

Public Engagement of the Task Force on Land Supply

Final PE Report

Submitted by A-World Consulting Limited
to Task Force on Land Supply
on 27 December 2018



Table of Content

1	Introduction.....	2
1.1	Background	2
1.2	The Consultants	6
2	Executive Summary.....	7
2.1	Public Engagement Design and Process.....	7
2.2	View Collection, Analysis and Findings	8
2.3	Overall Evaluation and Awareness of the PE	9

Section One: Public Engagement Programme

1	Programme Design.....	2
1.1	Overall Design	2
1.2	PE Process	2
1.3	Mechanism of View Collection and Analysis	3
2	PE Process.....	6
2.1	Pre-PE Events	6
2.2	PE Events	8
2.3	Information Dissemination	25
2.4	Publicity.....	30
2.5	Overall Evaluation and Awareness of the PE	34

Section Two: Analysis of Feedback received by the Task Force on Land Supply (TFLS) during the Public Engagement (PE)

1	Quantitative analysis of the Land Supply PE.....	4
2	Qualitative analysis of the Land Supply PE.....	12
3	Conclusion.....	100
4	List of Annexes.....	109

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

1.1.1 “Land is pivotal to sustaining Hong Kong’s housing, economic and social development”¹. Irrefutable as that maybe, what is lacking is “a broad consensus on the pros and cons, trade-offs and priorities of different options”². The Chief Executive announced the intention to engage the community in an extensive discussion and debate on the issue of land in July 2017. Attention was aroused and views have continued to be expressed since.

1.1.2 Appointed by the Chief Executive on 1 September 2017, the Task Force on Land Supply³ (TFLS) was formed with 22 non-official and 8 official members for a term of 1.5 years to 28 February 2019, with the primary task of, inter alia, providing an objective and rational forum for the community to discuss and consider, through analyses of the associated facts and pros and cons, the trade-offs on various land supply options, and to indicate their priorities of acceptance, with a view to building consensus, to the extent possible, and mapping out the direction for land supply that would benefit the community as a whole.

1.1.3 The TFLS had reviewed the estimations of land supply and demand under “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030” (Hong Kong 2030+). According to Hong Kong 2030+, the land requirement over the next 30 years will be no less than 4,800 hectares (ha). Taking into account the land supply of about 3,600 ha from committed and planned developments, Hong Kong still faces a land shortfall of at least 1,200 ha in total, in the long run up to 2046. Considering that the actual land demand may be higher than the estimate and many uncertainties on the supply-side, the TFLS is of the view that the land shortfall of at least 1,200 ha, based on which the public engagement

¹ Task Force on Land Supply, Meeting Paper No.02/2017 “Demand for Land”, p.1

² HKSAR Government, “The Chief Executive’s 2017 Policy Address”, para 142

³ TFLS Terms of Reference

(i) to take stock of the demand and supply of land resources;
(ii) to review and recommend enhancement to the implementation of land development measures for the short, medium and long term already promulgated, and taking into account these measures to review and evaluate other land supply options and their relative priorities;
(iii) to raise public awareness of the facts and constraints in land supply;
(iv) to engage the public in thorough discussions on the pros and cons of different land supply options and facilitate consensus-building on the preferred options and their priorities; and
(v) to come up with a broad framework recommending enhancement to the overall land supply strategy and prioritising different land supply options for further consideration by the Government.

exercise (PE) should be mounted, is a conservative estimate. Out of the minimum of the 1,200 ha shortfall, about 800 ha is the estimated shortfall up to 2026 (short-to-medium term), while the remaining (about 400 ha) is the shortfall projected for 2026 to 2046 (medium-to-long term). This was taken as the basic premise of the PE exercise.

1.1.4 The TFLS examined over 20 land supply options, some of which are initiatives already being implemented by the Government. After a macroscopic evaluation, and having regard to factors including whether or not the option would bring about additional land supply, 18 land supply options were shortlisted for the PE exercise⁴.

1.1.5 The 18 land supply options, considered potentially capable of providing additional land, were categorised as short-to-medium term options, medium-to-long term options and conceptual options. Their development benefits, costs, expected lead time to land formation, challenges and factors to be considered, relevant overseas experience, as well as the Government's related public engagement and consultation exercises, major studies' findings and proposals in the past were all explored:

(a) Short-to-medium Term Options

(with potential to provide additional land in around 10 years' time; these four short-to-medium term options also have the potential to provide more land in the medium-to-long term)

- (i) Developing Brownfield Sites
- (ii) Tapping into Private Agricultural Land Reserve in the New Territories
- (iii) Alternative Uses of Sites under Private Recreational Leases
- (iv) Relocation or Consolidation of Land-extensive Recreational Facilities

(b) Medium-to-long Term Options

(with potential to provide additional land in around 10 to 30 years' time)

- (i) Near-shore Reclamation outside Victoria Harbour
- (ii) Developing the East Lantau Metropolis
- (iii) Developing Caverns and Underground Space
- (iv) More New Development Areas in the New Territories
- (v) Developing the River Trade Terminal Site
- (vi) Developing Two Pilot Areas on the Periphery of Country Parks

⁴ See PE booklet for details

(c) Conceptual Options

(unable to confirm when and how much additional land can be provided for the time being)

- (i) Developing the River Trade Terminal Site and its Surroundings in the Long Term
- (ii) Developing More Areas on the Periphery of Country Parks
- (iii) Increasing Development Intensity of “Village Type Development” Zones
- (iv) Topside Development of Existing Transport Infrastructure
- (v) Utilising the Development Potential of Public Utilities Sites
- (vi) Relocation of Kwai Tsing Container Terminals
- (vii) Topside Development of Kwai Tsing Container Terminals
- (viii) Reclaiming Part of Plover Cove Reservoir for New Town Development

1.1.6 The TFLS noted, as a matter of fact and principle, that no single option could address the severe land shortage problem and provide sufficient land to meet all the foreseeable/unforeseeable development needs. This was widely reported in the media and recognised in the community.

1.1.7 Based on the above understanding of the land demand and supply in Hong Kong, and the land supply options deemed to have the potential to provide additional land in different time scales, a five-month, one of the most comprehensive and far-reaching PE exercises ever undertaken in Hong Kong, was designed and subsequently launched from 26 April 2018 to 26 September 2018 to encourage and gauge views from all sectors of the community. The PE programme was designed to elicit views from individuals and stakeholder groups alike, by making widely accessible in the public domain the relevant facts and information, as well as the deployment of multiple land supply options, to facilitate the building of consensus in regard to this urgent and vitally important issue for Hong Kong.

1.1.8 Specifically, the TFLS sought the public’s view with regard to questions including but not limited to the following:

1. All options to increase land supply bring different level of impacts to different stakeholders. In your opinion, how should the community take a holistic view to balance sustainable development and other needs, so as to identify a land supply model that can meet society's best interests?

2. According to estimates till 2046, there is a shortfall of at least 1,200 ha of land (equivalent to the total area of more than 60 Victoria Parks), while there is no single land supply option that can solve the land shortage problem. In your opinions, what kind of multi-pronged strategy should Hong Kong adopt?
3. The short-to-medium term land supply situation is the most acute. After striking a balance between factors such as development benefits and costs, and the time required to provide land, how should we prioritise and make trade-off between those practicable options?
4. Some suggest that Hong Kong needs additional land to build a land reserve to meet various unforeseeable demands and continuously improve our living environment. Do you agree that we should kick start the study for building a land reserve, to prepare for the rainy days?
5. Some of the land supply options may still be conceptual at this stage with considerable technical constraints and uncertainties. It takes time to revolve those issues. In your opinion, how should the Government prioritise these options?
6. Apart from the opinions in response to the options listed, do you have other suggestions to increase land supply?

1.2 The Consultants

- 1.2.1 Working with Circle Communications Limited (Design team), and the Social Sciences Research Centre of the University of Hong Kong (HKU-SSRC) as Independent Reporting Agency (IRA), A-World Consulting Limited (AWC) was appointed PE Director to assist in planning and conducting the PE exercise, in particular, (i) to advise, develop and execute the overall PE strategy, comprising the objectives, methodologies and implementation of the PE events; (ii) to coordinate, execute and monitor the PE exercise including but not limited to attending all relevant meetings of the TFLS, working closely with all agencies and contractors such as the video production company⁵, roving exhibition agency and website production company commissioned by the Task Force Secretariat, the Development Bureau (DEVB); and (iii) to monitor, record and analyse public views and sentiments and advise on suitable public relations strategy to respond to key public views and stakeholders.
- 1.2.2 AWC is also responsible for providing, with the Design Team, the creative concept and design for various PE materials⁶, projecting the urgency of the matter and the undesirable state we are in. In addition, AWC is tasked to provide Chinese and English editing services.
- 1.2.3 As the IRA, HKU-SSRC is in charge of the collation, analysis and reporting of views expressed by stakeholders and members of the public through all channels throughout the entire PE exercise. Both quantitative and qualitative methods are to be used to analyse views collected via View Collection Forms (VCF), PE events and other submissions. To ensure that, besides the “informed” views to be collected via the VCF, the TFLS is also able to access the view of the general population, a randomised telephone survey was also included, with the Telephone Survey Research Laboratory, Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) commissioned by Task Force Secretariat, DEVB, and HKU-SSRC providing advice on the design and methodology of the survey, as well as reviewing and analysing the findings, in the context of the overall PE views analysis. A detailed report from the IRA is at Section Two of this report.

⁵ Production of television and radio announcements in the public interest (APIs), short videos and animated infographic videos, and advice and execution of media buy on social media platform

⁶ PE Materials include PE booklet, pamphlet, poster, exhibition panels and website layout

2 Executive Summary

2.1 Public Engagement Design and Process

The Public Engagement (PE) Exercise by the Task Force on Land Supply (TFLS) was conducted from 26 April 2018 to 26 September 2018. A-World Consulting Limited (AWC), working with Circle Communications Limited (Design Team) and the Social Sciences Research Centre of the University of Hong Kong (HKU-SSRC) as Independent Reporting Agency (IRA), was appointed PE Director to assist in the planning and execution of the five-month PE exercise which includes organising and overseeing events, information dissemination, publicity, and views collection.

Given the gravity of the land shortage problem, the complexity of, and vested interests in regard to, the relevant issues, and the high level of call for all to partake in the engagement exercise, the strategy was to optimise confidence and win trust by putting in place an exceptionally comprehensive and far-reaching PE programme. All sorts of communication channels (see Chapter 1.2, Section One for details) were deployed to create a programme with exceptional breadth and depth, supported by a large number of multi-disciplinary activities and publicity initiatives to reach out to different sectors in the community, including the general public, young generation, critics and the “silent majority” to explore solutions to alleviate the shortage of land of at least 1,200 hectares (ha) in the long term (up to 2046) based on the 18 land supply options selected by the TFLS for public consideration. The TFLS’ commitment to and presence at the PE events were key.

2.1.1 PE Events

A total of 185 PE events, including 40 roving exhibitions in all 18 districts, four public fora, 72 meetings and 69 outreach events, were conducted for over 27,500 participant/times. The first month of the PE programme was dedicated to public education, warming the community up to the complex topic, the key facts and data and points of interest/concern. The topline statistics of the PE events are summarised in table 2 in Chapter 2.2, Section One. Prior to the launch, 32 pre-PE engagement meetings were held with the media, concerned groups and lawmakers to solicit input to the PE programme and other issues.

2.1.2 Information Dissemination

A variety of PE materials were produced. These include the PE booklet laying out the detailed considerations of the TFLS and the facts and issues associated with the selected land supply options; the pamphlet summarising the key points of the booklet; publicity poster; display panels with excerpts from the PE booklet for a series of district-

based roving exhibitions; short videos featuring members of the TFLS and animated infographic videos, in both Chinese and English. The PE pamphlet was also available in Bahasa Indonesia, Hindi, Nepali, Tagalog, Thai and Urdu on request, while accessible versions of the videos are available for the visually impaired. A dedicated website, Facebook page and Youtube channel were put in place as online platforms for information dissemination. In addition, the Commercial Radio Hong Kong was commissioned to produce an 11-episode, dedicated radio programme to reinforce public knowledge on the subject in the latter half of the PE programme. The interactive radio programme was hosted by a popular public affairs anchor and attended by TFLS members who took live calls from members of the public. The programme was available on air and at a dedicated website. For details, please refer to Chapter 2.3, Section One.

2.1.3 Publicity

On the publicity front, a set of television and radio Announcements in the Public Interest (TV and radio APIs) were created and broadcasted. Newspaper advertisements, outdoor advertisements, Facebook boosting and cross-posting in different Facebook pages were also in place at specific times in the PE programme. For details, please refer to Chapter 2.4, Section One.

2.2 View Collection, Analysis and Findings⁷

In line with the TFLS' decision to be as comprehensive as possible in engaging the public and soliciting feedback, View Collection Forms (VCF) were developed as a web-based tool with prompts, and a paper questionnaire available at roving exhibitions and Home Affairs Enquiry Centres to facilitate the submission of "informed" views. On top of that, to gauge the view of the general population, a randomised telephone survey was also conducted towards the last month of the PE programme. Both quantitative and qualitative feedback was collated and analysed by the IRA whose detailed report is published in Section Two. Some points of interest are listed as follows:

- A total of 29,065 VCFs (21,608 from WBT and 7,457 paper forms), 3,011 successful cases of randomised telephone survey and 1,302,488 qualitative comments from a wide variety of feedback channels⁸ including PE event summaries, written submissions, petitions and signature campaigns, traditional media, social networks and media, opinion surveys and VCFs were received and

⁷ Includes AWC's relevant programme design and IRA's input, as gleaned from Section Two of this report

⁸ See Table 2.1 in Chapter 2.1, Section Two

analysed. “Nearly 80% of responses to the VCF (22,652 out of 29,065) yielded at least 1200 ha of land⁹.” 88% of the qualitative comments were collected through petitions and signature campaigns¹⁰.

- On the overall findings in regard to the options, “the quantitative analysis shows that the most popular specified options are Brownfield, Private Agricultural Land reserve, East Lantau Metropolis and More New Development areas in NT, which all have majority support through both the VCF and telephone survey. The qualitative analysis shows strong support for Brownfield and More New Development areas in NT, with many concerns about Private Agricultural Land Reserve and East Lantau Metropolis, especially as regards negative conservation/environmental impact. Land-extensive Recreational Facilities and Peripheries of Country Parks are the two most unpopular options through both channels of quantitative analysis and through the qualitative analysis¹¹.”
- “Popular suggestions for selection criteria for land supply options were conservation or environmental impact, land use and planning outcomes, need for supporting infrastructure and community facilities, potential for housing development, protecting the public interest, time to provide land, financial cost, impact on residents and other economic considerations¹²,” as shown in the qualitative analysis.
- Regarding land reserve, “54% supported and 30% strongly supported this¹³” as shown in the result of the randomised telephone survey.

2.3 Overall Evaluation and Awareness of the PE

Throughout the PE period, an overwhelming number of media reports¹⁴ (4,573), averaging nearly 30 a day (with a daily maximum of over 80 reports) were monitored. This could well be one of the most ‘talked-about’ PE exercises in recent history in Hong Kong. The media reports reflected different sentiments in the community at different times of the PE exercise. There were allegations of the PE being “faked engagement” noted mostly at the beginning of the exercise. There were also calls to move fast to

⁹ See Chapter 1, Section Two

¹⁰ See Chapter 2.2, Section Two

¹¹ See Chapter 3.6, Section Two

¹² See Chapter 3.5.2, Section Two

¹³ See Chapter 1.4, Section Two

¹⁴ Media reports published from 26 April 2018 to 28 September 2018 were monitored, as the media reports on 27-28 September 2018 may refer to the conclusion of the PE on 26 September 2018

ameliorate the situation with combination of options especially towards the end of the PE exercise. What seems certain is that, through the often intense and serious debates and discussions over the five months of the PE programme, the appreciation of the land shortage issue and associated land supply options has increased fairly significantly.

Among the qualitative feedback, “comments providing an overall evaluation of the PE activities were largely positive (over nine hundred), although some negative comments (over two hundred) thought the materials were too much for the general public to digest¹⁵.” There were 294 comments about the TFLS and a typical relevant quote¹⁶ was - “Chairman and other members deserve public appreciation for their dedication in collecting public opinions during the PE¹⁷.”

¹⁵ See Chapter 3.5.6, Section Two

¹⁶ See Chapter 2.1, Section Two

¹⁷ See Chapter 2.15, Section Two

Section One: Public Engagement Programme

1 Programme Design

1.1 Overall Design

The PE programme was designed in deliberation with the TFLS, who endorsed it for implementation. The objectives of the programme correspond to the TFLS' terms of reference, viz 1) to raise public awareness of the facts and constraints in land supply and 2) to engage the public in thorough discussions on the pros and cons of different land supply options and facilitate consensus-building on the preferred options and their priorities. The key was to be genuine and facilitating in soliciting views and consensus building.

