

## Appendix G

### Gist of Community Workshop

## Tung Chung New Town Extension Study – Stage 2 Public Engagement Gist of Community Workshop

Date: 22 June 2013 (Saturday)  
 Time: 2:00pm – 5:30pm  
 Venue: Hong Kong Federation of Education Workers Wong Cho Bau Secondary School Hall  
 Address: Area 10, Phase 3, Fu Tung Estate, Tung Chung, Lantau Island, N.T.

### Representatives from the HKSAR Government and consultants:

Mr Ivan Chung, District Planning Officer/ Sai Kung & Islands, Planning Department  
 Mr David Lo, Chief Engineer/ Islands, Hong Kong Island and Islands Development Office, Civil and Engineering Development Department  
 Ms Theresa Yeung, Director of Planning, Ove Arup and Partners Hong Kong Limited

### Expert panel:

Prof. Rebecca Chiu Lai-har, JP, Department of Urban Planning and Design, University of Hong Kong  
 Dr. Ng Cho-nam, BBS, JP, Department of Geography, University of Hong Kong

### Facilitator:

Ms Suzanne Cheung

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
1.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>1.1. Ms Suzanne Cheung welcomed guests and audience to the community workshop.</p> <p>1.2. Ms Cheung reminded everyone of the simultaneous interpretation (S.I.) service available at the event.</p> <p>1.3. Ms Cheung introduced the kit set, rundown and house rules of the event to the audience.</p> <p>1.4. Ms Cheung introduced Government officials and attending guests and invited Mr Ivan Chung from the Planning Department to give his welcoming remarks.</p>	<p>Two different S.I channels were available at the event: channel 2 for English and channel 3 for Cantonese.</p> <p>Each kit set includes a digest, a leaflet, a comment form, a piece of blank paper and a folder.</p>
2.	<b>Welcoming remarks by Mr Ivan Chung, District Planning Officer/ Sai Kung &amp; Islands, Planning Department</b>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>2.1. Mr Chung thanked the public for attending the workshop and their involvement in Stage 1 Public Engagement.</p> <p>2.2. Mr Chung stated that the proposed development plan has been put forward after deliberation between different government departments and taking public views into account. Through the Stage 2 PE, Mr Chung hoped that more public views would be collected from different stakeholders.</p> <p>2.3. Mr Chung hoped the audience would make use of the opportunity to openly express their views and their opinion would be followed up in details.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Presentation of the Study by Ms Theresa Yeung, Representative of Study Team from Ove Arup and Partners Hong Kong Limited</b></p> <p>3.1 Ms Yeung expressed gratitude for the audience attending the activity and hoped for more public views in Stage 2 Public Engagement.</p> <p>3.2 <u>Results of Stage 1 Public Engagement</u></p> <p>3.2.1 The public has expressed their vision on the different aspects of development of Tung Chung in PE1. An initial land use options plan was proposed for public discussion. Public views were collected and compiled in the initial land use option concept.</p> <p>3.2.2 More than 2,300 suggestions and proposals were received in the same period last year. The public generally agreed that Tung Chung has the potential to be further developed. There were several factors that needed to be considered in planning, specifically a balance between social needs, development ratio, technical constraints and ecology etc.</p> <p>3.3 <u>Explanation of the initial land use options</u></p> <p>3.3.1 By expanding Tung Chung, it was hoped that Hong Kong's housing shortage could be alleviated. The need to improve connectivity to other areas and within Tung Chung was acknowledged. It was also hoped that the living environment of Tung Chung residents could be improved by providing more community facilities and open space.</p>	Visual aids such as maps at each table and overhead projectors on stage were provided.

