontario, Canada. There was a need to conserve the natural resources for the enjoyment of the next generation.
19.	Luk Tei Tong Village Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)815/15-16(04) (Chinese version only)
20.	Miss Helen CHEUNG Mei-yin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed "plundering" development for Lantau, which was a way to seize the precious natural resources of Lantau, was objectionable. The proposal put forward by LanDAC would lead to the devastation of Lantau. The Administration should withdraw the proposal, which would otherwise become a "Death Report" of Lantau. ● Over 80% of residents of Tai O objected to the proposal to develop a cable car system connecting Ngong Ping with Tai O, as the proposed works would cause damage to the grave sites in Tai O. ● To alleviate the traffic congestion problem in Tai O during public holidays, the Administration should provide ferry services between Tai O and Tung Chung, and reduce the holiday fares for bus services. ● The implementation of traffic relaxation measures to allow more vehicles to access the closed roads in south Lantau had brought in more visitors to Tai O, causing nuisances to the local residents.
21.	Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, BBS, MH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(06) (Chinese version only)
22.	Mr YU Hon-kwan, MH, JP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(07) (Chinese version only)
23.	Ms Amy YUNG Wing-sheung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● North Lantau should be planned for land development and south Lantau should remain as a conservation area. ● Residents of Discovery Bay objected to the proposed developments of ELM and a cross-sea viaduct connecting New Territories West and Hong Kong

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<p>Island via north Lantau, as the proposed developments would cause adverse visual and environmental impacts. The Administration should build a road linking up the Discovery Bay Tunnel Toll Plaza and the proposed new railway station in Siu Ho Wan to reduce the traffic flow along Cheung Tung Road, where many traffic accidents had occurred.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It was objectionable that tourist facilities would be developed in Discovery Bay by private developers for profit-making purposes. The Lands Department and the Planning Department should take enforcement actions against the land uses that were not in compliance with the statutory outline zoning plans.
24.	Mr WONG Man-hon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(08) (Chinese version only)
25.	Mr LOU Cheuk-wing, MH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration had failed to address the needs of Tai O residents in the planning of Lantau. ● To meet the transport needs of visitors and residents of Tai O, the Administration should construct a road along the northwestern coast of Lantau to connect Tung Chung with Tai O. ● It was not appropriate to develop a cable car system connecting Ngong Ping with Tai O before the proposed road connecting Tung Chung with Tai O was commissioned.
26.	Mr Holden CHOW Ho-ding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(09) (Chinese version only)
27.	Mr TSANG Kin-hung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(10) (English version only)
28.	Hong Kong Islands District Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)808/15-16(02) (Chinese version only)
<u>Session Two</u>		
29.	Hong Kong Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lantau was a suitable location for development of a commercial hub providing logistics, tourism, exhibition and convention and financial services. The Administration should first develop north Lantau and later south Lantau. To dovetail with the proposed developments in future, more transport

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<p>infrastructural facilities should be provided in Lantau.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration should adopt the concept of developing a "smart city" and promote the use of high-end technology in planning the development of Lantau. ● There was a need to have a coordinating office to manage various development projects in Lantau.
30.	Lantau Development Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(11) (Chinese version only)
31.	AsiaWorld-Expo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(12) (Chinese version only)
32.	Mr Dickson WONG Tsz-lok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● With reclamation works outside Victoria Harbour going on, the number of Chinese White Dolphins in north Lantau had dropped significantly in recent years. The concept of "development first, conservation later" for Lantau was objectionable. The possible adverse impact of the development of Lantau on Chinese White Dolphins would be irreversible. ● The proposed developments for Lantau would only facilitate the economic integration between Hong Kong and the Mainland but would not benefit Hong Kong people. Tourism development in Lantau would bring in more visitors from the Mainland, causing nuisances to the daily life of the local residents. ● The transport infrastructural facilities in Lantau should be improved to cater for the transport needs of residents of Lantau, not to complement tourism development.
33.	Tung Chung Rural Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Given that there was no private housing development in Tung Chung West, the Administration should adopt 60:40 as the public-to-private housing mix in planning the development of Tung Chung West. ● The Administration should provide a recreation and cultural centre and facilitate the development of a hotel in Tung Chung West. The Tung Chung West Railway Station should be provided as early as possible.