Given the gravity of the land shortage problem, the complexity of the relevant issues, and the high level of call for all to partake in the engagement exercise, the PE programme has to be as comprehensive and far reaching as possible. All sorts of communication channels (see below Chapter 1.2, Section One for details) were deployed to create a PE programme with exceptional breadth and depth through a large number of multi-disciplinary activities and publicity initiatives, reaching out to different sectors in the community, including the general public, young generation, critics and the "silent majority" to explore solutions to alleviate the shortage of land based on the 18 selected land supply options.

Among the 18 land supply options presented, some had been included in previous public consultation exercises while others were rather new in the public domain. Given the difference in the level of familiarity of the different options and the complexity of issues relevant to discussions, care was taken to familiarise the community with the subject matter i.e. public education was staged upfront and in parallel with especially the early PE meetings.

1.2 PE Process

Followed by a scene-setting, month-long pre-PE period with engagement of the media, lawmakers and concerned groups, the PE programme was launched as a two-stage campaign: the first month (26 April 2018 – 25 May 2018) focused on public education aimed to fostering public understanding of the land supply issue especially the severe shortage, while the core PE (26 May 2018 – 26 September 2018) focused on view collection through online and paper view collection forms and face-to-face meetings, whether en masse or in small groups, after engagement briefings and/or deliberations. Media reports and the dedicated email/hotline set up for the exercise were also

monitored for feedback.

A series of PE events targeting the general public, professional bodies, the youth, community groups, corporates and concerned groups, were planned. These included public fora; roving exhibitions; meetings with Advisory and Statutory bodies, District Council (DC), Legislative Council (LegCo), concerned groups and professional institutions; and outreach programmes targeting the community, corporates, schools, and the youth. For details, please refer to Chapter 2.2, Section One.

A corresponding set of comprehensive yet easy-to-grasp educational PE materials in multi-media formats were prepared and publicity efforts were undertaken to warm the community up for discussion. Please refer to Chapters 2.3 and 2.4, Section One, for details.

1.3 Mechanism of View Collection and Analysis¹⁸

In line with the overall strategy to be as comprehensive as possible in engaging the public and soliciting views, two channels of view collection, namely 1) “informed” view collection and 2) randomised telephone survey, were deployed in gauging views on land supply.

“Informed” view collection – a typical approach in any engagement exercise where participants would have read and understood, at least to a degree, the PE contents.

The IRA assisted in designing the bilingual VCF to measure the level of support for the set land supply options. The VCF was made available at an online platform (web-based tool/WBT) and as paper questionnaire distributed at the roving exhibitions (also available at Home Affairs Enquiry Centres where the PE booklet could be obtained and read for information). The feedback provided via VCF (other than open-ended comments) was processed and analysed quantitatively.

The paper questionnaire was made available on 26 May 2018 coinciding with the launch of the roving exhibition, after one month of public education. On 7 June 2018, the WBT, which, in principle, was identical to the paper questionnaire, only with a captcha and video to be played for at least one minute before participant could start with their view submission, was launched. The WBT also included an automatic

¹⁸ Includes AWC’s relevant programme design and IRA’s input, as gleaned from Section Two of this report

calculation of the total land yield from options chosen by the participant and prompts for more land options to be chosen, if the participant would like to achieve at least 1,200 ha of land yield, which is equivalent to the estimated minimum land shortfall. “At the end of the PE, HKU-SSRC had received and processed 29,065 responses via the VCF (excluding blank forms and duplicates¹⁹), made up of 7,457 paper forms and 21,608 forms via the WBT²⁰.”

“HKU-SSRC coded all the open-ended responses in the 29,065 VCF as well as all submissions received through other channels by the end of the PE period using the NVivo software, based on a coding framework in Annex 1 that was developed to reflect all the issues covered in the Public Engagement Booklet, and then extended to cover all the other relevant issues raised in the qualitative materials collected during the PE process, so far²¹.”

Other than the VCF, a total of 68,300 feedback/comments, via various channels²², including written submissions (3,846), petitions and signature campaigns (64,439), and opinion surveys (15)²³ were received during the PE period. Other feedback via channels including traditional media, social networks and media were also recorded and/or analysed subsequently by the IRA, who took into account views collected in the 145 PE events²⁴ too.

Randomised telephone survey – to gauge the view of the general population, a telephone survey was conducted with fieldwork undertaken from 13 August 2018 to 18 September 2018 by the CUHK. The findings, which are quantitative in nature, were included in the analysis of the IRA. The two channels ensure the TFLS hears from all who wish to speak up on the subject, as well as the silent majority, while the quantitative and qualitative analyses inform the TFLS not only of the strength or otherwise of public support for certain land supply options but also concerns and skepticism, if any, in the community.

¹⁹ Among the paper forms, 192 were found to have duplicate reference numbers, but only one paper form had duplicate information and hence was removed from the analysis. Among the WBT forms, 2584 were found to have duplicate IP address. However, as IP addresses can be legitimately shared, only two WBT forms were removed as duplicates after taking into account the time gap between submissions from the same IP address and similarity of responses

²⁰ See Chapter 1.1, Section Two

²¹ See Chapter 2.1, Section Two

²² For a full list of channels monitored and analysed by the IRA, see Table 2.1 in Chapter 2.1, Section Two

²³ Of the 20 opinion surveys analysed by HKU-SSRC, 15 were submissions directly to the TFLS and 5 were in papers prepared by the Task Force Secretariat, DEVB.

²⁴ All PE events listed in Chapter 2.2, Section One, and elaborated in subsequent chapters, except for the 40 roving exhibitions

Details of the findings by the IRA are presented in Section Two of this report.

2 PE Process

2.1 Pre-PE Events

To warm up different sectors to the PE, a month-long initial engagement period was dedicated to pre-PE meetings. Out of the total of 32 pre-PE events held, 10 were with media outlets, and the remaining 22, tabulated below, were with DC members, Legislative Councilors, specific project proponents, professional groups and concerned groups sampled for the TFLS to obtain input to the design of the PE programme, as well as to pave the ground for future discussion.

Table 1: List of Pre-PE Events (Excluding Meetings with Media Outlets)

No.	Date	Name of Event
1.	15/3/2018	Meeting with the Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons of District Councils
2.	23/3/2018	Meeting with professional institutions (Hong Kong Institute of Architects and Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design)
3.	27/3/2018	Meeting with Legislative Councilors (Hon Tony Tse Wai-chuen, Hon Chan Kin-por, Hon Chan Chun-ying, and Hon Ma Fung-kwok)
4.	28/3/2018	Meeting with professional institutions (Hong Kong Institute of Engineers, Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects, Hong Kong Institute of Planners and Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors)
5.	29/3/2018	Meeting with land supply option advocator (Topside development of existing transport infrastructure) - Lam Chiu-ying and Hong Kong Countryside Foundation
6.	3/4/2018	Meeting with representatives from environmental organisations (The Conservancy Association, World Wildlife Fund Hong Kong, Green Power, Green Peace, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Green Earth and Friends of the Earth)
7.	3/4/2018	Meeting with Legislative Councilors (Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions)
8.	3/4/2018	Meeting with Legislative Councilor of Functional Constituency - Agriculture and Fisheries (Hon Steven Ho Chun-yin) and representatives from agriculture and fisheries sector
9.	6/4/2018	Meeting with land supply option advocator (Topside development of Container Terminals) - Chow Ming-kuen
10.	6/4/2018	Meeting with land supply option advocator (Plover Cove

No.	Date	Name of Event
		Reservoir) – Lai Chiu-cheong
11.	6/4/2018	Meeting with Legislative Councilors (Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong)
12.	6/4/2018	Meeting with Legislative Councilors (New People's Party)
13.	7/4/2018	Meeting with the Platform Concerning Subdivided Flats in Hong Kong
14.	9/4/2018	Meeting with the Heung Yee Kuk
15.	10/4/2018	Meeting with representatives from environmental organisations (Green Sense, Green Lantau Association, Save Lantau Alliance, Hong Kong Dolphin Conservation Society, HKWildlife.net Forum, Lantau Buffalo Association and Greeners Action)
16.	11/4/2018	Meeting with Legislative Councilors (Liberal Party)
17.	12/4/2018	Meeting with Legislative Councilors (Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong)
18.	16/4/2018	Meeting with Legislative Councilors (Democratic Party)
19.	17/4/2018	Meeting with Legislative Councilors (Civic Party)
20.	17/4/2018	Meeting with Legislative Councilor (Roundtable)
21.	18/4/2018	Meeting with the Citizens Task Force on Land Resources
22.	25/4/2018	Meeting with Legislative Councilors (The Professionals Guild)

2.2 PE Events

A total of 185 PE events were conducted reaching out to over 27,500 participant/times. The key statistics of the PE events are summarised in Table 2 below and elaborated in the following Chapters.

Table 2: Key Statistics of PE Events

No.	Events	Number of Events / Spots	Estimated Reach (participant/times)
1	Public Fora	4	751
2	Roving Exhibitions (3 days per spot)	40	17,718
3	Meetings	72	4,068
3.1	Advisory and Statutory Bodies	13	475
3.2	District Council	4	124
3.3	Legislative Council	2	174
3.4	Concerned Group	29	1,327
3.5	Professional Institution	24	1,968
4	Outreach Programmes	69	4,970
4.1	Community Outreach	12	537
4.2	Corporate Outreach	14	411
4.3	School Outreach	23	3,160
4.4	Youth Outreach	20	862
Total		185	27,507

2.2.1 Public Forum

As a platform for the general public to express views, four public fora, one each on Hong Kong Island, Kowloon, New Territories East and New Territories West, were held. Please see Table 3 below for details. The fora were conducted in Cantonese with English simultaneous interpretation, and a public affairs media programme anchor as moderator. Political parties and concerned groups demonstrated at all the fora and had submitted various public petitions.

A panel of TFLS members, chaired by the TFLS Chairman, were the host of the public fora. Typically, a presentation would be made by the TFLS, followed by participants invited to speak on drawing of lots by the moderator. Efforts were made to optimise the number of participants to speak. Consolidated responses from the panel were provided at intervals bearing in mind the primary purpose of the public fora was for the TFLS to listen to and collect views. All comment forms submitted were included in the view collection and analysis exercise of the IRA whether or not the contents were read out during the forum. Apart from those who registered prior to the forum, walk-in participants were entertained and were admitted 15 minutes after the official start time subject to availability of seats. The four public fora were well attended with a total attendance of 751 participant/times.

Facebook live broadcast was conducted for all 4 fora.

Table 3: List of Public Fora

No.	Date	Time	Name of Event	Venue
1	16/6/2018	2:00pm-5:00pm	Public Forum (Hong Kong Island)	Leighton Hill Community Hall (133 Wong Nai Chung Road, Happy Valley)
2	7/7/2018	2:00pm-5:00pm	Public Forum (New Territories East)	Tai Po Community Centre (2 Heung Sze Wui Street, Tai Po)
3	28/7/2018	2:00pm-5:00pm	Public Forum (New Territories West)	Yuen Long Town East Community Hall (9 Long Yat Road, Yuen Long)
4	25/8/2018	2:00pm-5:00pm	Public Forum (Kowloon)	Lecture Theatre, Education Bureau's Kowloon Tong Education Services Centre (19 Suffolk Road, Kowloon Tong)

2.2.2 Roving Exhibition

40 spots were included in the roving exhibition, covering high pedestrian traffic malls, government facilities and/or transport junctures such as MTR stations across the 18 districts to reach out to audiences of various socio-economic background. The exhibition at each spot was for three consecutive days, mostly over weekends.

Manned by a roving exhibition agency appointed by the Task Force Secretariat, DEVB, the exhibition featured panels with contents extracted from the PE booklet. Tables and chairs were set in the exhibition area to facilitate participants to fill out the paper questionnaire or access the WBT via tablets available on site or with their own devices to submit views. The PE TV API, infographic videos and short videos were put on as part of information provision. Copies of the PE booklet, pamphlet and souvenirs (i.e. plastic folders and pens) were also available. Over 17,700 visits were recorded at the exhibitions. Table 4 below shows the details of roving exhibitions held.

Table 4: List of Roving Exhibitions

No.	Date	District	Venue
1	26/5/2018-28/5/2018	Wan Chai	Lee Theatre Plaza, Causeway Bay
2	26/5/2018-28/5/2018	Sha Tin	Sunshine City Plaza, Ma On Shan
3	27/5/2018-29/5/2018	Kwun Tong	Kai Tin Shopping Centre, Lam Tin
4	1/6/2018-3/6/2018	Southern	Marina Square West Centre, Ap Lei Chau
5	1/6/2018-3/6/2018	Kowloon City	Gourmet Place - Wonderful Worlds of Whampoa
6	1/6/2018-3/6/2018	Yuen Long	T Town, Tin Shui Wai
7	6/6/2018-8/6/2018	Central and Western	MTR Admiralty Station
8	8/6/2018-10/6/2018	North	Avon Mall, Fanling
9	16/6/2018-18/6/2018	Wong Tai Sin	Tsz Wan Shan Shopping Centre
10	16/6/2018-18/6/2018	Sai Kung	Sheung Tak Plaza, Tseung Kwan O

No.	Date	District	Venue
11	22/6/2018-24/6/2018	Tai Po	Tai Po Mega Mall
12	22/6/2018-24/6/2018	Tsuen Wan	8 1/2, Tsuen Wan
13	27/6/2018-29/6/2018	Sham Shui Po	Cheung Sha Wan Government Offices
14	30/6/2018-2/7/2018	Yau Tsim Mong	Hoi Fu Shopping Centre, Mong Kok
15	6/7/2018-8/7/2018	Tuen Mun	Tuen Mun Cultural Square
16	6/7/2018-8/7/2018	Kowloon City	Homantin Plaza
17	13/7/2018-15/7/2018	Sha Tin	Wo Che Plaza, Sha Tin
18	13/7/2018-15/7/2018	Kwun Tong	Domain Mall, Yau Tong
19	20/7/2018-22/7/2018	Islands	Fu Tung Plaza, Tung Chung
20	23/7/2018-25/7/2018	Wan Chai	Times Square, Causeway Bay
21	27/7/2018-29/7/2018	Tsuen Wan	Belvedere Square, Tsuen Wan
22	27/7/2018-29/7/2018	Eastern	Cityplaza
23	1/8/2018-3/8/2018	Central and Western	Harbour Building, Central
24	3/8/2018-5/8/2018	Kwai Tsing	Cheung Fat Plaza, Tsing Yi
25	10/8/2018-12/8/2018	Tuen Mun	Tuen Mun Parklane Square
26	10/8/2018-12/8/2018	Wong Tai Sin	Fung Tak Shopping Centre, Wong Tai Sin
27	17/8/2018-19/8/2018	Eastern	Oi Tung Shopping Centre, Shau Kei Wan
28	20/8/2018-22/8/2018	Sha Tin	MTR Shatin Station

No.	Date	District	Venue
29	24/8/2018-26/8/2018	Kwai Tsing	MTR Kwai Fong Station
30	24/8/2018-26/8/2018	North	Sheung Shui Town Centre
31	31/8/2018-2/9/2018	Kwun Tong	Lei Yue Mun Plaza, Yau Tong
32	31/8/2018-2/9/2018	Sai Kung	Nan Fung Plaza, Tseung Kwan O
33	7/9/2018-9/9/2018	Yau Tsim Mong	Kowloon Park, Tsim Sha Tsui
34	7/9/2018-9/9/2018	Islands	Yat Tung Shopping Centre, Tung Chung
35	13/9/2018-15/9/2018	Southern	Stanley Plaza
36	14/9/2018-16/9/2018*	Tai Po	Fu Shin Shopping Centre, Tai Po
37	21/9/2018-23/9/2018	Sham Shui Po	Dragon Centre, Sham Shui Po
38	22/9/2018-24/9/2018	Eastern	Fitfort, North Point
39	23/9/2018-25/9/2018	Yuen Long	Yuen Long Jockey Club Town Square
40	24/9/2018-26/9/2018	Yau Tsim Mong	MTR Mong Kok East Station

*Due to typhoon, the exhibition originally scheduled for 16 September 2018 was cancelled.

2.2.3 Meetings

The TFLS attended 72 meetings with Advisory and Statutory Bodies, DC, LegCo, concerned groups and professional institutions. Such meetings normally would kick off with a presentation by the TFLS, followed by views expression from the audience and a question and answer session. Oftentimes, these parties would also send written submissions to the TFLS after the meetings. 4,068 participant/times were recorded for these meetings.