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p data-bbox="327 225 1765 331">3.3.2 The proposed plan also looked into providing more job opportunities in Tung Chung for local residents, given the strategic location of Tung Chung that connects to major infrastructure, such as the Hong Kong International Airport and Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge (HKZMB).</p> <p data-bbox="327 368 663 400">3.4 <u>Tung Chung East</u></p> <p data-bbox="327 440 1765 579">3.4.1 The proposed 120 hectares of reclamation equals to the size of three West Kowloon Cultural Hubs. It was designed after considerations of nearby infrastructure, navigation channel and the ecology in Tai Ho Wan. The plan was still at an initial stage, visual aids were not finalised regarding the coastline and the different zonings of land uses.</p> <p data-bbox="327 619 1765 799">3.4.2 The first proposed theme for Tung Chung East was “Livable Town”. Under this theme, the number of flats would be maximised, especially near the MTR TCE station. Land of commercial and public use proposed to be located close to TCE station because of the high traffic and density of people, and land for residential development would be near the seaside to avoid noise. This option was expected to accommodate 110,000 people in 38,000 flats with domestic plot ratio of 3 to 6.</p> <p data-bbox="327 839 1765 938">3.4.3 Government, institution and community (GIC) land uses, such as schools and clinics would be spread throughout the area. A standard sport ground would be constructed next to the promenade. It was hoped that residents would be able to reach their destination within 5-10 mins.</p> <p data-bbox="327 978 1765 1118">3.4.4 The proposed MTR Tung Chung East station has a walking distance of 500m, and 30-to 40-storey buildings of plot ratio 5 to 6 would be built within this 500m. The gradually decreasing plot ratio from the MTR station to the waterfront produced a stepped height profile, which would be integrated with the mountainous backdrop to provide a comfortable living environment.</p> <p data-bbox="327 1158 1765 1374">3.4.5 The second proposed theme for Tung Chung East was “Economic Vibrancy”. Under this theme, the strategic location of Tung Chung could be capitalised and turned into a regional business district with residential development. The estimated population was 95,000 with 33,000 flats. A marina was proposed under the theme based on the public opinion of having world-class recreational facilities built in Tung Chung, which could boost the surrounding economy. Business opportunities would be available along the waterfront. Similar concept for GIC land uses was applied in this option.</p> <p data-bbox="327 1414 674 1442">3.5 <u>Tung Chung West</u></p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
3.5.1	With the high ecological value of Tung Chung Bay in mind, the proposed reclamation had been limited to 14 hectares. Initial estimation shows that the proposed reclamation would not affect water currents in the area. The proposed reclamation would improve connectivity in Tung Chung with a promenade and cycling paths.	
3.5.2	View corridors would be built to preserve Tung Chung Bay and a low domestic plot ratio would be used to the new development near existing villages at Tung Chung River with similar plot ratio.	
3.5.3	Taller buildings of higher domestic plot ratio would be built next to the mountain and the MTR Tung Chung West station. This proposal expects to house 43,000 people in 15,000 flats. A 35m wide buffer zone for preservation of the Tung Chung River would be set up. District 39, southwest to the Yat Tung Estate, would be of higher development density.	
3.5.4	Ma Wan Chung village and Hau Wong Temple would not be affected. The sea view for the Hau Wong Temple as a tradition was respected and would be maintained.	
3.5.5	The proposed town park in Tung Chung West would adapt to the current landscape in the area, and integrate local heritage such as the Tung Chung Battery. Tung Chung West and Tung Chung North would be connected with pedestrian walkways.	
3.6	<u>Transportation</u>	
3.6.1	For outbound transportation in Tung Chung, two new MTR stations were proposed, one next to Yat Tung Estate in Tung Chung West, another one located on the reclaimed land in Tung Chung East. Other vehicles meanwhile could travel to other parts of Hong Kong by using the existing highway network.	
3.6.2	A promenade along the future coastline would be constructed to link up the whole Tung Chung. The promenade would preserve the characteristics of different areas at each respective section. View corridors would enhance the view in the area; serve as walkways and as ventilation channels. Major pedestrian walkways would allow people to commute within Tung Chung more conveniently. And Cycling paths would be built alongside sidewalks.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Group Discussion</b>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
4.1	<p data-bbox="439 189 837 220"><u>Guidelines for group discussion</u></p> <p data-bbox="439 263 1431 293">4.1.1 Ms Suzanne Cheung introduced the guidelines for the group discussion session.</p> <p data-bbox="439 336 1727 437">4.1.2 One hour was given to the audience to discuss several areas: Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West's land use options, and integration of the existing Tung Chung town centre and the expansion and other suggestions.</p> <p data-bbox="439 480 1693 544">4.1.3 A facilitator was present at each table to smoothen discussion. Technicians were also available at the venue upon request for more information regarding the study and proposal.</p> <p data-bbox="439 587 1559 617">4.1.4 A representative from each group would be invited to present their views after discussion.</p>	