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration should provide public sewerage facilities in unsewered villages in Lantau. ● The Administration should develop access roads and car parks to improve the connectivity of villages in Lantau. The parking of private cars, buses and goods vehicles along Yu Tung Road had caused traffic congestion problems. The road linking up Yu Tung Road and Tung Chung Road should be made open to reduce the traffic flow along Tung Chung Road.
34.	Mr FAN Fook-yau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration should create more employment opportunities for grass-root people by developing tourist facilities, hotels and elderly residential care homes in Lantau. ● Residents of old villages in Tung Chung longed for early implementation of the Tung Chung West Railway Station. ● The Administration should improve the transport infrastructural facilities in Lantau, such as Tung Chung Road, which was one of the major roads in Lantau.
35.	Mr LAW Wai-hung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)807/15-16(02) (Chinese version only)
36.	Mr LAI Ka-chung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(13) (Chinese version only)
37.	Miss WONG Yuk-Ting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Development of Lantau would destroy the natural environment and the land inhabited by the villagers. It would also worsen the air quality in Lantau. ● The plan to realize Lantau's "One-hour Intercity Traffic Circle" would bring in more Mainland visitors to Hong Kong, causing nuisances to the local residents. ● The proposed development projects for Lantau, together with the on-going projects of the HKBCF island of HZMB and the third runway of HKIA, would cause damage to the habitat of Chinese White Dolphins. It was doubtful how the proposed development of an animal farm in Shui Hau could promote animal protection in Hong Kong.
38.	Mr WAN Loi-hei	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed development strategy for Lantau would benefit the residents of Lantau. ● South Lantau should be planned for tourism

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<p>development. The Administration should provide tourist facilities in south Lantau to promote tourism development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration should carry out works to widen South Lantau Road before planning the development of Lantau.
39.	Mr CHOW Cheung-fuk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)815/15-16(05) (Chinese version only)
40.	Mr CHAN Kwok-lam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(14) (Chinese version only)
41.	Miss TSANG King-lai	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed development of shopping, dining and hotel facilities and tourist attractions in Lantau would bring in more visitors from the Mainland to Lantau, causing nuisances to the daily life of the local residents. To promote local economic activities in Lantau, the Administration should set up bazaars and provide support for the development of small shops with local characteristics. ● The proposed development strategy for Lantau was lacking in plans to protect Chinese White Dolphins. The Administration should develop conservation initiatives based on the recommendations of green groups, to promote nature conservation in Lantau. ● About half of the members of LanDAC had personal interest in land development in Lantau.
42.	Mr TAM Ming-fai	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(15) (Chinese version only)
43.	Mr LING Ka-leung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(16) (Chinese version only)
44.	Miss KWAN Wing-yee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration should withdraw the proposed development strategy for Lantau. The development proposals would have adverse impact on the natural environment and local communities of Lantau. ● The Administration should not use economic development as an excuse to damage the natural environment of Lantau and facilitate the transfer of benefits to the business sector. ● The development proposals lacked conservation initiatives.
45.	Mr Jensen LO Shek-kee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(17) (Chinese version only)

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
46.	Save Lantau Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Papers Nos. CB(1)583/15-16(02) and (03) (Chinese version only)
47.	Tai O Cultural Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration should preserve the heritage of the Tai O fishing village so that Tai O would remain an attraction for tourists. The Administration should take into account the tourist receiving capacity of Tai O and the needs of the local residents in planning the development of Lantau. ● The proposals to develop a cable car system connecting Ngong Ping with Tai O and an entrance plaza in Tai O were objectionable. The traffic restriction measure on South Lantau Road should not be relaxed. ● The Administration should provide public sewerage systems for the stilt houses and more indoor recreation facilities in Tai O.
48.	Christian Justice on Earth Concern Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(18) (Chinese version only)
49.	Tung Chung Safe and Healthy City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)807/15-16(01) (Chinese version only)
<u>Session Three</u>		
50.	Tung Chung Youth Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration should reserve sites in Lantau for developing tertiary education institutes to provide educational programmes on aircraft repair, eco-tourism and convention and exhibition management to equip young people with relevant skills to take up jobs in Lantau. ● The Sunset Peak was suitable for promoting green tourism. However, the proposed viewing and stargazing facilities would adversely affect the natural landscape. ● The Administration should provide more sports facilities and venues in Tung Chung to cater for the needs of young people. The Administration should make use of videos to disseminate the information about the proposed development strategy for Lantau to young people.
51.	Outlying Islands Women Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)808/15-16(01) (Chinese version only)