2.2.3.1 Advisory and Statutory Bodies

TFLS members attended 13 Advisory and Statutory Bodies (ASB) meetings/exchange sessions to gauge views by taking time from the ASBs' original meeting schedule within dedicated sections of their scheduled meetings, or informal exchange sessions. Table 5 is a list of the meetings with ASBs.

Table 5: List of Meetings with ASBs

No.	Date	Name of Event
1	12/5/2018	Seminar organised by Heung Yee Kuk
2	30/5/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Housing Authority and its Committees
3	4/6/2018	Meeting with the Advisory Council on the Environment
4	14/6/2018	Meeting with the Land and Development Advisory Committee
5	19/6/2018	Meeting with the Lantau Development Advisory Committee
6	5/7/2018	Meeting with the Advisory Committee on Water Supplies
7	8/7/2018	Forum organised by Construction Industry Council
8	19/7/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Logistics Development Council
9	20/7/2018	Meeting with the Country and Marine Parks Board
10	4/8/2018	Meeting with the Town Planning Board
11	9/8/2018	Meeting with the Council for Sustainable Development
12	20/8/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Maritime and Port Board
13	13/9/2018	Meeting with the Advisory Committee on Agriculture and Fisheries

2.2.3.2 District Council

Four workshops for DC members and their colleagues were held respectively in New Territories West, New Territories East, Kowloon and Hong Kong Island. An attendance of 124 (participant/times) in total was recorded. The workshops were organised to provide a dedicated platform for DC members from different regions in a bid to facilitate more focused discussion and expression of views by DC members concerning the land supply options and general land supply issues.

Similar to the arrangement for public forum, a panel of TFLS members hosted the workshops and a moderator facilitated the discussions. After a presentation by the TFLS, the moderator would draw out question forms filled by attendees who wished to express views on site. Consolidated responses from the TFLS were made at intervals. All comment forms were collected and included in IRA's view analysis regardless whether or not they were read out during the workshops. Table 6 shows the DC Workshops held.

Table 6: List of District Council Workshops

No.	Date	Name of Event
1	5/5/2018	District Council Workshop (New Territories West)
2	10/5/2018	District Council Workshop (New Territories East)
3	12/5/2018	District Council Workshop (Kowloon)
4	14/5/2018	District Council Workshop (Hong Kong Island)

2.2.3.3 Concerned Group

29 concerned group meetings, including that with think tanks, political parties and green groups were held. These ranged from small group exchanges to large groups rallying with their views and positions. The spread of these groups was wide and far-reaching. Table 7 lists the meetings held with concerned groups.

Table 7: List of Meetings with Concerned Groups

No.	Date	Name of Event
1	9/5/2018	Meeting with the Federation of Public Housing Estates
2	10/5/2018	Meeting with local leaders in Tai Po district
3	14/5/2018	Meeting with local leaders in Eastern district
4	24/5/2018	Meeting with the Land Watch
5	19/6/2018	Forum organised by the Justice and Peace Commission of the Hong Kong Catholic Diocese (The Land Debate: Sustainable Development and Ethics)
6	5/7/2018	Luncheon with Path of Democracy
7	17/7/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Thinkers
8	24/7/2018	Exchange with the Legislative Councilor Hon Steven Ho Chun-yin and Hong Kong Fishermen Consortium
9	24/7/2018	Meeting with the New People's Party
10	27/7/2018	Meeting with the Legislative Councilor Hon Frankie Yick Chi-ming and representatives from transport sector
11	9/8/2018	Meeting with the Federation of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University Alumni Associations
12	12/8/2018	Meeting with District Councilors Lee Chi-wing, Chiu Man-leong and Alliance of Protection of Ma Liu Shui
13	15/8/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Christian Council
14	15/8/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Fisherman Village Representative Association
15	1/9/2018	Meeting with the agriculture and fisheries sector
16	3/9/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong CPPCC Youth Association
17	5/9/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong University Graduates Association
18	5/9/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Alliance of Golfers
19	7/9/2018	Meeting with the Tuen Mun Rural Committee
20	11/9/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Exhibition & Convention Industry Association
21	11/9/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Chi Tong Association Limited
22	12/9/2018	Meeting with green groups

No.	Date	Name of Event
23	13/9/2018	Meeting with the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong's Professional Affairs Committee
24	15/9/2018	Forum organised by the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions
25	15/9/2018	Meeting with the Architect Planner Fellowship Limited
26	17/9/2018	Meeting with the Labour Party
27	21/9/2018	Meeting with the Civic Party
28	24/9/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Water Sports Council
29	26/9/2018	Meeting with the Elderly Service Advocacy Alliance

2.2.3.4 Professional Institution

24 meetings with professional institutions were held with an extensive and comprehensive range from disciplines such as architecture, construction, engineering, landscaping, planning, surveying, and urban design, to accounting, chartered secretary, education, law, medicine, etc. Table 8 shows the meetings with professional institutions.

Table 8: List of Meetings with Professional Institutions

No.	Date	Name of Event
1	28/5/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Institute of Planners
2	29/5/2018	The Land for Hong Kong Forum organised by the Hong Kong Institute of Architects, the Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects, Hong Kong Institute of Planners and the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
3	31/5/2018	Forum organised by the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
4	2/6/2018	Forum organised by the LEAPS
5	11/6/2018	The Land Supply Policy Luncheon organised by Hong Kong Real Property Federation
6	11/6/2018	Meeting with Executive Committee of the Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union
7	15/6/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Institute of Architects
8	21/6/2018	The second quarterly general meeting of the Hong Kong Institute of Architects
9	25/6/2018	The Land Supply Policy Forum and Luncheon organised by the Hong Kong Green Building Council
10	25/6/2018	Forum organised by the LEAPs
11	26/6/2018	Meeting with the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors
12	27/6/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants
13	12/7/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
14	6/8/2018	Luncheon with the Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators
15	6/8/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Professionals and Senior Executives Association
16	11/8/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Project Management Exchange Centre and the Hong Kong Association of Construction Professionals

No.	Date	Name of Event
17	13/8/2018	Meeting with the Association of Engineering Professionals in Society Ltd
18	15/8/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Academy of Engineering Sciences
19	16/8/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design and the Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
20	23/8/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Medical Association
21	24/8/2018	Meeting with the Law Society of Hong Kong
22	30/8/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Institute of Chartered Secretaries
23	1/9/2018	The Land Use and Supply Forum 2018 organised by the HKCA Young Members Society
24	19/9/2018	Annual meeting of the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors

2.2.3.5 Legislative Council

On 29 May 2018, the TFLS gave a presentation to the Panel on Development (the Panel) of LegCo referring to the PE booklet, pamphlet and a subject paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)996/17-18(04)).

Subsequently, on 19 September 2018, a public hearing (five sessions) was held as a special meeting of the Panel. The PE booklet, pamphlet and papers titled respectively CB(1)1389/17-18(01) and CB(1)996/17-18(05) were tabled. Members of the public and the LegCo both expressed their views regarding “Planning for land supply in Hong Kong”. A total of 159 members of the public spoke up. 101 written submissions were received. Table 9 below records the engagement with the LegCo.

Table 9: List of Engagement with the Legislative Council

No.	Date	Name of Event
1	29/5/2018	Meeting with the Panel on Development of LegCo
2	19/9/2018	Public hearing on the Panel on Development of LegCo

2.2.4 Outreach

69 outreach events targeting the community, corporates, schools and youths were organised. Similar to other engagement meetings, the outreach events normally started with a presentation by the TFLS, followed by views expression and a question and answer session. On occasions, the audience would break into discussion groups and would report back their group consensus. The estimated attendance at these events totals 4,970 participant/times.

2.2.4.1 Community Outreach

To reach out further to the community, 12 instances of outreach to NGOs championing causes involving that for residents of subdivided units, public housing, ethnic minorities, women and the elderly were organised. Table 10 below lists the community outreach events held.

Table 10: List of Community Outreach Events

No.	Date	Name of Event
1	29/4/2018	Exchange with Society for Community Organization and home visits
2	5/5/2018	Home visits in Yuen Long district
3	12/5/2018	Home visits in Wong Tai Sin district
4	23/5/2018	Exchange with ethnic minorities
5	11/8/2018	Forum organised by the Platform of Concerning Subdivided Flats in Hong Kong
6	21/8/2018	Meeting with the Zonta Clubs of Hong Kong
7	28/8/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Tseung Kwan O Aged Care Complex – Jockey Club District Elderly Community Centre cum Day Care Unit
8	30/8/2018	Land forum organised by the Hong Kong Council of Social Service
9	7/9/2018	Meeting with the Caritas Women Development Project
10	8/9/2018	Land forum organised by HK01
11	9/9/2018	Meeting with HK Housing Alliance
12	12/9/2018	Meeting with Hong Kong Federation of Women

2.2.4.2 Corporate Outreach

Business chambers and foreign chambers of commerce were engaged to hear the voice of the business community. 14 corporate outreach events were held. A few written submissions were made by these organisations after the meetings. Table 11 below lists these corporate outreach events.

Table 11: List of Corporate Outreach Events

No.	Date	Name of Event
1	24/5/2018	Meeting with the Real Estate and Infrastructure Committee of the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce
2	13/7/2018	Breakfast meeting with the British Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong
3	23/7/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Chinese Importers' and Exporters' Association
4	25/7/2018	Meeting with the Federation of Hong Kong Industries
5	26/7/2018	Meeting with the Chinese Manufacturers' Association of Hong Kong
6	13/8/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Chinese Enterprises Association
7	13/8/2018	Meeting with the Chinese General Chamber of Commerce
8	22/8/2018	Meeting with the American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong
9	22/8/2018	Meeting with the Junior Chamber International Hong Kong
10	29/8/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Real Estate Agencies General Association
11	4/9/2018	Meeting with overseas chambers of commerce in Hong Kong (International Business Committee)
12	10/9/2018	Meeting with the Business and Professionals Federation of Hong Kong
13	13/9/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Young Industrialist Council
14	21/9/2018	Meeting with the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

2.2.4.3 School Outreach

23 sessions of school outreach were organised with the support of the school sponsoring bodies, Education Bureau and District Offices. Depending on the size of the audience, break-out group discussions were often staged facilitating more in-depth sharing. Audience size sometimes was in hundreds – on two occasions, over 800 students turned up. Table 12 below is a list of school outreach events.

Table 12: List of School Outreach Events

No.	Date	Name of Event
1	18/5/2018	School Outreach — Stewards Pooi Tun Secondary School
2	26/6/2018	School Outreach — Cognitio College (Kowloon)
3	27/6/2018	School Outreach — PHC Wing Kwong College
4	27/6/2018	School Outreach — Buddhist Hung Sean Chau Memorial College
5	28/6/2018	Seminar in the Open University of Hong Kong: Land for the Young – An Exchange with Youths
6	28/6/2018	School Outreach — St Joseph’s Anglo-Chinese School
7	29/6/2018	School Outreach — Joint School Activity organised by Tung Wah Group of Hospitals
8	29/6/2018	School Outreach — Shun Lee Catholic Secondary School
9	29/6/2018	School Outreach — Kwun Tong Government Secondary School
10	4/7/2018	School Outreach — Ho Fung College (Sponsored by Sik Sik Yuen)
11	4/7/2018	School Outreach — Joint school activity organised by Po Leung Kuk
12	4/7/2018	School Outreach — Debate competition in Methodist College
13	5/7/2018	School Outreach — Maryknoll Secondary School
14	6/7/2018	School Outreach — HKSYPIC Wong Tai Shan Memorial College
15	6/7/2018	School Outreach — Lui Ming Choi Lutheran College
16	9/7/2018	School Outreach — Sha Tin Government Secondary School
17	9/7/2018	School Outreach — Sir Ellis Kadoorie Secondary School (West Kowloon)
18	10/7/2018	School Outreach — Heung To Middle School
19	12/7/2018	School Outreach — Tsuen Wan Public Ho Chuen Yiu Memorial College
20	16/7/2018	School Outreach — Pui Tak Canossian College
21	23/7/2018	School Outreach — Caritas Chong Yuet Ming Secondary School
22	11/9/2018	School Outreach — SKH Chan Young Secondary School
23	14/9/2018	School Outreach — ELCHK Lutheran Secondary School

2.2.4.4 Youth Outreach

To widen the reach to the young generation, 20 engagement events were held in collaboration with different youth associations, youth arms of political parties and uniform groups. With the support of the District Offices, the Home Affairs Bureau and the Youth Development Commission, seven exchanges with young people from different districts.

A youth exchange session hosting young people from 18 districts were held, with over 130 youngsters having attended. They were divided into nine groups each led by a TFLS member to discuss the pros and cons of the 18 land supply options, and they gave presentations on their preferred options at the end of the discussion. Table 13 below lists the youth outreach events held.

Table 13: List of Youth Outreach Events

No.	Date	Name of Event
1	1/6/2018	Exchange with youths in Central and Western district
2	7/6/2018	Exchange with youths in Tsuen Wan district
3	20/6/2018	Exchange with the Young Civics
4	22/6/2018	Exchange with the Young DAB
5	30/6/2018	Youth Exchange Session
6	4/7/2018	Exchange with youths in Sham Shui Po district
7	6/7/2018	Exchange with youths in Kwun Tong district
8	19/7/2018	Exchange with the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong youths
9	20/7/2018	Exchange with the New People's Party youths
10	25/7/2018	Exchange with the Liberal Party youth committee
11	26/7/2018	Luncheon with the Y. Elites Association
12	30/7/2018	Exchange with youths in North District
13	2/8/2018	Exchange with the Young Democrats
14	4/8/2018	Exchange with youths in Yau Tsim Mong district
15	8/8/2018	Exchange with the Hong Kong Outstanding Students' Association
16	17/8/2018	Exchange with the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups
17	18/8/2018	Forum organised by the Cambridge University of Hong Kong and China Affairs Society (Rejuvenating the Land Debate Introduction)
18	29/8/2018	Meeting with the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions Youth Affairs Committee
19	4/9/2018	Exchange with youths in Southern District (the Southern District Youth Cadets)

No.	Date	Name of Event
20	14/9/2018	Exchange with the Hong Kong Girl Guides Association

2.3 Information Dissemination

Apart from the PE booklet, pamphlet and roving exhibition panels, multi-media materials such as the TFLS Chairman's online blog, publicity videos, radio programmes, PE website and social media platforms were deployed to educate the public and provide information on event updates.

2.3.1 PE Booklet, Pamphlet and Roving Exhibition Panels

A set of print PE materials, in different levels of details, were produced to cater for the different need and interest of the public. The PE booklet is the comprehensive guide on the broad picture and issues on land supply and the identified land supply options, while the pamphlet and roving exhibition panels present the gist of the PE booklet. They were produced in both Chinese and English versions. The PE pamphlet was also available in Bahasa Indonesia, Hindi, Nepali, Tagalog, Thai and Urdu on request.

Over 20,000 copies of the PE booklet and over 40,000 copies of the PE pamphlet were distributed. They were available at roving exhibitions, public fora, meetings, outreach events, major Government premises such as Home Affairs Enquiry Centres in the 18 districts and the Mobile Exhibition Centre (MEC) of the Planning Department (PlanD), which visited a total of 28 spots including primary schools, secondary schools and housing estates during the PE period.

2.3.2 Chairman's Blog

To share inspirations, observations and to respond to public sentiments and issues as appropriate, the TFLS Chairman published 12 articles on his blog intermittently in the PE period. The blog articles, in Chinese only, were available on the PE website and shared on the TFLS Facebook page. Table 14 below is the Chairman's blog per title and publishing date.

Table 14: List of Chairman's Blog

No.	Date	Title
1	7/5/2018	增闢土地 你我抉擇
2	28/5/2018	同一天空下
3	5/6/2018	先自己做好
4	12/6/2018	酷熱的感動
5	20/6/2018	聆聽亦是一個選項
6	27/6/2018	冰島的足球神話

No.	Date	Title
7	10/7/2018	仿佛回到校園時
8	24/7/2018	土地不足寸步難移
9	7/8/2018	你我加油
10	23/8/2018	土地為誰增闢？
11	4/9/2018	這麼近，那麼遠
12	27/9/2018	結束便是另一個開始

2.3.3 Videos

A total of 12 animated infographic videos were produced and published to help viewers familiarise with the current land demand and supply situation and grasp the pros and cons of various land supply options. Apart from Chinese and English language versions, accessible version for the visually impaired was also available.

Seven short videos highlighting different social issues stemming from the land shortage problem and highlights of a typical day of the TFLS, featuring TFLS Members, were produced and published. They were produced in Chinese language with bilingual subtitles. Accessible version was also available.

Five event videos featuring different PE events, including the home visits, public forum, roving exhibition, youth outreach and engagement with the elderly were produced. The videos were in Chinese language only.

Together with the TV API in Chinese and English to be detailed in Chapter 2.4.1, Section One, a total of 25 videos were produced.