5.	<p data-bbox="439 660 936 691"><b>Presentations from discussion groups</b></p> <p data-bbox="327 732 797 762"><b>5.1 Presentation from Group 1</b></p> <p data-bbox="327 805 1771 869">5.1.1 Group 1 suggested moving the marina to the north of Tung Chung East to minimise the noise impact to the residents and increase employment opportunities for local residents.</p> <p data-bbox="327 912 1715 976">5.1.2 Group 1 also suggested that a plot of land at the north of Tung Chung East should be reserved for non-residential purposes.</p> <p data-bbox="327 1019 1733 1083">5.1.3 Group 1 stated that building high-rises along the highway and low-rise buildings towards the waterfront could promote better ventilation and avoid blocking the views of current residents.</p> <p data-bbox="327 1126 1704 1267">5.1.4 Group 1 opined that constructing major tourist destinations like the Citygate Outlets near MTR Tung Chung station should be avoided as the burden in that area was heavy. They suggested that relocating some of these attractions to locations nearer to the Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA) could alleviate the nuisance brought by tourists.</p> <p data-bbox="327 1310 1771 1374">5.1.5 Group 1 stated that developing high-value-added industries (using beauty and cosmetics malls in Korea as examples) could increase employment.</p> <p data-bbox="327 1417 1771 1447">5.1.6 Group 1 supported Theme 2: Economic Vibrancy in Tung Chung East but stated that GIC land uses should</p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	be included under the theme.	
5.1.7	In Tung Chung West, Group 1 stated that there should be no high-density development near the Prajna Dhyana Temple in Shek Mun Kap to avoid conflicts between monks and residents.	
5.1.8	Group 1 was concerned with building high-density development at exiting villages and the North-eastern part of the reclaimed land.	
5.1.9	Group 1 suggested that transportation should be improved in Tung Chung.	
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Presentation from Group 2</b>	
5.2.1	Group 2 was against reclamation in Tung Chung.	
5.2.2	Group 2 requested a 3D development blueprint to better show the actual planning and for further discussion.	
5.2.3	Group 2 pointed out that no development in the educational sector would create serious problems in the future, especially among teenagers.	
5.2.4	Regarding Tung Chung East, Group 2 opined that the proposed marina would be for members only and locals could not benefit from the facility.	
5.2.5	Group 2 suggested that there were insufficient internal transportation link such as buses, footbridges in Tung Chung.	
5.2.6	Group 2 pointed out that the ratio of public housing to private housing was not stated.	
5.2.7	Group 2 pointed out that there were already some private planning in Shek Lau Po, but the Government stated that the area was still under planning and would include preservation.	
5.2.8	Group 2 was concerned whether mangroves and water current would be negatively affected by the proposed development.	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
5.2.9	Group 2 was concerned with the different treatment toward Hau Wong Temple and Prajna Dhyana Temple, and stated that the loss of the monastery would mean a loss of place for learning for the public.	
5.3	<b>Public Presentation (3)</b>	
5.3.1	Regarding Tung Chung East, Group 3 was against reclamation because of pollution and the narrowed navigation channel.	
5.3.2	Group 3 opined that the proposed marina would not be for the benefit of the local residents.	
5.3.3	Group 3 was concerned that reclamation would affect the health of residents and the lives of dolphins.	
5.3.4	Group 3 stated that noise pollution was already a serious problem, thus further development and more residents were not preferred.	
5.3.5	Group 3 suggested introducing range farms instead of high-density development to avoid overcrowding.	
5.3.6	Regarding Tung Chung West, Group 3 suggested preserving the whole area around Tung Chung River; people moving in to the area would bring pollution.	
5.3.7	Group 3 opined that the serene environment around Prajna Dhyana Temple should be preserved.	
5.3.8	Group 3 stated that the proposed new population in the area would threaten employment opportunities for Yat Tung residents.	
5.3.9	Group 3 suggested that more community facilities (e.g. elderly homes, special schools, organic farms etc.) should be built to boost employment instead of high plot ratio residential development.	
5.3.10	Group 3 opined that the location of the MTR Tung Chung West station should be further discussed and an underground MTR station was preferred to avoid pollution.	
5.4	<b>Public Presentation (4)</b>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
5.4.1	Regarding Tung Chung East, Group 4 was not against reclamation and preferred Theme 2: Economic Vibrancy.	
5.4.2	Group 4 stated that a comprehensive plan on increasing the variety of businesses and job opportunities should be provided.	
5.4.3	Group 4 suggested that more community facilities should be built, especially those for the elderly and a community complex.	