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
52.	Mr WONG Yuen-lai	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)808/15-16(03) (Chinese version only)
53.	Island Youth Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)808/15-16(04) (Chinese version only)
54.	Lantau Island Association of Societies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Papers Nos. CB(1)767/15-16(19) and CB(1)815/15-16(07) (Chinese version only)
55.	Hong Kong Industrial & Commercial Association Limited Islands Branch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(05) (Chinese version only)
56.	反對香港「被規劃」行動組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed "plundering" development for Lantau, which was a way to seize the precious natural resources of Lantau, was objectionable. The proposal put forward by LanDAC would lead to the devastation of Lantau. The Administration should withdraw the proposal, which had not undergone thorough public consultation. ● There was a concern that the arrangements for custom, immigration and quarantine clearances at HKBCF of HZMB might affect the operation of the legal system of Hong Kong. ● The Administration should take into consideration the needs of the local communities and the outcome of the economic assessment in planning the development of the economic infrastructural facilities in north Lantau. The proposed economic and tourism developments in Lantau would only benefit the business sector but not the residents of Lantau.
57.	Civic Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed development strategy for Lantau lacked a detailed plan to develop Lantau into a low-carbon community. ● Development proposals should be people-oriented. The Administration should provide adequate community and recreation facilities, such as sports grounds, to address the needs of the residents of Tung Chung.

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposal to develop tourist facilities in south Lantau would cause damage to the habitats of species of conservation concern, such as Romer's Tree Frogs, Milkweed Butterflies and Chinese Tri-spine Horseshoe Crabs. ● Tsing Ma Bridge was the only road connecting Lantau to other areas in Hong Kong. The Administration should improve the transport infrastructural facilities in Lantau to meet the needs of the residents. The proposed development of a cable car system connecting Ngong Ping with Tai O was objectionable.
58.	Tai O Residents' Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(04) (Chinese version only)
59.	Mr CHIU Wai-kuen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(20) (Chinese version only)
60.	仲夏荷花別樣紅、本土行動	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed development strategy for Lantau was objectionable. ● The Administration had not listened to the views of the public that the natural environment of Lantau should be protected from land development. The Administration should not develop the land in the country parks in Lantau. ● The Administration should preserve the ecology of Lantau and promote eco-tourism to attract more overseas visitors.
61.	Association of Engineering Professionals in Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(21) (Chinese version only)
62.	Lantau Buffalo Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed development of an animal farm in Shui Hau was objectionable. The proposed development strategy lacked conservation initiatives for buffaloes in Lantau. The Administration should set up a dedicated office to implement policies to conserve local species, including buffaloes and cattle. ● The Administration should conduct technical studies on how to protect the natural habitats of buffaloes from developments in Lantau. ● The Administration should take action against dangerous driving, which posed threat to animals and residents in south Lantau.

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
63.	大嶼山拾壆村	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration should improve the dilapidated Chi Ma Wan Road, which was the major access road for the villagers in the area. Cyclists using the village access roads to Shap Long Tsuen for mountain biking posed threat to the safety of the villagers. The Administration should widen the village access roads. ● The Administration should expedite the development of Chi Ma Wan Peninsula. ● The cattle/buffaloes in Lantau had damaged plants and crops in the villages and their excretion had caused hygienic problems to the environment.
64.	Ms CHING Hang-ying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed economic and tourism developments in Lantau would cause irreversible adverse impact on the natural environment. ● The Administration should follow the principle of "conservation first, development later", which was a global trend nowadays, in formulating a development strategy for Lantau.
65.	Ms YAU Mei-po	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed development strategy for Lantau would destroy the natural environment. The natural resources in Lantau had become tools of private developers and landowners to reap profits. ● Lantau belonged to Hong Kong people. The Administration should not proceed with any development in Lantau without the consent of Hong Kong people. ● The Administration should provide assistance to the Tai O Cultural Workshop for the operation of a private heritage museum.
<u>Session Four</u>		
66.	World Wide Fund For Nature Hong Kong	● LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(06) (English version only)
67.	The Conservancy Association	● LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(11) (English version only)
68.	Mr WONG Chak-sang	● LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(07) (Chinese version only)