All videos were available on the PE website, Facebook page and YouTube channel. Facebook boosting and cross-posting in different Facebook pages was applied to some of the videos to optimise viewership. The number of views is recorded in Table 16 in Chapter 2.3.6, Section One.

2.3.4 Dedicated Radio Programme

A dedicated, 11 episode radio programme, in Cantonese, named “我哋揀我地” was produced and aired on Commercial Radio Hong Kong (CRHK). Archives of the full version radio programme was available on CRHK’s dedicated website²⁵ and shared on TFLS’ PE website; whereas highlight videos were available on TFLS’ Facebook page and Youtube channel. All 18 land supply options were introduced in the programme from July to August 2018, with phone-in arrangements. Table 15 below is a list of “我哋揀我地” radio programme with the theme of the episode by airing date.

Table 15: List of “我哋揀我地” Radio Programme

No.	Date	Name of Episode
1	18/7/2018	我哋揀我地《第一集》簡介：香港土地匱乏問題
2	19/7/2018	我哋揀我地《第二集》棕地發展、利用私人的新界農地儲備
3	25/7/2018	我哋揀我地《第三集》利用私人遊樂場地契約用地作其他用途、重置或整合佔地廣的康樂設施
4	26/7/2018	我哋揀我地《第四集》於新界發展更多新發展區、增加「鄉村式發展」地帶的發展密度
5	1/8/2018	我哋揀我地《第五集》維港以外近岸填海、發展東大嶼都會
6	8/8/2018	我哋揀我地《第六集》發展香港內河碼頭用地、長遠發展香港內河碼頭用地及鄰近用地
7	15/8/2018	我哋揀我地《第七集》利用岩洞及地下空間、填平部分船灣淡水湖作新市鎮發展
8	22/8/2018	我哋揀我地《第八集》發展郊野公園邊陲地帶兩個試點、發展郊野公園邊陲地帶其他地點
9	29/8/2018	我哋揀我地《第九集》利用公用事業設施用地的發展潛力、於現有運輸基建設施上作上蓋發展
10	30/8/2018	我哋揀我地《第十集》重置葵青貨櫃碼頭、葵青貨櫃碼頭上蓋發展
11	31/8/2018	我哋揀我地《第十一集》總結：日後增闢香港土地的方向

²⁵ <http://event.881903.com/landforhongkong>

2.3.5 PE Website

A dedicated responsive PE website²⁶, in Traditional Chinese, Simplified Chinese and English, was set up and maintained, serving as a digital portal of information including PE materials and upcoming public events. All contents of the PE booklet were available on the website. The engagement feedback WBT was also embedded as a prominent page. The website attracted a total of 215,843 visits and a total of 12,954,280 hits.

2.3.6 Social Media

Channels of the social media, i.e. Facebook page and YouTube channel, were deployed to dispatch multimedia information via graphic illustrations and videos.

A Facebook page²⁷ was set up when the PE was launched and maintained throughout the PE period. 86 posts²⁸ were published, 31 of which were still images or photos, 40 were videos, 14 were links and 1 was post sharing. The total number of shares, comments and reactions²⁹ were respectively 1,117, 6,447 and 2,066. 1,754 page likes were recorded. Number of lifetime post total reach³⁰ was 2,764,309 whereas number of lifetime engaged users³¹ was 65,919. Apart from the videos mentioned in Chapter 2.3.3, Section One, event reminders of roving exhibitions and public fora were also posted. Facebook post boosting and cross-posting in different Facebook pages for selected videos and graphic posts were put in place.

On the Youtube Channel³² set up and maintained for the PE, 81 videos, including different versions of videos, were published and 72 users subscribed to the Channel.

The view counts of videos on the social media platforms are captured in the following Table 16.

²⁶ www.landforhongkong.hk

²⁷ <http://www.facebook.com/LandforHongKong>

²⁸ Excluding the 5 interrupted Facebook live videos

²⁹ Total number of reactions and comments of the Page post and of shared posts of other users on Facebook

³⁰ The number of people for whom the Page's post entered their screen. Posts include statuses, photos, links, videos and more (unique users).

³¹ The number of unique people who engaged in certain ways with the Page post. For example, by commenting on, liking, sharing or clicking on particular elements of the post. (Unique users)

³² <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCUNkrg8rpQuFUWGMghADAbg>

Table 16: View Counts of Videos on Social Media Platforms (Facebook and Youtube)

No.	Item	Quantity^	Total View Count^
1	TV API	1	274,711
2	Short videos	7	1,028,226
3	Animated infographic videos	12	370,527
4	Event videos	5	2,585
5	Videos on “我哋揀我地” radio programme highlights	11	1,816
	Total	36	1,677,865

^The quantity and view counts include all different versions of the video
(e.g. Cantonese, English and web accessible versions)

2.4 Publicity

To call for participation and enhance visibility of the PE exercise, APIs, advertisements, media events posters and souvenirs, were produced. On the front of media publicity, a total of 4,573 media reports³³ were recorded.

2.4.1 TV and Radio API

A set of APIs produced for the PE featuring the predicament of land shortage in Hong Kong in a dramatic manner and calling for action to voice view was broadcasted on television and radio throughout the five-month PE period. The TV API was also published on TFLS' Facebook page, Youtube Channel and PE website. Table 17 lists the TV and Radio API broadcasts.

Table 17: List of TV and Radio API Broadcast in the Media

No.	Date	Name of Media	Language	Format
1	26/4/2018- 26/9/2018	TVB Pearl/ Jade	Cantonese and English	TV API
2	26/4/2018- 26/9/2018	Cable/Fantastic TV	Cantonese and English	TV API
3	26/4/2018- 26/9/2018	NOW/ViuTV	Cantonese and English	TV API
4	26/4/2018- 26/9/2018	RTHK	Cantonese	TV API
5	26/4/2018- 26/9/2018	RTHK	Cantonese, Putonghua and English	Radio API
6	26/4/2018- 26/9/2018	Commercial Radio Hong Kong	Cantonese and English	Radio API
7	26/4/2018- 26/9/2018	Metro Radio	Cantonese and English	Radio API

³³ Media reports published from 26 April 2018 to 28 September 2018 were monitored, as the media reports on 27-28 September 2018 may refer to the conclusion of the PE on 26 September 2018

2.4.2 Newspaper Advertisement

Newspaper advertisements were placed to publicise PE activities such as the public fora, roving exhibitions, and to call for participation using the WBT. Seven bursts of advertisement throughout the PE period were inserted, with details captured in Table 18 below.

Table 18: List of Newspaper Advertisement Placed

No.	Date	Subject Matter	Name of Media	Language
1	27/4/2018	Launch of PE	Ming Pao Daily News	Chinese
2	27/4/2018	Launch of PE	Sing Tao Daily	Chinese
3	27/4/2018	Launch of PE	Headline Daily	Chinese
4	27/4/2018	Launch of PE	South China Morning Post	English
5	23/5/2018	Public Fora and Roving Exhibitions (No. 1 - 14)	Ming Pao Daily News	Chinese
6	23/5/2018	Public Fora and Roving Exhibitions (No. 1 - 14)	Headline Daily	Chinese
7	23/5/2018	Public Fora and Roving Exhibitions (No. 1 - 14)	South China Morning Post	English
8	4/6/2018	Public Forum (Hong Kong Island)	Apple Daily	Chinese
9	4/6/2018	Public Forum (Hong Kong Island)	AM730	Chinese
10	4/6/2018	Public Forum (Hong Kong Island)	South China Morning Post	English
11	25/6/2018	Public Forum (New Territories East) and Roving Exhibitions (No. 13-22)	Oriental Daily	Chinese
12	25/6/2018	Public Forum (New Territories East) and Roving Exhibitions (No. 13-22)	Metro Daily	Chinese
13	25/6/2018	Public Forum (New Territories East) and Roving Exhibitions (No. 13-22)	South China Morning Post	English
14	16/7/2018	Public Forum (New Territories West) and Roving Exhibitions (No. 23-32)	Ming Pao Daily News	Chinese

No.	Date	Subject Matter	Name of Media	Language
15	16/7/2018	Public Forum (New Territories West) and Roving Exhibitions (No. 23-32)	Headline Daily	Chinese
16	16/7/2018	Public Forum (New Territories West) and Roving Exhibitions (No. 23-32)	South China Morning Post	English
17	13/8/2018	Public Forum (Kowloon) and Roving Exhibitions (No. 33-40)	Sing Tao Daily	Chinese
18	13/8/2018	Public Forum (Kowloon) and Roving Exhibitions (No. 33-40)	Sky Post	Chinese
19	13/8/2018	Public Forum (Kowloon) and Roving Exhibitions (No. 33-40)	South China Morning Post	English
20	13/9/2018	Web-based tool	Ming Pao Daily News	Chinese
21	13/9/2018	Web-based tool	Headline Daily	Chinese
22	13/9/2018	Web-based tool	South China Morning Post	English

2.4.3 Outdoor Advertisement

Still advertisement was placed on tram body, billboards in MTR stations and in-train tube card throughout the PE period. The TV API was also played on in-train TV on certain MTR lines.

2.4.4 Media Events

The PE programme was formally launched on 26 April 2018 with a well-attended media conference, followed by an Editors' briefing. The media conference was well attended by major traditional and online media, arousing public awareness as intended.

On the launch day of the WBT on 7 June 2018, a media briefing was organised with the TFLS Chairman and Professor John Bacon-Shone, Director, HKU-SSRC (the IRA) to introduce the view collection mechanism including the WBT.

Other than these planned activities, the media took a fair amount of interest in the exercise and published a significant amount of reports throughout the five-month PE period. A large number of reporters, for instance, attended the public fora, and often requested the Chairman of the TFLS to say a few words afterwards, resulting in reports about the TFLS meetings and deliberations. Table 19 shows a list of planned media events held.

Table 19: List of Media Events

No.	Date	Name of Event
1	26/4/2018	Launch Day Media Conference
2	26/4/2018	Launch Day Editors' Briefing
3	7/6/2018	Media Briefing on Web-based Tool

2.4.5 PE Poster

Over 1,000 copies of the poster were distributed. It was put up at public fora, DC Workshops, MEC of PlanD and distributed to Home Affairs Enquiry Centres, academic institutions, as well as Government bureaux and departments.

2.4.6 Souvenirs

An A4 Plastic folder and ball pen were produced and distributed at public fora, roving exhibitions, meetings, outreach programmes and MEC of PlanD. Around 11,100 plastic folders and 10,900 ball pens were given away.

2.5 Overall Evaluation and Awareness of the PE

Throughout the PE period, an overwhelming 4,573 media reports³⁴ in the five-month PE period, averaging nearly 30 media reports a day (with a daily maximum of over 80 reports), were monitored. This PE exercise could well be one of the most “talked-about” in recent history in Hong Kong. There were allegations of the PE being “faked engagement” noted mostly at the beginning of the exercise. There were also calls to move fast to ameliorate the situation with combination of options especially towards the end of the PE exercise. What seems certain is that, through the often intense and serious debates and discussions over the five months of the PE programme, the appreciation of the land shortage issue and associated land supply options has increased fairly significantly.

The large number of participants, and their varied background, of the “informed” view collection process and randomised telephone surveys, as well as the PE events and written feedback, confirm that the PE programme attracted a sizeable, well-rounded audience with far-reaching impact. The call now for the majority is for fast and firm actions to deliver more land going forward.

Apart from the vast media and community interest, the success of the PE programme largely hinged on the unreserved commitment and presence of the TFLS members. Throughout the five-month PE period, TFLS members have diligently attended PE events and listened, regardless of the audience size (from over 800 in schools or over 280 at a public forum to one-on-one dialogues with visitors to the roving exhibition). The direct discussions with kai-fongs in the local community were often as passionate and intense as those witnessed at any other meetings. Among qualitative feedback, there were 294 comments about the TFLS and a typical relevant quote³⁵ was “Chairman and other members deserve public appreciation for their dedication in collecting public opinions during the PE³⁶.”

In the randomised telephone survey conducted by CUHK, 56% of the respondents “had ever heard of or watched any PE activities (‘聽過或者睇過土地供應專責小組嘅公眾參與活動或展覽內容’)³⁷”.

³⁴ Media reports published from 26 April 2018 to 28 September 2018 were monitored, as the media reports on 27-28 September 2018 may refer to the conclusion of the PE on 26 September 2018

³⁵ See Chapter 2.1, Section Two

³⁶ See Chapter 2.15, Section Two

³⁷ See Chapter 1.4, Section Two

In general, among qualitative feedback, “comments providing an overall evaluation of the PE activities were largely positive (over nine hundred), although some negative comments (over two hundred) thought the materials were too much for the general public to digest³⁸.” There were also comments that it was difficult to reach consensus, comments on PE documents such as the level of details and transparency, presumptions such as the Government’s “preset disposition” towards particular land supply options, the questionnaire design, consultation channels, target audience, etc.³⁹

The above is the programme and activity review. The findings from analyses of views collected are presented in Section Two.

-End of Section One-

³⁸ See Chapter 3.5.6, Section Two

³⁹ See Chapter 3.7, Section Two

**Section Two: Analysis of Feedback received by the Task Force on Land
Supply (TFLS) during the Public Engagement (PE)**

Analysis of Feedback received by the Task Force on Land Supply (TFLS) during the Public Engagement (PE)

Professor John Bacon-Shone

Director, Social Sciences Research Centre, HKU (HKU-SSRC)

Independent Reporting Agency

27 December 2018

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Chapter 1 Quantitative analysis of the Land Supply PE	4
1.1 Introduction	4
1.2 The ten options with supply estimates.....	4
1.3 The eight conceptual options	10
1.4 Other land supply questions in the telephone survey.....	11
Chapter 2 Qualitative analysis of the Land Supply PE	12
2.1 Introduction	12
2.2 Qualitative analysis overall	13
2.3 Qualitative analysis of land supply feedback.....	13
2.4 Qualitative analysis of short-to-medium term options in the PE booklet.....	14
2.5 Qualitative analysis of medium-to-long term options in the PE booklet	33
2.6 Qualitative analysis of conceptual options in the PE booklet	54
2.7 Qualitative analysis of additional land supply options	76
2.8 Qualitative analysis of opinions about land reserve.....	86
2.9 Qualitative analysis of opinions about current strategy and initiatives.....	87
2.10 Qualitative analysis of selection criteria for land supply options.....	90
2.11 Qualitative analysis of opinions about consequences of insufficient land supply	92
2.12 Qualitative analysis of opinions about definitions of the options.....	93
2.13 Qualitative analysis of opinions about land use strategy	94
2.14 Qualitative analysis of opinions about causes of land supply shortage	95
2.15 Qualitative analysis of opinions about the public consultation	97
Chapter 3 Conclusion	100
3.1 Basis for conclusions with different types of information.....	100
3.2 Quantitative analysis of options	100
3.2.1 Introduction	100
3.2.2 Summary of quantitative results	101
3.3 Other quantitative analysis.....	102
3.4 Qualitative analysis of options.....	102
3.4.1 Introduction	102
3.4.2 Short-to-medium options	103
3.4.3 Medium-to-long options.....	103
3.4.4 Conceptual options	104
3.4.5 Other land supply options	105

3.5 Other qualitative analysis	106
3.5.1 Current land supply strategy	106
3.5.2 Selection criteria for options	106
3.5.3 Consequences of shortage.....	106
3.5.4 Land use strategy	106
3.5.5 Causes of shortage.....	106
3.5.6 PE comments	107
3.6 Options overall.....	107
3.7 PE feedback.....	108
List of Annexes:	109

Chapter 1 Quantitative analysis of the Land Supply PE

1.1 Introduction

All feedback about the specific land supply options (ten with supply estimates and eight conceptual options) covered in the Public Engagement (PE) View Collection Forms (VCF¹) (i.e. using the Web Based Tool (WBT) or the matching paper form) (other than open-ended comments for Q1-4) was processed and analysed using quantitative methods in the rest of this chapter. At the end of the PE, HKU-SSRC had received and processed 29,065 responses via the VCF (excluding blank forms and duplicates²), made up of 7,457 paper forms and 21,608 forms via the WBT.

We also include analysis and comparison of the telephone survey covering the land supply options, which the TFLS commissioned from CUHK.

Given that 1,200 ha was presented in the PE documents as the minimal additional land supply needed, the primary analysis presented highlights responses that yielded at least 1,200 ha. Nearly 80% of responses to the VCF (22,652 out of 29,065) yielded at least 1,200 ha and the mean and median additional land supply yielded by all responses were 1,953 and 1,969 ha respectively (3,292 ha was the maximum, yielded by choosing all the options). Please see **Annexes 1a-1c** for the underlying results for the quantitative analysis of the VCF.