5.4.4	Group 4 opined that the focus of development should not be above ground only, and enquired whether there would be underground malls and businesses to make the most out of the proposed reclaimed area.	
5.4.5	Group 4 agreed with one of the previous views that 3D graphics regarding Tung Chung development should be created.	
5.4.6	Group 4 was against building of a marina as no real benefits could be provided by the facility.	
5.4.5	Regarding Tung Chung West, Group 4 was against reclamation because the ecology of Ma Wan Chung would be affected.	
5.4.6	Group 4 opined that high plot ratio development near Prajna Dhyana Temple would cut off the link between the top and the bottom of the mountain and the development should move towards Tung Chung town centre.	
5.4.7	Group 4 stated that the natural environment of Tung Chung River and farmlands should be preserved.	
	<b>5.5 Public Presentation (5)</b>	
5.5.1	Regarding Tung Chung East, Group 5 suggested that tourism should be the focus and the area should be developed into a town with its own characteristics.	
5.5.2	Group 5 opined that plot ratios 5 and 6 were too high for Tung Chung development.	
5.5.3	Group 5 suggested that existing facilities in Tung Chung could not satisfy the needs of local residents and new residents would further strain the resources.	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
5.5.4	Group 5 was against the building of a marina.	
5.5.5	Regarding Tung Chung West, Group 5 stated that the plot ratio 5 development near Prajna Dhyana Temple would not only blocks ventilation but also affect the serene atmosphere and scenery in the area; they suggested reserving an area of at least 500m around Prajna Dhyana Temple to balance economic and cultural development.	
5.5.6	Group 5 opined that there should not be too much public housing and green areas should be preserved.	
5.5.7	Group 5 suggested building facilities like night markets, wet markets, farmlands, organic farming for family enjoyment.	
5.5.8	Group 5 mentioned that Prajna Dhyana Temple had plans to cooperate with the Government to build an elderly home to help deal with the aging population.	
5.5.9	Group 5 suggested that Tung Chung should be developed into a small international town with the multicultural society and nearby infrastructure (e.g. HKIA expansion and HKZMB).	
<b>5.6</b>	<b>Public Presentation (6)</b>	
5.6.1	Group 6 suggested that the needs of the local residents should be considered.	
5.6.2	Regarding Tung Chung East, Group 6 pointed out that in Theme 1: Livable Town, the focus should not only be on providing housing as people would live and spend in the area; for Theme 2: Economic Vibrancy, more commercial opportunities for the grassroots and teenagers should be included.	
5.6.3	Group 6 suggested that there should be middle-end development for residents to develop and join as the population in Tung Chung was mixed.	
5.6.4	Group 6 also suggested that public spaces or venues for local societies, such as a community hall should be built for residents to hold events or activities.	
5.6.5	Group 6 opined that more recreational facilities should be provided for teenagers.	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
5.6.6	Regarding Tung Chung West, Group 6 stated that a cycling path could be built to serve as the link between Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West	
<b>5.7</b>	<b>Public Presentation (7)</b>	
5.7.1	Regarding Tung Chung East, Group 7 suggested that there should be no reclamation, or to limit the reclaimed area to the least damaging extent.	
5.7.2	Group 7 stated that the ratio of public to private housing should be increased.	
5.7.3	Group 7 opined that Tung Chung should be developed into a self-sustainable town and local job opportunities should be provided.	
5.7.4	Group 7 was against the building of a marina but welcomed more commercial opportunities.	
5.7.5	Group 7 was concerned whether the current MTR line have the capacity to serve two more MTR stations in Tung Chung.	
5.7.6	Group 7 suggested that more covered pedestrian walkways should be built.	
5.7.7	Regarding Tung Chung West, Group 7 was against reclamation because there was no need for it.	
5.7.8	Group 7 opined that it was necessary to preserve Tung Chung River, and the proposed 30 m buffer zone at Tung Chung River should be extended to 50m.	
5.7.9	Group 7 suggested that the hiking path behind Prajna Dhyana Temple should be preserved.	
<b>5.8</b>	<b>Public Presentation (8)</b>	
5.8.1	Regarding Tung Chung East, Group 8 opined that reclamation would bring water pollution. They stated that the Government should only go ahead with the proposed reclamation if they have measures to tackle the pollution problem.	
5.8.2	Group 8 suggested building a cycling path along the promenade.	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
5.8.3	Group 8 stated that community facilities (e.g. sports ground) should be built away from residents because of possible light pollution.	
5.8.4	Group 8 pointed out that there should be more commercial opportunities for the grassroots in Tung Chung.	
5.8.5	Group 8 opined that the modes of transportation in the area should be more diverse, i.e. there should be minibuses, bicycles and ferries that connect Tung Chung with other nearby areas.	
5.8.6	Group 8 identified the imbalance of development between Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West.	
5.8.7	Regarding Tung Chung West, Group 8 was against reclamation because plenty of land was usable in the area.	
	<b>5.9 Public Presentation (9)</b>	