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
69.	Defend Hong Kong Campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● With the commissioning of HZMB in future, developments in Lantau would attract investments from Zhuhai and Macau and would drive the economic growth of Hong Kong. ● The proposed development of ELM as the third Central Business District would promote the role of Hong Kong as a "super-connector" between the Mainland and the rest of the world to complement the national "One Belt One Road" strategy. ● "Hong Kong independence" as advocated by some members of the public had caused political disputes and would delay the development of Lantau as well as affect the long-term economic development of both Hong Kong and the Mainland.
70.	Miss Betty LEE Ri-yee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed development of an animal farm in Shui Hau was objectionable. The natural habitats of Horseshoe crabs, Chinese White Dolphins and buffaloes, which were ecologically valuable species in Lantau, should be protected. ● The Administration should promote the rehabilitation of agricultural land for farming and the development of eco-tourism and home-stay lodgings, which would bring more local job opportunities. ● Due to the altitude requirements for aircraft departing from Hong Kong entering the Mainland airspace, the proposed operation of the three-runway system of HKIA would arouse aviation safety problems.
71.	Mr LAM Man-lok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(23) (Chinese version only)
72.	Mr Andy YIU Chi-sang	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(08) (Chinese version only)
73.	Miss WONG Pui-chi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration had not paid heed to the conservation of biodiversity in making proposals for the development of Lantau. ● The Administration's proposal to develop recreation facilities at the Sunset Peak and Yi O would damage the natural environment. The proposed reclamation in Tung Chung East would adversely affect the planned marine park in the surrounding waters of

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<p>The Brothers islands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To increase land supply in Hong Kong, the Administration should optimize the use of brownfield sites.
74.	Event, Exhibition & Display Association of Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(24) (Chinese version only)
75.	Christian Concern for Earth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Given that the population of Hong Kong was projected to decrease starting from 2043, the Administration should withdraw the proposal to develop ELM. ● The Administration should set up open bazaars and facilitate agricultural rehabilitation in Lantau so as to boost the local economy. ● South Lantau should be designated as a Development Permission Area ("DPA") where interim planning control would be taken to protect the area from unauthorized developments. ● The public engagement period for the proposed development strategy for Lantau should be extended for 3 months. The Administration should revise the proposed strategy and conduct the public engagement afresh.
76.	Living Islands Movement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed development strategy for Lantau lacked new conservation initiatives. ● Conservation specialists should be engaged in formulating concrete conservation measures, which should be included in a blueprint for the development of Lantau. ● The Administration should complete the statutory procedure for the designation of the Soko Islands Marine Park and the Southwest Lantau Marine Park as soon as possible.
77.	Peng Chau Reclamation Concern Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(25) (Chinese version only)
78.	Miss LEE Lai-fan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration should step up efforts in formulating measures on the conservation of country parks before taking forward the development projects which would cause destruction to the natural environment. ● The Administration should implement measures to

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<p>address the light pollution problems which affected the stargazing activities at the Sunset Peak.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration should take actions against contravention of land use restrictions in country park areas. ● The proposed reclamation projects for the development of Lantau and the construction of the third runway at HKIA were objectionable.
79.	Mr Francis LEUNG Yin-bun	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)808/15-16(06) (Chinese version only)
80.	Mr KWOK Chung-man	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposal put forward by LanDAC would lead to the devastation of Lantau and have adverse impact on the development of Hong Kong in future. LanDAC should be dissolved. ● An expert team should be engaged to conduct a study on the positioning of the proposed artificial islands to be developed in the central waters between Hong Kong Island and Lantau. ● The works for the possible rail link between north Lantau and Tuen Mun should take priority and be taken forward in concurrence with the reclamation works in Tung Chung East. ● About 10% of land in Tung Chung West was planned for high-density subsidized housing development, while about 50% of the land was planned for low-density private housing development. It was doubtful whether the land in Tung Chung West would be well utilized.
81.	Ms Fanny WONG Fan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)815/15-16(12) (Chinese version only)
82.	Green Sense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration had misquoted the concept of sustainable development in making proposals for the development of Lantau. The proposals would only achieve profit-making purposes. ● The sites with high ecological value, such as the land near the coast of northwestern Lantau, should be designated as DPAs or country park areas. ● The proposals to develop ELM and a third runway at HKIA should be withdrawn. ● The Administration should conduct a strategic environmental impact assessment for the

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		development of Lantau to strengthen the conservation of the natural environment of Lantau and then formulate a revised development strategy for Lantau. Afterwards, the Administration should conduct a new public engagement exercise to gauge views on the revised development strategy.
83.	Association For Tai O & Environment Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(09) (Chinese version only)
84.	Hong Kong Christian Institute	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration should withdraw the proposed development strategy for Lantau. ● The proposed development strategy would adversely affect the biodiversity and the natural environment of Lantau. The purpose of the strategy was making profits. ● The Administration should dissolve LanDAC and set up a new committee which would operate in an open and transparent manner.
85.	Mr Jason YU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(26) (English version only)
86.	TFP Farrells Ltd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)767/15-16(27) (English version only)
87.	Public Transport Research Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)800/15-16(10) (Chinese version only)
88.	Mrs CHAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)807/15-16(03) (Chinese version only)