1.2 The ten options with supply estimates

Table 1.1 shows the support for all the ten different options with supply estimates attached amongst 29,065 responses via the VCF in the original order of the options, both among all responses and also among the approximately 80% of responses that yielded at least 1,200 ha of additional land supply. It also combines options across time scales, to see the impact of time scale.

¹ Please see **Annexes 3c and 3e** for the VCF in Chinese and English respectively

² Among the paper forms, 192 were found to have duplicate reference numbers, but only one paper form had duplicate information and hence was removed from the analysis. Among the WBT forms, 2584 were found to have duplicate IP address. However, as IP addresses can be legitimately shared, only two WBT forms were removed as duplicates after taking into account the time gap between submissions from the same IP address and similarity of responses.

Table 1.1 Support for the ten options in original order from VCF

Option	Time Frame	% of all responses	% of responses at least 1,200 ha
Brownfield (BRN)	SM	84	88
	ML	78	82
	SM ML	87	91
	SM&ML	74	79
Private agricultural land reserve (PAL)	SM	64	74
	ML	57	66
	SM ML	68	79
	SM&ML	52	62
Private Recreational Leases (PRL)	SM	51	51
	ML	45	45
	SM ML	54	54
	SM&ML	42	42
Land-extensive recreational facilities (LRL)	SM	29	30
	ML	25	26
	SM ML	33	34
	SM&ML	21	22
Near-shore reclamation (NSR)	ML	49	58
East Lantau Metropolis (ELM)	ML	62	78
Caverns & underground (CAU)	ML	43	45
More new development areas in NT (NDA)	ML	61	75
River Trade Terminal site (RTT)	ML	41	46
Peripheries of country parks (PCP)	ML	28	34

Note: SM|ML means SM or ML option chosen, SM&ML means both SM and ML chosen

The remaining quantitative analysis of these 10 options focuses on responses that yielded at least 1,200 ha.

Tables 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 show that the options in order of decreasing popularity amongst VCF submissions whose options yielded at least 1,200 ha are: BRN (79-91%), ELM (78%), NDA (75%), PAL (62-79%), NSR (58%), PRL (42-54%), RTT (46%), CAU (45%), PCP (34%) and LRL (22-34%).

In other words, amongst the ten options with supply estimates attached, BRN, ELM and NDA have around four fifths support amongst VCF responses that yielded at least 1,200 ha; PAL, NSR have around two thirds support; PRL, RTT and CAU have approximately half support; while PCP and LRL are the options that have only minority support amongst these responses. Amongst all responses to the VCF, BRN has around four fifths support; PAL, ELM and NDA have about two thirds support; PRL, NSR have around half support; RTT and CAU have around two fifths support; while PCP and LRL have support from less than a third.

As seen from Table 1.2, the more popular options are popular across age groups, while PCP is particularly unpopular amongst young people and PRL & LRL amongst older people. As seen from Table 1.3, the only major difference across housing background is more support for PRL

amongst public housing tenants. As seen from Table 1.4, PRL and LRL are unpopular on HK Island.

Table 1.2 Support for the ten options in decreasing order of popularity amongst 1,200+ ha by age group from VCF

Option & Time Frame	% of responses at least 1,200 ha	Age <18	Age 18-30	Age 31-59	Age 60+
BRN SM ML	91	90	90	92	90
BRN SM	88	85	87	89	87
BRN ML	82	77	82	83	80
PAL SM ML	79	70	72	80	85
BRN SM&ML	79	72	78	80	77
ELM ML	78	75	72	80	84
NDA ML	75	74	76	76	72
PAL SM	74	63	67	76	81
PAL ML	66	53	60	68	71
PAL SM&ML	62	46	56	64	68
NSR ML	58	42	48	60	72
PRL SM ML	54	62	63	53	39
PRL SM	51	57	61	51	37
RTT ML	46	34	41	49	47
PRL ML	45	47	53	45	31
CAU ML	45	54	50	44	39
PRL SM&ML	42	42	50	42	29
PCP ML	34	30	25	34	45
LRL SM ML	34	38	39	33	28
LRL SM	30	33	35	30	25
LRL ML	26	26	30	25	21
LRL SM&ML	22	21	26	22	17

Table 1.3 Support for the ten options in decreasing order of popularity amongst 1,200+ ha by housing situation from VCF

Option & Time Frame	% of responses at least 1,200 ha	S owner	S private	S public	HH owner	HH private	HH public
BRN SM ML	91	91	93	88	92	89	90
BRN SM	88	88	90	84	88	85	87
BRN ML	82	82	85	77	83	80	80
PAL SM ML	79	82	80	74	76	75	70
BRN SM&ML	79	79	82	74	80	77	77
ELM ML	78	82	79	76	75	77	73
NDA ML	75	73	78	75	76	74	77
PAL SM	74	78	77	68	72	70	65
PAL ML	66	69	70	59	64	60	57
PAL SM&ML	62	65	66	54	60	55	52
NSR ML	58	64	61	52	53	53	46
PRL SM ML	54	48	49	65	60	51	69
PRL SM	51	45	47	61	57	47	66
RTT ML	46	48	49	41	44	41	42
PRL ML	45	39	42	53	50	42	59
CAU ML	45	44	43	43	49	46	49
PRL SM&ML	42	37	40	49	47	38	56
PCP ML	34	37	36	29	28	29	28
LRL SM ML	34	31	31	37	38	33	42
LRL SM	30	28	29	33	34	29	37
LRL ML	26	23	24	27	28	24	32
LRL SM&ML	22	20	21	23	24	20	27

Note: S means self, HH means household member, public means public rental tenant, private means private rental tenant. Other housing options are too rare to be included at this stage

Table 1.4 Support for the ten options in decreasing order of popularity amongst 1,200+ ha by region from VCF

Option & Time Frame	% of responses at least 1,200 ha	HK Island	Kln West	Kln East	NT West	NT East
BRN SM ML	91	92	92	91	90	91
BRN SM	88	89	88	88	86	88
BRN ML	82	84	82	80	80	83
PAL SM ML	79	83	78	75	75	78
BRN SM&ML	79	81	79	77	76	80
ELM ML	78	81	77	75	76	80
NDA ML	75	76	79	77	75	71
PAL SM	74	79	73	69	71	74
PAL ML	66	71	66	62	62	67
PAL SM&ML	62	67	61	56	58	62
NSR ML	58	62	62	58	57	54
PRL SM ML	54	35	58	68	62	61
PRL SM	51	33	55	65	59	58
RTT ML	46	45	47	44	46	48
PRL ML	45	29	49	57	51	50
CAU ML	45	39	46	49	47	48
PRL SM&ML	42	27	46	53	48	47
PCP ML	34	35	35	34	33	31
LRL SM ML	34	25	37	39	38	37
LRL SM	30	22	33	35	34	33
LRL ML	26	18	28	30	28	27
LRL SM&ML	22	20	21	23	24	20

Table 1.5 shows a comparison of the views expressed in the VCF with the views expressed in the telephone survey. The telephone survey did not offer a choice of time scale to respondents, so for the options that have multiple time scales, we show the responses from the VCF that selected either time scale (i.e. SM|ML in the notation explained under Table 1.1) as a reasonable comparator. The telephone survey had 3,011 respondents³, of whom 2,577 respondents (86%) chose options that yielded at least 1,200 ha. Please see Annex 2 for the underlying results from the telephone survey.

³ This includes 2,005 landline interviews and 1,006 mobile phone interviews of adults using random digit dialling with at least six contact attempts, weighted to address the overlap of landlines and mobile phones and also to match the age and gender distribution of the population, as reported by Census and Statistics Department, HKSARG. This should ensure a representative sample of the adult population with high coverage and sampling error of at most 1%. Please see the underlying tables in **Annexes 2a and 2b**

Among telephone survey respondents whose choices yielded at least 1,200 ha, NDA and BRN both have support from at least four fifths, PAL, ELM, NSR, RTT and CAU have support from around two thirds; PRL and PCP from more than a half; while LRL has support from only a quarter. Amongst all telephone survey responses, BRN and NDA have support from around four fifths; CAU, RTT, PAL, NSR, PRL and ELM from around two thirds; PCP from more than a half; and LRL from less than a quarter.

Putting the VCF and telephone survey response together, we can see that amongst those whose responses generated at least 1,200 ha, BRN has support from more than four fifths through both channels; PAL, ELM and NDA has support from at least two thirds through both channels; NSR and PRL have support from at least a half through both channels; RTT and CAU have support from at least two fifths; while LRL and PCP have weak support through at least one channel.

Amongst all respondents from both channels, BRN has support from around four fifths through both channels; PAL, ELM and NDA have support from around two thirds from both channels; NSR and PRL have support from about half from both channels; RTT and CAU have support of around two fifths from both channels; while LRL and PCP have weak support.

Table 1.5 Support for the ten options in decreasing order of popularity, from VCF and telephone survey

Option	Time Frame	VCF		Telephone survey	
		% of all responses	% of responses at least 1,200 ha	% of all responses	% of responses at least 1,200 ha
Brownfield (BRN)	SM ML	87	91	79	83
Private agricultural land reserve (PAL)	SM ML	68	79	61	68
East Lantau Metropolis (ELM)	ML	62	78	58	68
More new development areas in NT (NDA)	ML	61	75	78	88
Near-shore reclamation (NSR)	ML	49	58	61	68
Private Recreational Leases (PRL)	SM ML	54	54	61	62
River Trade Terminal site (RTT)	ML	41	46	65	68
Caverns & underground (CAU)	ML	43	45	66	68

Land-extensive recreational facilities (LRL)	SM ML	33	34	23	24
Peripheries of country parks (PCP)	ML	28	34	53	57

Table 1.6 shows the twelve most popular combinations (those with at least 1% support each), which together account for about 21% of responses that yield at least 1,200 ha in the VCF. All combinations in this table do not differ at all on the time scale (i.e. they either accept an option at both time scales or reject at both time scales). It is noteworthy that all the top combinations include BRN, all except combination 5 also include PAL, all except combinations 5 and 8 include ELM and all except combinations 9 and 12 include NDA. Conversely, all but combination 1 exclude LRL and all but combinations 1, 5 and 10 exclude PRL.

Table 1.6 Most popular combinations of the ten options amongst responses of at least 1200ha from VCF

Rank	Combo	% of responses at least 1,200 ha	Cumulative %
1	All	5.6	5.6
2	All-PRL_SM&ML-LRL_SM&ML	3.3	8.9
3	All-PRL_SM&ML-LRL_SM&ML-CAU-RTT-PCP	2.2	11.1
4	All-PRL_SM&ML-LRL_SM&ML-NSR-CAU-RTT-PCP	1.5	12.6
5	BRN_SM&ML+PRL_SM&ML+NDA	1.3	13.8
6	All-PRL_SM&ML-LRL_SM&ML-PCP	1.2	15.1
7	All-PRL_SM&ML-LRL_SM&ML-CAU	1.2	16.2
8	BRN_SM&ML+PAL_SM&ML+NDA	1.0	17.3
9	BRN_SM&ML+PAL_SM&ML+ELM	1.0	18.3
10	All-LRL_SM&ML	1.0	19.2
11	All-PRL_SM&ML-LRL_SM&ML-CAU-PCP	1.0	20.2
12	All-PRL_SM&ML-LRL_SM&ML-NDA-CAU-PCP	1.0	21.2

Note: "-" means this option was not included in the combination

1.3 The eight conceptual options

Table 1.7 shows the support for the eight conceptual options in the original order of the options based on responses to the VCF and from the telephone survey. All of the options have support in the 34-49% range from the VCF and 44-67% from the telephone survey, with the notable exception of Plover Cove Reservoir (16% VCF and 23% telephone survey).

Table 1.7 Support for the eight conceptual options in the PE document from VCF and telephone survey

Option	VCF % support	Telephone survey % support
Long Term River Trade Terminal	47	67
More Country Park Peripheries	33	48
Village Zones	45	54
Topside Transport Infrastructure	49	57
Public Utility Sites	42	67
Container Terminal Relocation	44	52
Topside Container Terminal	37	44
Plover Cove Reservoir	16	23

1.4 Other land supply questions in the telephone survey

The telephone survey also covered some questions not included explicitly in the VCF, such as which factor should be considered first if Hong Kong needs to increase land supply, support for a land reserve and awareness of the PE activities.

As regards the most important factor, 34% chose environmental impact, 21% chose speed of supply, 18% chose quantity of supply, with other choices getting less than 5% support.

As regards support for a land reserve, 54% supported and 30% strongly supported this, with only 9% not supporting and 2% strongly not supporting this.

As regards awareness of the PE activities, 56% had ever heard of or watched any PE activities (“聽過或者睇過土地供應專責小組嘅公眾參與活動或展覽內容”).

Chapter 2 Qualitative analysis of the Land Supply PE

2.1 Introduction

HKU-SSRC coded all the open-ended responses in the 29,065 VCF⁴ (using the WBT and paper forms) as well as all submissions received through other channels by the end of the PE period using the NVivo software, based on a coding framework in **Annex 1** that was developed to reflect all the issues covered in the Public Engagement Booklet, and then extended to cover all the other relevant issues raised in the qualitative materials collected during the PE process. Where appropriate (i.e. there is some disagreement), comments are coded as positive, negative or neutral. The comments in the submissions are also divided up by the feedback channels shown in Table 2.1. It is impracticable to account for some individuals or organizations expressing their views through multiple channels, so the same view may be included in more than one channel.

In the discussion below, topics are normally sorted within tables in decreasing order and topics with at least 50 comments are mentioned in the text, together with typical relevant quotes. The quotes have been translated as necessary and edited lightly to ensure relevance, e.g. a comment about brownfield and agricultural land in the brownfield section would have the agricultural land reference removed. Topics for which at least half of the comments came through a single channel are highlighted by adding a reference to the dominant channel, e.g. (SCP) if at least half came through signature campaigns or petitions.

Table 2.1 Submissions through Feedback Channels⁵

Channel	Abbreviation	Number
PE Event summaries	E	145
Written Submissions	WS	3,846
Petitions and Signature Campaigns	SCP	64,439 (13P, 12SC)
Media (e.g. Print News, Web News, TV Programs, Radio Programs)	M	4,573
Social Networks and Media (e.g. Facebook, Blogs, Forums)	SNM	4,999
View Collection Form	VCF	29,065
Opinion Surveys	OS	20 ⁶

⁴ Please see **Annexes 3c and 3e** for the Chinese and English VCF respectively

⁵ Submissions can be found on the TFLS website. For SNM, the list is in **Annex 4**. For M, the list is in **Annex 5**

⁶ 15 were direct written submissions and 5 were in monthly information papers submitted to TFLS

2.2 Qualitative analysis overall

Table 2.2 Overall count of comments coded by domain of comment and channel

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A. Opinion about land supply	9489	36128	1145485	121	15420	18407	47327	1272362
B. Opinion about issues not mentioned in the PE document	1118	1940	4506	14	1750	3897	6930	20155
C. Comments on public consultation	694	888	496	3	1155	696	6039	9971
Total	11301	38956	1150487	138	18325	23000	60296	1302488

Table 2.2 shows the overall breakdown of all the 1,302,488 comments by channel and broad domain (**SCP**), about 88% came through channel SCP.

2.3 Qualitative analysis of land supply feedback

Table 2.3 shows the breakdown of the 1,272,362 comments about land supply by broad topic and channel (**SCP**), about 90% through channel SCP.