5.9.1	Regarding Tung Chung East, Group 9 identified five main focuses of development, namely transportation, commercial, tourism, heritage and preservation.	
5.9.2	Group 9 urged the Government to consider the types of people who would be included in the future population of Tung Chung.	
5.9.3	Regarding Tung Chung West, Group 9 pointed out that the current lack of community facilities and a further 43,000 increase in the population would strain the limited resources.	
5.9.4	Group 9 opined that Tung Chung River should be kept at its original state.	
5.9.5	Group 9 suggested building a Buddhism tourist zone.	
	<b>5.10 Public Presentation (10)</b>	
5.10.1	Regarding Tung Chung East, Group 10 preferred Theme 2: Economic Vibrancy.	
5.10.2	Group 10 supported high-density commercial activities near the proposed marina.	
5.10.3	Regarding Tung Chung West, Group 10 was against proposed high-rise development next to Prajna	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	<p>Dhyana Temple.</p> <p>5.10.4 Group 10 urged the government to preserve the existing marine characteristics and environment as much as possible.</p> <p>5.10.5 Group 10 supported ecotourism near Tung Chung River.</p> <p>5.10.6 Group 10 stated that heritage preservation in the area should not only include the historic site itself (e.g. Tung Chung Battery) but also the context where the site was in.</p> <p>5.10.7 Group 10 preferred a natural coastline to a concrete, manmade coastline.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Expert opinion of Prof. Rebecca Chiu, JP, Department of Urban Planning and Design, University of Hong Kong</b></p> <p>6.1 Prof Chiu expressed gratitude that many Tung Chung residents has contributed to the discussion and shared local knowledge that was known to local residents only. She said the ideas would be conceptualised to the Government for planning.</p> <p>6.2 Prof Chiu explained that the positioning of Tung Chung was important: as an important part of Hong Kong, Tung Chung should help to shoulder problems the city was facing such as growing population.</p> <p>6.3 Prof Chiu identified reclamation as the answer to the previous question, i.e. more land for housing and economic development should be provided.</p> <p>6.4 Prof Chiu mentioned that Tung Chung's neighbouring regions were well developed in terms of infrastructure, cultural facilities, economic activities, and housing, and the positioning of Tung Chung should be considered in relation to these regions.</p> <p>6.5 Prof Chiu also mentioned there were positive and negative sides of the development plan. She mentioned that although there were different views on certain issues, the decision-making was a test to the Government after balancing and accessing the concerns from different stakeholders.</p>	
7.	<p><b>Expert opinion of Dr Ng Cho-nam, BBS, JP, Department of Geography, University of Hong Kong</b></p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
7.1	Dr Ng made clear that the expert panel did not represent the Government and they would speak from a professional, experienced point of view to give objective suggestions.	
7.2	Dr Ng was happy to see the residents of Tung Chung who had a great understanding of the area and the development needs.	
7.3	Dr Ng said there was a consensus of supporting sustainable development to boost the economy, improve social issues, and preserve the environment. He stated that people also wanted Tung Chung to become a more livable town.	
7.4	Dr Ng opined that Tung Chung functions at a local level for the whole of Hong Kong so keeping its characteristics, heritage etc. would be very important.	
7.5	Dr Ng hoped that the Government could join hands with the public and the Study Team to work on a plan with the greatest benefits and the least damaging effects.	
7.6	Dr Ng explained that the final version of the development of Tung Chung would not be able to cater to everyone's demands, but still hoped for acceptance for the final development in the future. He stated that everyone's suggestions could help to improve the planning and reach a balanced development.	
7.7	Dr Ng believed the Study Team and the Government would learn from poor development designs and make Tung Chung better than other developed areas.	
<b>8.</b>	<p data-bbox="439 1015 1637 1086"><b>Closing remarks by Mr David Lo, Chief Engineer/ Islands, Hong Kong Island and Islands Development Office, Civil and Engineering Development Department</b></p> <p data-bbox="327 1126 1767 1230">8.1 Mr Lo thanked participants for actively participating in the discussions, which has given the Study Team a deeper understanding on the local situation. All valuable opinions would be very useful later in drafting the zoning plan.</p> <p data-bbox="327 1270 1749 1374">8.2 Mr Lo explained after Stage 2 Public Engagement, the Study Team would organise the opinions received so far and draft the zoning plan. He also mentioned that there would be a Stage 3 Public Engagement to further collect views.</p> <p data-bbox="327 1414 1704 1444">8.3 Mr Lo reminded the participants that the Stage 2 Public Engagement would end on July 21 and views</p>	

Ref. No.	Issues/Discussion	Remarks
	could still be submitted by email, fax and post.	
9.	<p data-bbox="439 264 618 293"><b>End of Event</b></p> <p data-bbox="327 336 1715 403">9.1 Ms Suzanne Cheng stated that Stage 2 Public Engagement would end on July 21 while a public forum would be held at the same venue on July 13 and urged participants to register and join the activity.</p>	