Table 2.3 Comments about land supply options by channel

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A. Opinion about land supply	9489	36128	1145470	121	15420	18407	47327	1272362
A.01 Short-to-medium term options in Public Engagement booklet	3144	16789	546474	43	6052	5242	13749	591493
A.02 Medium-to-long term options in Public Engagement booklet	3494	12165	388251	40	5747	8530	15937	434164
A.03 Conceptual options in Public Engagement booklet	1312	4154	137961	30	1555	1780	6812	153604
A.04 Other suggested options	382	1208	5905	1	393	2005	5516	15410
A.05 Opinion about land reserve	37	158	0	1	78	18	43	335
A.06. Opinion about current land supply strategy and ongoing initiatives	490	1067	7115	2	505	527	4098	13804

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.07 Selection criteria about land supply options	443	414	55986	4	391	153	1073	58464
A.09 Consequences of insufficient land supply	164	159	110	0	683	134	91	1341
A.10 Comments about definition of the options	23	14	3668	0	16	18	8	3747

2.4 Qualitative analysis of short-to-medium term options in the PE booklet

Table 2.4 Comments about Short-to-medium term options in PE booklet

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.01 Short-to-medium term options in Public Engagement booklet	3144	16789	546474	43	6052	5242	13749	591493
A.1.3 Alternative uses of sites under Private Recreational Leases	1274	10647	204313	15	2325	3265	7909	229748
A.1.3.0.1 General attitude towards “Alternative uses of sites under Private Recreational Leases”	387	2677	60611	6	634	1196	2963	68474
A.1.3.0.1a Positive	204	732	59080	5	325	896	1581	62823
A.1.3.0.1b Negative	125	1808	1531	1	179	172	1232	5048
A.1.3.0.1c Neutral	58	137	0	0	130	128	150	603
A.1.3.0.2 General attitude towards Fanling Golf Course development option	206	1197	37377	3	479	648	1328	41238
A.1.3.0.2a Positive	94	310	37309	2	247	471	975	39408
A.1.3.0.2a.1 Fanling Golf Course - No specific development option	53	215	36504	2	196	428	837	38235
A.1.3.0.2a.3 Full development option of	28	46	805	0	21	31	100	1031

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
Fanling Golf Course								
A.1.3.0.2a.2 Partial development option of Fanling Golf Course	13	49	0	0	30	12	38	142
A.1.3.0.2b Negative	81	852	68	1	142	110	290	1544
A.1.3.0.2b.1 Fanling Golf Course - No specific development option	61	591	68	1	127	103	246	1197
A.1.3.0.2b.3 Full development option of Fanling Golf Course	18	220	0	0	14	6	35	293
A.1.3.0.2b.2 Partial development option of Fanling Golf Course	2	41	0	0	1	1	9	54
A.1.3.0.2c Neutral	31	35	0	0	90	67	63	286
A.1.3.0.2c.1 Fanling Golf Course - No specific development option	28	29	0	0	83	64	58	262
A.1.3.0.2c.3 Full development option of Fanling Golf Course	3	1	0	0	4	2	3	13
A.1.3.0.2c.2 Partial development option of Fanling Golf Course	0	5	0	0	3	1	2	11

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.1.3.1 Reasons or concerns for “Alternative uses of sites under Private Recreational Leases”	681	6773	106325	6	1212	1421	3618	120036
A.1.3.1.1 Comments about “Alternative uses of sites under Private Recreational Leases”	580	5310	106226	6	998	1311	3398	117829
A.1.3.1.1.16 The development priority of this option	10	59	37106	0	22	47	121	37365
A.1.3.1.1.16 a High priority	8	47	37106	0	20	40	108	37329
A.1.3.1.1.16 b Low priority	2	12	0	0	1	6	13	34
A.1.3.1.1.16 c Neutral	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
A.1.3.1.1.08 Housing development issue	78	377	33141	3	153	220	416	34388
A.1.3.1.1.09 Potential for land development	35	137	28756	0	77	92	97	29194
A.1.3.1.1.80 No reason	63	540	3946	2	77	435	1255	6318
A.1.3.1.1.11 Comments about the sports development of Hong Kong	47	738	1463	0	66	14	135	2463
A.1.3.1.1.13 Comments about Private Recreational Leases	20	272	779	0	72	36	68	1247
A.1.3.1.1.06 Supporting infrastructural	40	126	779	0	62	59	40	1106

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
facilities / community facilities								
A.1.3.1.1.14 Comments about public use rights	45	526	0	1	75	49	134	830
A.1.3.1.1.17 Impact on Hong Kong's reputation or image	21	485	37	0	19	27	160	749
A.1.3.1.1.10 Stakeholders and their interests	20	342	0	0	55	30	75	522
A.1.3.1.1.21 Contributions to society	16	335	91	0	8	2	63	515
A.1.3.1.1.15 Comments about sports / recreational facilities	24	237	0	0	50	14	166	491
A.1.3.1.1.18 Public interest	44	108	0	0	79	63	151	445
A.1.3.1.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	28	161	91	0	27	11	28	346
A.1.3.1.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	24	149	0	0	34	38	65	310
A.1.3.1.1.2a Positive	4	13	0	0	8	6	11	42
A.1.3.1.1.2b Negative	16	122	0	0	14	24	43	219
A.1.3.1.1.2c Neutral	4	14	0	0	12	8	11	49
A.1.3.1.1.22 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	4	116	0	0	5	1	173	299

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.1.3.1.1.12 Comments about relocate facilities	17	79	0	0	34	70	98	298
A.1.3.1.1.19 There are other feasible options	7	203	37	0	12	8	27	294
A.1.3.1.1.05 Time required to provide land	18	61	0	0	44	68	47	238
A.1.3.1.1.5a Take longer time	5	17	0	0	13	5	6	46
A.1.3.1.1.5b Take shorter time	12	42	0	0	29	63	38	184
A.1.3.1.1.5c Neutral	1	2	0	0	2	0	3	8
A.1.3.1.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	7	96	0	0	2	9	24	138
A.1.3.1.1.20 Impact on next generation	4	83	0	0	3	0	19	109
A.1.3.1.1.01 Financial cost of development	2	39	0	0	4	12	28	85
A.1.3.1.1.1a Relative higher	1	17	0	0	3	2	14	37
A.1.3.1.1.1b Relative lower	1	17	0	0	1	10	14	43
A.1.3.1.1.1c Neutral	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
A.1.3.1.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	4	32	0	0	9	6	5	56
A.1.3.1.1.23 Comments about land development, e.g. To set up regulations in	2	6	0	0	9	0	3	20

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
controlling of land development								
A.1.3.1.1.90 Others	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
A.1.3.1.2 Specific comments about Fanling Golf Course	101	1463	99	0	214	110	220	2207
A.1.3.1.2.01 History and heritage, e.g. Heritage Building, world's second-oldest course outside Scotland, ancestral burial places	34	546	68	0	82	43	94	867
A.1.3.1.2.03 Environment, Ecological and conservation values, e.g. more than 30,000 trees on site, Old and Valuable Trees	32	431	31	0	72	37	37	640
A.1.3.1.2.04 A preferred venue for hosting international tournaments in Hong Kong	25	349	0	0	45	15	44	478
A.1.3.1.2.02 One of the top golf clubs in the world	9	112	0	0	5	3	20	149
A.1.3.1.2.05 Fanling Lodge, e.g. Relocation, removal or retention	1	24	0	0	10	12	25	72
A.1.3.1.2.90 Others	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.1.1 Developing brownfield sites	872	2818	204664	12	1381	1019	2250	213016

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.1.1.0 General attitude towards “Developing brownfield sites”	352	1213	61868	6	523	474	1055	65491
A.1.1.0.1 Positive	270	1127	61868	6	377	395	952	64995
A.1.1.0.2 Negative	24	54	0	0	27	24	46	175
A.1.1.0.3 Neutral	58	32	0	0	119	55	57	321
A.1.1.1 Reasons or concerns for “Developing brownfield sites”	520	1605	142796	6	858	545	1195	147525
A.1.1.1.17 The development priority of this option	41	160	61014	0	52	56	177	61500
A.1.1.1.17a High priority	40	158	61014	0	49	51	173	61485
A.1.1.1.17b Low priority	1	2	0	0	2	5	4	14
A.1.1.1.17c Neutral	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
A.1.1.1.08 Housing development issue	43	129	39487	3	75	48	95	39880
A.1.1.1.09 Potential for land development	38	91	32128	0	108	40	56	32461
A.1.1.1.10 Rural land uses / rural environment	10	27	5031	0	23	6	16	5113
A.1.1.1.18 Comments about development procedures	12	27	4873	0	19	7	8	4946
A.1.1.1.80 No reason	81	639	263	3	89	190	484	1749
A.1.1.1.11 Land resumption and development approaches	54	89	0	0	98	34	101	376
A.1.1.1.11.2 Land Resumption Ordinance	24	41	0	0	43	23	61	192

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.1.1.1.11.2 a Positive	16	38	0	0	29	19	60	162
A.1.1.1.11.2 b Negative	4	3	0	0	8	1	0	16
A.1.1.1.11.2 c Neutral	4	0	0	0	6	3	1	14
A.1.1.1.11.1 Public-private partnership	21	34	0	0	35	7	27	124
A.1.1.1.11.1 a Positive	14	19	0	0	23	3	8	67
A.1.1.1.11.1 b Negative	4	12	0	0	3	4	19	42
A.1.1.1.11.1 c Neutral	3	3	0	0	9	0	0	15
A.1.1.1.11.4 Other land resumption and development approaches	9	13	0	0	20	4	13	59
A.1.1.1.11.3 Apply Land Resumption Ordinance first, then PPP	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.1.1.1.13 Comments about how to accommodate brownfield operations	45	85	0	0	93	31	52	306
A.1.1.1.05 Time required to provide land	28	52	0	0	43	46	44	213
A.1.1.1.5a Take longer time	9	11	0	0	13	12	13	58
A.1.1.1.5b Take shorter time	17	38	0	0	26	33	29	143
A.1.1.1.5c Neutral	2	3	0	0	4	1	2	12
A.1.1.1.12 Other comments about Land resumption and compensation	30	61	0	0	61	20	32	204

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.1.1.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	32	59	0	0	44	15	28	178
A.1.1.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	28	50	0	0	25	10	42	155
A.1.1.1.2a Positive	14	40	0	0	16	9	25	104
A.1.1.1.2b Negative	13	3	0	0	4	1	10	31
A.1.1.1.2c Neutral	1	7	0	0	5	0	7	20
A.1.1.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	24	29	0	0	56	13	14	136
A.1.1.1.19 Comments about illegal land uses	13	25	0	0	26	6	11	81
A.1.1.1.01 Financial cost of development	8	32	0	0	9	13	12	74
A.1.1.1.1a Relative higher	4	14	0	0	2	8	6	34
A.1.1.1.1b Relative lower	3	14	0	0	3	4	6	30
A.1.1.1.1c Neutral	1	4	0	0	4	1	0	10
A.1.1.1.14 Concerns about the fairness and transparency for the government	12	12	0	0	15	6	8	53
A.1.1.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	9	7	0	0	6	2	7	31
A.1.1.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	3	10	0	0	6	2	5	26

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.1.1.1.16 Other comments / concerns about public-private partnership	6	9	0	0	6	0	0	21
A.1.1.1.21 Public interest	2	6	0	0	4	0	2	14
A.1.1.1.20 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	4
A.1.1.1.90 Others	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
A.1.2 Tapping into the private agricultural land reserve in the New Territories	842	2253	137457	14	2287	719	2437	146009
A.1.2.0 General attitude towards “Tapping into the private agricultural land reserve in the NT”	312	909	57693	6	709	313	1047	60989
A.1.2.0.1 Positive	172	731	4836	6	435	215	726	7121
A.1.2.0.2 Negative	41	112	1102	0	36	28	120	1439
A.1.2.0.3 Neutral	99	66	51755	0	238	70	201	52429
A.1.2.1 Reasons or concerns for “Tapping into the private agricultural land reserve in the NT”	530	1344	79764	8	1578	406	1390	85020
A.1.2.1.18 It needs careful study and proper handling	2	11	39152	0	6	2	10	39183
A.1.2.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	19	31	33700	0	23	7	24	33804
A.1.2.1.2a Positive	2	4	0	0	7	0	6	19
A.1.2.1.2b Negative	12	21	33700	0	7	5	13	33758
A.1.2.1.2c Neutral	5	6	0	0	9	2	5	27

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.1.2.1.12 Land resumption and development approaches	178	324	2636	3	600	174	700	4615
A.1.2.1.12.2 Land Resumption Ordinance	61	104	2261	1	184	98	357	3066
A.1.2.1.12.2 a Positive	44	91	2261	1	116	85	345	2943
A.1.2.1.12.2 b Negative	7	3	0	0	33	7	8	58
A.1.2.1.12.2 c Neutral	10	10	0	0	35	6	4	65
A.1.2.1.12.1 Public-private partnership	103	196	375	2	360	60	288	1384
A.1.2.1.12.1 a Positive	51	109	47	2	202	16	78	505
A.1.2.1.12.1 b Negative	26	73	106	0	85	39	196	525
A.1.2.1.12.1 c Neutral	26	14	222	0	73	5	14	354
A.1.2.1.12.4 Other land resumption and development approaches	12	20	0	0	53	16	55	156
A.1.2.1.12.3 Apply Land Resumption Ordinance first, then PPP	2	4	0	0	3	0	0	9
A.1.2.1.13 Other comments about Land resumption and compensation	32	54	2355	0	112	20	46	2619
A.1.2.1.10 Agricultural land uses	29	29	1102	0	22	10	30	1222
A.1.2.1.80 No reason	33	478	173	3	30	52	239	1008
A.1.2.1.14 Concerns about the fairness and	46	93	106	0	189	30	64	528

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
transparency for the government								
A.1.2.1.19 Comments about development procedures	17	18	328	0	64	2	2	431
A.1.2.1.08 Housing development issue	36	81	0	2	103	31	98	351
A.1.2.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	20	16	106	0	27	5	22	196
A.1.2.1.09 Potential for land development	17	34	0	0	91	18	32	192
A.1.2.1.16 Other comments / concerns about public-private partnership	26	42	0	0	100	5	16	189
A.1.2.1.05 Time required to provide land	10	29	0	0	74	28	25	166
A.1.2.1.5a Take longer time	3	4	0	0	9	2	10	28
A.1.2.1.5b Take shorter time	5	20	0	0	54	26	10	115
A.1.2.1.5c Neutral	2	5	0	0	11	0	5	23
A.1.2.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	18	33	0	0	71	2	12	136
A.1.2.1.22 There are other feasible options	2	1	106	0	1	0	0	110
A.1.2.1.17 The development priority of this option	10	34	0	0	14	6	28	92

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.1.2.1.17a High priority	5	27	0	0	11	6	25	74
A.1.2.1.17b Low priority	4	7	0	0	3	0	3	17
A.1.2.1.17c Neutral	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.1.2.1.01 Financial cost of development	10	15	0	0	20	11	26	82
A.1.2.1.1a Relative higher	0	4	0	0	4	1	14	23
A.1.2.1.1b Relative lower	6	10	0	0	6	6	5	33
A.1.2.1.1c Neutral	4	1	0	0	10	4	7	26
A.1.2.1.11 Rural land uses / rural environment	6	2	0	0	12	2	6	28
A.1.2.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	10	4	0	0	6	0	3	23
A.1.2.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	0	2	0	0	7	1	3	13
A.1.2.1.23 Comments about the stability and reliability of the food supply in Hong Kong	5	3	0	0	1	0	0	9
A.1.2.1.24 Public interest	2	2	0	0	4	0	0	8
A.1.2.1.20 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	1	2	0	0	1	0	3	7
A.1.2.1.21 Impact on next generation	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5
A.1.2.1.90 Others	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
A.1.4 Relocation or consolidation of Land- extensive recreational facilities	156	1071	40	2	59	239	1153	2720

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.1.4.0 General attitude towards “Relocation or consolidation of Land-extensive recreational facilities”	65	517	20	1	24	115	543	1285
A.1.4.0.1 Positive	34	259	20	1	12	111	102	539
A.1.4.0.2 Negative	19	252	0	0	7	2	428	708
A.1.4.0.3 Neutral	12	6	0	0	5	2	13	38
A.1.4.1 Reasons or concerns for “Relocation or consolidation of Land-extensive recreational facilities”	91	554	20	1	35	124	610	1435
A.1.4.1.80 No reason	16	434	20	1	5	48	246	770
A.1.4.1.17 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	1	13	0	0	1	0	102	117
A.1.4.1.13 Comments about sports / recreational facilities	11	12	0	0	1	1	77	102
A.1.4.1.08 Housing development issue	6	18	0	0	4	40	27	95
A.1.4.1.11 Comments about relocate facilities	12	16	0	0	4	3	17	52
A.1.4.1.09 Potential for land development	5	9	0	0	4	12	15	45
A.1.4.1.12 Comments about public use rights	10	7	0	0	2	2	17	38
A.1.4.1.15 Impact on Hong Kong's reputation / image	1	4	0	0	0	1	25	31

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.1.4.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	4	8	0	0	0	1	16	29
A.1.4.1.10 Comments about the sports development of Hong Kong	1	1	0	0	1	2	21	26
A.1.4.1.14 The development priority of this option	5	7	0	0	1	3	9	25
A.1.4.1.14a High priority	0	3	0	0	1	3	3	10
A.1.4.1.14b Low priority	4	4	0	0	0	0	6	14
A.1.4.1.14c Neutral	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.1.4.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	4	6	0	0	4	8	2	24
A.1.4.1.05 Time required to provide land	5	8	0	0	5	0	4	22
A.1.4.1.5a Take longer time	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	5
A.1.4.1.5b Take shorter time	5	6	0	0	2	0	1	14
A.1.4.1.5c Neutral	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
A.1.4.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	5	4	0	0	0	1	4	14
A.1.4.1.2a Positive	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
A.1.4.1.2b Negative	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	6
A.1.4.1.2c Neutral	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	5

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.1.4.1.16 Contributions to society	1	2	0	0	0	1	10	14
A.1.4.1.18 There are other feasible options	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	10
A.1.4.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	8
A.1.4.1.19 Impact on next generation	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5
A.1.4.1.01 Financial cost of development	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	5
A.1.4.1.1a Relative higher	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	4
A.1.4.1.1b Relative lower	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.1.4.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3

As seen in Table 2.4, there were 591,493 comments about Short-to-medium term options in the PE booklet, including 229,748 about private recreational leases, 213,016 about brownfield, 146,009 about private agricultural land reserve and 2,720 about land-extensive recreational facilities.

Of the 229,748 comments about private recreational leases, 68,474 were about general attitude (62,823 positive (**SCP**) (“utilising the sites under Private Recreational Leases is the most effective way to increase land supply in Hong Kong”), 5,048 negative (“do not agree with retrieving sites under Private Recreational Leases”))

In addition, 41,238 were attitudes specific to Fanling golf course (38,235 positive (**SCP**) (“development of sites under Private Recreational Leases, e.g. Fanling Golf Course should be given priority”), 1,197 negative (“do not agree to include Fanling Golf Course as a land supply option as keeping the golf course is important for development of golf”) without specifying the development option, 1,031 were positive (**SCP**) (“support retrieving the whole of Fanling Golf Course for high density housing development”), 293 negative (**WS**) (“it is in the great interest for Hong Kong as an international city to preserve the whole Fanling golf course”) for full development and 142 were positive (“half of Fanling Golf Course should be developed for public housing, the rest should be retained for its historical value”), 54 negative (**WS**) (“ridiculous to even consider taking away part of the existing Fanling golf club land which

plays host to international golf events”) for the partial development), and another 2,207 comments were about Fanling golf course including 867 about the heritage (**WS**) (“golf course is a historical heritage”), 640 about conservation value (**WS**) (“heritage and green conservation site and must be preserved for generations to come”), 478 about its hosting of international tournaments (**WS**) (“Do not agree to recover Fanling golf course, because Hong Kong’s international golf event is held there”), 149 about being a top world club (**WS**) (“ranked in the world top 100 golf courses which means that it is of high quality and prestige”) and 72 about Fanling Lodge (“Fanling Lodge, which is located on the side of the Fanling Golf Club, should also not be retained”).

There were another 120,036 comments about reasons or concerns for these leases, of which 37,329 were that this option should be a high priority (**SCP**) (“government should prioritise the development of brownfields and sites under Private Recreational Leases to release potential land resources”), 34,388 were about housing development (**SCP**) (“should consider how to utilize the sites under Private Recreational Leases for public housing development as early as possible”), 29,194 were about the development potential (**SCP**) (“there will be sufficient land for housing development if the golf course is retrieved after the end of the lease”), 2,463 about sports development (**SCP**) (“land issues and sports development are equally important to Hong Kong, and the community should not pit housing against sports”), 1,247 were specific to the lease conditions (**SCP**) (“request a comprehensive review of Private Recreational Leases policy by government”), 1,106 were about supporting infrastructure and community facilities (**SCP**) (“most of the land held by private recreation clubs is not easily accessible by public transport”), 830 about public use rights (**WS**) (“private recreational areas are open to the public for too few hours”), 749 about impact on Hong Kong image (**WS**) (“Hong Kong is an internationally renowned city, and there must be a decent golf course”), 522 about stakeholders and their interests (**WS**) (“government has to consider the different perspectives of stakeholders”), 515 about contributions to society (**WS**) (“many of these sports clubs have a long heritage which support the community and contribute to the society in different ways”), 491 about sports/recreation facilities (“there are only a few golf courses in Hong Kong”), 445 were about public interest (“public interest is certainly greater than the interests of the golf club”), 346 about economic impact (“private recreational clubs are very important to the economy and can attract businesses and companies, professionals and regional headquarters to move to Hong Kong”), 310 about conservation impact (42 positive (“golf course must be reclaimed, this causes the least environmental damage with low development costs”), 219 negative (**WS**) (“chopping down a forest of heritage trees will have an environmental impact of losing part of a green lung”)), 299 about liveability (**VCF**) (“also need land for sports, recreation and other activities to enhance the quality of life of the people”), 298 about relocation of the facilities (“golf courses can be relocated to the landfill), 294 about other feasible options (**WS**) (“many government owned or linked sites could be repurposed before recreational leases should be considered”), 238 about the time required (46 longer (“involves expansion of Fan Kam Road, the time for development is long”), 184 shorter (“PRLs can provide the most land in a short period of time”)), 138 about the impact on residents (**WS**) (“housing built on the site will add traffic jams in the neighborhood which is already quite congested”), 109 about impact on the next generation (**WS**) (“recreational lands for private sports clubs are important for continuation of sports development for the betterment of the youth”), 85 about financial cost (37 higher (“involves expansion of the Fanling & Kam Tin Highway and diversion of the Dong Jiang water aqueduct system, the cost

is higher”), 43 lower (“reclaiming the Fanling Golf Course is a low-cost option”) and 56 about technical issues (**WS**) (“Golf course is flat land, technically feasible for housing development”).

Of the 213,016 comments about brownfield sites, 65,491 were about general attitude (64,995 positive (**SCP**) (“prioritise development of brownfields”), 175 negative (“opposed developing brownfields”)), 147,525 were about reasons or concerns, including 61,485 that this option should be a high priority (**SCP**) (“prioritise the land planning of brownfields for public housing”), 39,880 about the housing development potential (**SCP**) (“more than sufficient land from brownfields to meet Hong Kong's housing needs”), 32,461 about land development potential (**SCP**) (“converting the brownfields into development land is the best option to supply large amount of land”), 5,113 about rural land use (**SCP**) (“one important objective of development of brownfield land is to improve the rural environment”), 4,946 about development procedures (**SCP**) (“simplify the planning process and take the courage to solve the brownfield land problem”), 376 about land resumption including 162 positive comments about land resumption using the ordinance (“if the government puts public interests first, it can certainly employ the Lands Resumption Ordinance to take back brownfield land”) and 124 about using PPP (67 positive (“Following the principle of high fairness and transparency, the Government can definitely consider cooperating with the private sector to develop brownfield land in the New Territories”), 42 negative (“oppose PPP as there is conflict of interest”)), 306 about how to accommodate brownfield operations (“businesses currently operating there should be relocated to the right place to free up land”), 213 about the timescale (58 longer (“takes too long to develop the brownfield lands as land ownership is extremely dispersed”) and 143 shorter (“basic infrastructure is already in place, so the time to develop the brownfields will be shorter than country parks and reclamation”)), 204 about compensation (“development of brownfield land is difficult as it involves compensation to many stakeholders and occupiers”), 178 about supporting infrastructure (“plan roads and build houses as soon as possible in brownfield and farmland”), 155 about the conservation impact (104 positive (“re-examine the development of these brownfield lands, to make good use of the land and to improve the environment there”), 31 negative (“developing the brownfields into new communities will only be harmful to the air quality, environment and hygiene there”)), 136 about economic impact (“development of brownfield will harm the logistics industry”), 81 about illegal land uses (“many operations on brownfield land are illegal and should be recovered immediately for new development”), 74 about cost (34 higher (“development of brownfield lands is of low efficiency, involves high cost”), 30 lower (“brownfield lands should be considered for development first, because the cost is lower”)) and 53 about fairness and transparency (“to ensure proper town planning and fairness in implementation, government should use land resumption rather than PPP”).

Of the 146,009 comments about private agricultural land reserve in the New Territories, 60,989 were about general attitudes (7,121 positive (**SCP**) (“reclaim the over one thousand hectares of agricultural land hoarded up by property developers for public housing development”), 1,439 negative (**SCP**) (“do not support any actions to sacrifice agricultural land for development”)) and 85,020 about reasons and concerns, including 39,183 about the need for care (**SCP**) (“farmland should be approached with extreme caution because these options will cause irreversible harm to Hong Kong's environment and natural resources”), 33,758 about negative conservation/environmental impact (**SCP**) (“other values of these agricultural lands are neglected, such as preservation of arable land for local agriculture and

fish culture, ecological, relieving flood risk and urban heat island effect”), 4,615 about land resumption, including 3,066 references to the land resumption ordinance (2,943 positive (**SCP**) (“land should be reclaimed with Land Resumption Ordinance to make the development smooth”), 58 negative (**M**) (“against the principle of private property right for the government to collect the private-owned land”)), 1,384 comments about public-private partnership (505 positive (“Following the principle of high fairness and transparency, the Government can definitely consider cooperating with the private sector to develop agricultural land in the New Territories”), 525 negative (“only lead to collusion and promote profit-making by businessmen”)) and 156 about other land resumption approaches (“land exchange to implement the zoning of the land should be continued as it is proven to be effective in implementing complex developments”), 2,619 about compensation (**SCP**) (“private agricultural land reserve owned by property developers can be recovered by the payment of compensation to increase land supply”), 1,222 about agricultural land uses (**SCP**) (“Hong Kong needs a certain proportion of agricultural land and fish ponds to grow local fruits and vegetables, freshwater fish and other crops, or as a leisure farm to give Hong Kong people a relaxing place to go”), 528 about fairness and transparency (“to ensure proper town planning and fairness in implementation, government should use land resumption rather than PPP in developing private agricultural land”), 431 about development procedures (**SCP**) (“simplifying the approval process and enhancing communication with the estate developers will enhance the success rate of public-private partnership projects”), 351 comments about housing development (“If a small portion of private agricultural land reserves can be converted into subsidized housing and private housing, the problem of housing land supply will be solved”), 196 about economic impact (**SCP**) (“PPP arrangement may affect the local agricultural industry”), 192 about the potential for land development (“reclaiming the large amount of agricultural land hoarded by property developers in the New Territories for many years can quickly cope with the demand for land supply”), 189 about other concerns with PPP (**M**) (“partnership with private developers to develop housing will not help to lower property prices. The URA is a good example”), 166 about the timescale (28 longer (“legal process of using the Land Resumption Ordinance to recover developer's agricultural land will be long”), 115 shorter (“priority should be given to the development of agricultural land, because it is the fastest way”)), 136 about supporting infrastructure (**M**) (“plan roads and build houses as soon as possible in farmland”), 110 about other feasible options (**SCP**) (“there are alternative land development options to replace using farmland for housing development”), 92 about development priority (74 high (“give private land a high priority as existing resources that can minimize the problem right away”), 17 low (“should be the last resort so as to minimize the impact of development”)) and 82 about financial cost (23 higher (“if the farmland is a remote site, the cost to develop will be very high”) and 33 lower (“a lot of idle land in the New Territories and it is the most time and cost efficient option to acquire by land resumption”)).

Of the 2,720 comments about land-extensive recreational facilities, 1,285 were about general attitude (539 positive (“public housing can also be built on land of land-extensive recreational facilities”), 708 negative (“oppose because this option can only provide a few hectares of land”)) and 1,435 were about reasons and concerns, including 117 about liveability (**VCF**) (“having these recreational facilities is what makes Hong Kong liveable!”), 102 about sports facilities (**VCF**) (“we do not have enough recreational space in Hong Kong - you should not take any away”), 95 about housing development (“consolidate some recreational facilities for

land to build public housing”) and 52 about relocation of facilities (“recreational facilities may be relocated to sites that were unsuitable for housing”).

2.5 Qualitative analysis of medium-to-long term options in the PE booklet

Table 2.5 Comments about medium-to-long term options in PE booklet

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.02 Medium-to-long term options in Public Engagement booklet	3494	12165	388251	40	5747	8530	15937	434164
A.2.2 Developing the East Lantau Metropolis OR Artificial islands in the Central Waters	1156	3234	133726	8	2296	3762	5213	149395
A.2.2.0 General attitude towards “Developing the East Lantau Metropolis / General artificial islands in the Central Waters”	470	1417	62322	4	851	1756	2509	69329
A.2.2.0.1 Positive	228	937	513	4	529	1102	1492	4805
A.2.2.0.2 Negative	156	432	61809	0	181	446	884	63908
A.2.2.0.3 Neutral	86	48	0	0	141	208	133	616
A.2.2.1 Reasons or concerns for “Developing the East Lantau Metropolis / Artificial islands in the Central Waters”	686	1817	71404	4	1445	2006	2704	80066
A.2.2.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	112	264	50947	0	233	189	303	52048
A.2.2.1.2a Positive	6	21	0	0	28	22	3	80
A.2.2.1.2b Negative	86	218	50947	0	139	151	244	51785
A.2.2.1.2c Neutral	20	25	0	0	66	16	56	183
A.2.2.1.80 No reason	92	776	9605	3	149	744	1596	12965
A.2.2.1.24 There are other feasible options	15	32	3689	0	8	47	11	3802

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.2.1.01 Financial cost of development	52	111	3084	0	122	103	72	3544
A.2.2.1.1a Relative higher	43	95	3084	0	77	87	58	3444
A.2.2.1.1b Relative lower	7	14	0	0	28	12	8	69
A.2.2.1.1c Neutral	2	2	0	0	17	4	6	31
A.2.2.1.15 Impact on next generation	8	11	2473	0	12	24	15	2543
A.2.2.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	50	25	591	0	54	22	20	762
A.2.2.1.09 Potential for land development	60	107	0	1	182	156	163	669
A.2.2.1.05 Time required to provide land	61	91	0	0	160	231	70	613
A.2.2.1.5a Take longer time	43	65	0	0	103	193	31	435
A.2.2.1.5b Take shorter time	15	23	0	0	39	30	33	140
A.2.2.1.5c Neutral	3	3	0	0	18	8	6	38
A.2.2.1.10 Impact on sea transport	1	4	591	0	8	4	2	610
A.2.2.1.08 Housing development issue	38	77	0	0	100	175	63	453
A.2.2.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	21	28	212	0	53	59	13	386
A.2.2.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	42	65	0	0	93	46	50	296

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.2.1.16 The development priority of this option	30	67	0	0	36	47	110	290
A.2.2.1.16a High priority	14	52	0	0	21	27	68	182
A.2.2.1.16b Low priority	16	13	0	0	14	19	42	104
A.2.2.1.16c Neutral	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	4
A.2.2.1.23 Public interest	6	5	212	0	8	28	9	268
A.2.2.1.11 Comments about reclamation areas	19	15	0	0	34	24	78	170
A.2.2.1.11a Smaller than in the PE Booklet	0	2	0	0	8	8	32	50
A.2.2.1.11b Larger than in the PE Booklet	15	9	0	0	18	12	36	90
A.2.2.1.11c Neutral	4	4	0	0	8	4	10	30
A.2.2.1.13 Stakeholders and their interests, e.g. Involving less of the holders' interests	14	14	0	0	55	36	21	140
A.2.2.1.12 Comments about the transport network connection	14	26	0	0	27	15	23	105
A.2.2.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	16	23	0	0	16	12	25	92
A.2.2.1.20 To have in-depth study of the implementation of this option	13	28	0	0	24	7	12	84
A.2.2.1.21 Hong Kong still has plenty of land	2	14	0	0	6	17	13	52

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.2.1.14 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	5	10	0	0	13	2	14	44
A.2.2.1.17 Comments related to the Laws of Hong Kong, e.g. Protection of the Harbour Ordinance	6	8	0	0	13	6	5	38
A.2.2.1.19 Comments about relocate other facilities	2	4	0	0	10	5	6	27
A.2.2.1.22 Comments about development approaches	0	4	0	0	13	4	4	25
A.2.2.1.25 Comments about development procedures	4	4	0	0	8	1	0	17
A.2.2.1.18 Impact on Hong Kong's reputation / image	1	1	0	0	3	2	6	13
A.2.2.1.26 Compensation mechanism	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	7
A.2.2.1.90 Others	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
A.2.6 Developing two pilot areas on the periphery on country parks	635	2106	132780	10	721	1300	3949	141501
A.2.6.0.1 General attitude towards “Developing two pilot areas on the periphery on country parks”	257	929	59332	5	280	613	1891	63307
A.2.6.0.1a Positive	101	406	18	3	117	257	438	1340
A.2.6.0.1b Negative	118	495	59314	2	115	324	1394	61762
A.2.6.0.1c Neutral	38	28	0	0	48	32	59	205

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.6.0.2 General attitude towards the pilot area in Tai Lam	4	15	0	0	4	5	5	33
A.2.6.0.2a Positive	1	7	0	0	2	1	4	15
A.2.6.0.2b Negative	3	7	0	0	0	4	1	15
A.2.6.0.2c Neutral	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3
A.2.6.0.3 General attitude towards the pilot area in Shui Chuen O	5	10	0	0	6	2	1	24
A.2.6.0.3a Positive	2	7	0	0	4	0	0	13
A.2.6.0.3b Negative	3	2	0	0	0	2	1	8
A.2.6.0.3c Neutral	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3
A.2.6.1 Reasons or concerns for “Developing two pilot areas on the periphery on country parks”	369	1152	73448	5	431	680	2052	78137
A.2.6.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	78	164	49621	0	104	96	352	50415
A.2.6.1.2a Positive	11	8	0	0	12	4	5	40
A.2.6.1.2b Negative	59	137	49030	0	60	79	317	49682
A.2.6.1.2c Neutral	8	19	591	0	32	13	30	693
A.2.6.1.14 Impact on public enjoyment value / recreational potential	35	45	14550	0	33	25	72	14760
A.2.6.1.17 Impact on next generation	6	14	4129	0	4	7	38	4198
A.2.6.1.22 There are other feasible options	10	33	3689	0	6	14	20	3772
A.2.6.1.80 No reason	59	547	1237	4	62	298	1123	3330

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.6.1.19 Comments related to the Laws of Hong Kong, e.g. Country Parks Ordinance	14	23	222	0	22	10	10	301
A.2.6.1.08 Housing development issue	23	67	0	1	42	78	83	294
A.2.6.1.09 Potential for land development	26	36	0	0	49	26	46	183
A.2.6.1.15 The development priority of this option	12	29	0	0	19	22	58	140
A.2.6.1.15a High priority	1	12	0	0	1	5	13	32
A.2.6.1.15b Low priority	11	17	0	0	17	17	45	107
A.2.6.1.15c Neutral	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
A.2.6.1.16 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	4	21	0	0	4	12	83	124
A.2.6.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	24	38	0	0	17	13	23	115
A.2.6.1.05 Time required to provide land	17	17	0	0	19	25	16	94
A.2.6.1.5a Take longer time	12	7	0	0	13	6	3	41
A.2.6.1.5b Take shorter time	4	10	0	0	6	18	13	51
A.2.6.1.5c Neutral	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
A.2.6.1.13 Comments about land development, e.g. To set up	14	13	0	0	7	8	20	62

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
regulations in controlling of land development								
A.2.6.1.20 Compensation mechanism	7	14	0	0	13	2	9	45
A.2.6.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	5	16	0	0	5	6	12	44
A.2.6.1.01 Financial cost of development	8	12	0	0	4	7	11	42
A.2.6.1.1a Relative higher	4	8	0	0	1	2	8	23
A.2.6.1.1b Relative lower	3	2	0	0	2	5	3	15
A.2.6.1.1c Neutral	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	4
A.2.6.1.24 Impact on Hong Kong's reputation / image / overall interests	5	6	0	0	2	1	25	39
A.2.6.1.18 Stakeholders and their interests, e.g. Involving less of the holders' interests	3	12	0	0	4	11	9	39
A.2.6.1.11 Impact on existing infrastructure	8	8	0	0	1	8	5	30
A.2.6.1.10 Comments about landscape and aesthetic value	3	11	0	0	0	3	13	30
A.2.6.1.23 To have in-depth study of the implementation of this option	4	14	0	0	2	0	3	23
A.2.6.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	1	6	0	0	8	3	3	21

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.6.1.21 Hong Kong still has plenty of land	2	3	0	0	3	4	7	19
A.2.6.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	1	2	0	0	1	1	11	16
A.2.6.1.90 Others	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.2.1 Near-shore reclamation outside Victoria Harbour	1335	3401	121559	10	2326	3341	5664	137636
A.2.1.0.1 General attitude towards “Near-shore reclamation outside Victoria Harbour”	481	1376	59461	5	823	1557	2587	66290
A.2.1.0.1a Positive	202	898	512	5	519	1064	1475	4675
A.2.1.0.1b Negative	181	428	58949	0	158	334	990	61040
A.2.1.0.1c Neutral	98	50	0	0	146	159	122	575
A.2.1.0.2 General attitude towards reclamation at Lung Kwu Tan	43	54	177	0	35	15	29	353
A.2.1.0.2a Positive	14	34	0	0	11	11	17	87
A.2.1.0.2b Negative	25	16	177	0	15	3	10	246
A.2.1.0.2c Neutral	4	4	0	0	9	1	2	20
A.2.1.0.3 General attitude towards reclamation at Siu Ho Wan	13	36	0	0	12	5	21	87
A.2.1.0.3a Positive	9	26	0	0	4	3	8	50
A.2.1.0.3b Negative	3	10	0	0	2	1	11	27
A.2.1.0.3c Neutral	1	0	0	0	6	1	2	10
A.2.1.0.4 General attitude towards reclamation at Sunny Bay	13	32	0	0	9	5	13	72

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.1.0.4a Positive	9	27	0	0	5	5	7	53
A.2.1.0.4b Negative	3	4	0	0	0	0	6	13
A.2.1.0.4c Neutral	1	1	0	0	4	0	0	6
A.2.1.0.5 General attitude towards reclamation at Tsing Yi Southwest	6	32	0	0	12	5	6	61
A.2.1.0.5a Positive	4	26	0	0	8	4	6	48
A.2.1.0.5b Negative	1	6	0	0	1	1	0	9
A.2.1.0.5c Neutral	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	4
A.2.1.0.6 General attitude towards reclamation at Ma Liu Shui	63	72	26	0	89	34	233	517
A.2.1.0.6a Positive	10	34	0	0	20	18	29	111
A.2.1.0.6b Negative	46	34	26	0	54	14	200	374
A.2.1.0.6c Neutral	7	4	0	0	15	2	4	32
A.2.1.1 Reasons or concerns for “Near- shore reclamation outside Victoria Harbour”	716	1799	61895	5	1346	1720	2775	70256
A.2.1.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	145	266	48107	0	221	140	309	49188
A.2.1.1.2a Positive	9	23	0	0	28	19	10	89
A.2.1.1.2b Negative	118	203	48107	0	129	111	256	48924
A.2.1.1.2c Neutral	18	40	0	0	64	10	43	175
A.2.1.1.80 No reason	87	753	9604	3	158	711	1672	12988
A.2.1.1.24 There are other feasible options	13	25	3715	0	11	40	13	3817

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.1.1.09 Potential for land development	43	121	0	1	166	146	152	629
A.2.1.1.05 Time required to provide land	62	99	0	0	162	201	62	586
A.2.1.1.5a Take longer time	37	65	0	0	100	172	23	397
A.2.1.1.5b Take shorter time	21	30	0	0	42	27	34	154
A.2.1.1.5c Neutral	4	4	0	0	20	2	5	35
A.2.1.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	58	64	203	0	89	24	49	487
A.2.1.1.08 Housing development issue	50	83	0	1	90	159	66	449
A.2.1.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	49	36	224	0	32	18	67	426
A.2.1.1.16 The development priority of this option	28	70	0	0	37	48	106	289
A.2.1.1.16a High priority	13	51	0	0	17	29	63	173
A.2.1.1.16b Low priority	15	16	0	0	19	18	43	111
A.2.1.1.16c Neutral	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	5
A.2.1.1.01 Financial cost of development	29	75	0	0	70	47	54	275
A.2.1.1.1a Relative higher	21	55	0	0	31	36	39	182
A.2.1.1.1b Relative lower	4	19	0	0	26	8	8	65
A.2.1.1.1c Neutral	4	1	0	0	13	3	7	28

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.1.1.13 Stakeholders and their interests, e.g. Involving less of the holders' interests	14	19	0	0	62	38	20	153
A.2.1.1.12 Comments about reclamation areas	5	24	0	0	28	8	84	149
A.2.1.1.12a Smaller than in the PE Booklet	1	4	0	0	4	2	37	48
A.2.1.1.12b Larger than in the PE Booklet	3	13	0	0	14	4	39	73
A.2.1.1.12c Neutral	1	7	0	0	10	2	8	28
A.2.1.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	17	35	0	0	54	29	12	147
A.2.1.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	47	16	0	0	45	13	13	134
A.2.1.1.20 To have in-depth study of the implementation of this option	12	20	21	0	20	8	12	93
A.2.1.1.14 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	11	10	21	0	8	1	13	64
A.2.1.1.15 Impact on next generation	7	12	0	0	8	19	14	60
A.2.1.1.11 Impact on sea transport and road transport in the vicinity	7	16	0	0	8	11	13	55
A.2.1.1.23 Public interest	7	7	0	0	7	21	10	52
A.2.1.1.21 Hong Kong still has plenty of land	3	9	0	0	6	18	11	47

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.1.1.17 Comments related to the Laws of Hong Kong, e.g. Protection of the Harbour Ordinance	6	12	0	0	16	7	6	47
A.2.1.1.19 Comments about relocate other facilities	9	8	0	0	11	6	9	43
A.2.1.1.22 Comments about development approaches	1	3	0	0	16	3	2	25
A.2.1.1.25 Comments about development procedures	3	2	0	0	11	2	0	18
A.2.1.1.10 Impact of reclamation on port operations, e.g. Tsing Yi Southwest	0	8	0	0	2	0	1	11
A.2.1.1.18 Impact on Hong Kong's reputation / image	1	3	0	0	0	2	5	11
A.2.1.1.26 Compensation mechanism	2	0	0	0	8	0	0	10
A.2.1.1.90 Others	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
A.2.3 Developing caverns and underground space	203	1239	50	4	156	85	599	2336
A.2.3.0 General attitude towards “Developing caverns and underground space”	85	570	25	2	54	40	280	1056
A.2.3.0.1 Positive	60	354	25	2	34	23	243	741
A.2.3.0.2 Negative	9	200	0	0	10	4	27	250
A.2.3.0.3 Neutral	16	16	0	0	10	13	10	65
A.2.3.1 Reasons or concerns for “Developing caverns	118	669	25	2	102	45	319	1280

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
and underground space”								
A.2.3.1.80 No reason	16	427	25	1	13	18	166	666
A.2.3.1.11 Comments about relocate facilities / to accommodate facilities	29	50	0	0	17	2	36	134
A.2.3.1.09 Potential for land development	19	30	0	1	13	2	33	98
A.2.3.1.01 Financial cost of development	9	46	0	0	12	3	6	76
A.2.3.1.1a Relative higher	7	44	0	0	12	3	6	72
A.2.3.1.1b Relative lower	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.2.3.1.1c Neutral	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
A.2.3.1.08 Housing development issue	7	22	0	0	4	5	15	53
A.2.3.1.12 Comments about the urban environment at ground level	4	12	0	0	11	1	11	39
A.2.3.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	7	18	0	0	6	4	3	38
A.2.3.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	5	9	0	0	6	1	15	36
A.2.3.1.05 Time required to provide land	7	16	0	0	6	0	2	31
A.2.3.1.5a Take longer time	6	15	0	0	6	0	1	28

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.3.1.5b Take shorter time	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
A.2.3.1.5c Neutral	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
A.2.3.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	2	8	0	0	4	3	7	24
A.2.3.1.2a Positive	1	4	0	0	1	0	1	7
A.2.3.1.2b Negative	1	3	0	0	2	2	5	13
A.2.3.1.2c Neutral	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4
A.2.3.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	4	4	0	0	1	0	14	23
A.2.3.1.10 Comments about connectivity between different areas / transport and other facilities	0	6	0	0	5	6	4	21
A.2.3.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	4	7	0	0	2	0	0	13
A.2.3.1.13 The development priority of this option	3	6	0	0	0	0	3	12
A.2.3.1.13a High priority	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	6
A.2.3.1.13b Low priority	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	6
A.2.3.1.14 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	2	3	0	0	2	0	2	9
A.2.3.1.15 Stakeholders and their interests, e.g. Involving less of	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
the holders' interests								
A.2.3.1.90 Others	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
A.2.4 More new development areas in the New Territories	94	1148	90	8	162	34	377	1913
A.2.4.0 General attitude towards “More new development areas in the NT”	41	554	45	4	64	15	183	906
A.2.4.0.1 Positive	37	518	45	4	43	11	154	812
A.2.4.0.2 Negative	1	29	0	0	7	3	15	55
A.2.4.0.3 Neutral	3	7	0	0	14	1	14	39
A.2.4.1 Reasons or concerns for “More new development areas in the NT”	53	594	45	4	98	19	194	1007
A.2.4.1.80 No reason	19	457	45	4	14	7	119	665
A.2.4.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	4	31	0	0	13	3	22	73
A.2.4.1.09 Potential for land development	8	23	0	0	17	2	17	67
A.2.4.1.08 Housing development issue	5	17	0	0	6	2	13	43
A.2.4.1.11 Land resumption and compensation	2	9	0	0	13	0	3	27
A.2.4.1.05 Time required to provide land	2	12	0	0	4	1	4	23
A.2.4.1.5a Take longer time	0	7	0	0	2	1	1	11
A.2.4.1.5b Take shorter time	2	5	0	0	1	0	2	10

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.4.1.5c Neutral	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
A.2.4.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	3	7	0	0	7	1	3	21
A.2.4.1.12 The development priority of this option	2	11	0	0	4	0	2	19
A.2.4.1.12a High priority	1	7	0	0	4	0	2	14
A.2.4.1.12b Low priority	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
A.2.4.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	2	8	0	0	4	2	1	17
A.2.4.1.2a Positive	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
A.2.4.1.2b Negative	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
A.2.4.1.2c Neutral	0	5	0	0	4	1	0	10
A.2.4.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	2	3	0	0	7	0	1	13
A.2.4.1.01 Financial cost of development	0	7	0	0	1	0	4	12
A.2.4.1.1a Relative higher	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5
A.2.4.1.1b Relative lower	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
A.2.4.1.1c Neutral	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
A.2.4.1.10 Rural land uses / rural environment	0	1	0	0	3	1	3	8
A.2.4.1.14 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	7

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.4.1.13 Comments about development procedures	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	6
A.2.4.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
A.2.4.1.90 Others	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
A.2.5 Developing the River Trade Terminal site	71	1037	46	0	86	8	135	1383
A.2.5.0 General attitude towards “Developing the River Trade Terminal site”	30	504	23	0	33	4	68	662
A.2.5.0.1 Positive	12	385	23	0	20	3	41	484
A.2.5.0.2 Negative	10	111	0	0	3	1	23	148
A.2.5.0.3 Neutral	8	8	0	0	10	0	4	30
A.2.5.1 Reasons or concerns for “Developing the River Trade Terminal site”	41	533	23	0	53	4	67	721
A.2.5.1.80 No reason	8	429	23	0	4	2	54	520
A.2.5.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	10	20	0	0	8	1	2	41
A.2.5.1.09 Potential for land development	4	14	0	0	5	1	2	26
A.2.5.1.08 Housing development issue	0	14	0	0	6	0	1	21
A.2.5.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	4	9	0	0	5	0	1	19

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.5.1.10 Comments about release lands from other areas	4	6	0	0	7	0	1	18
A.2.5.1.12 The development priority of this option	4	11	0	0	2	0	0	17
A.2.5.1.12a High priority	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
A.2.5.1.12b Low priority	4	6	0	0	2	0	0	12
A.2.5.1.12c Neutral	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.2.5.1.13 Comments about relocate River Trade Terminal site	2	9	0	0	3	0	2	16
A.2.5.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	0	6	0	0	4	0	0	10
A.2.5.1.2a Positive	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
A.2.5.1.2b Negative	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	6
A.2.5.1.2c Neutral	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
A.2.5.1.05 Time required to provide land	1	4	0	0	2	0	1	8
A.2.5.1.5a Take longer time	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	5
A.2.5.1.5b Take shorter time	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
A.2.5.1.11 Comments about rationalise the land uses along the entire western coastal area of Tuen Mun	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	7

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.2.5.1.01 Financial cost of development	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	6
A.2.5.1.1a Relative higher	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	5
A.2.5.1.1c Neutral	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
A.2.5.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	4
A.2.5.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
A.2.5.1.14 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
A.2.5.1.90 Others	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3

As seen in Table 2.5, there are 434,164 comments about medium-to-long terms options in the Public Engagement booklet, including 149,395 about developing ELM, 141,501 about the periphery of country parks, 137,636 about near-shore reclamation outside Victoria Harbour, 2,336 about caverns and underground space, 1,913 about new development areas in the NT and 1,383 about developing the River Trade Terminal site.

Of the 149,395 comments about developing ELM, 69,329 were about general attitude (4,805 positive (“agree to develop ELM”), 63,908 negative (**SCP**) (“Strongly oppose ELM”)) and 80,066 were about reasons and concerns, including 52,048 about the conservation/environmental impact (80 positive (“With the progress of science and technology, the impact of ELM on marine ecology has been reduced”), 51,785 negative (**SCP**) (“ELM has a huge negative impact on the environment”)), 3,802 about other feasible options (**SCP**) (“stop talking about ELM, there are enough brown field sites”), 3,544 about the cost (3,444 higher (**SCP**) (“ELM will eat up money better used for Hong Kong healthcare and education”), 69 lower (“cost will not be higher than brownfield”)), 2,543 about the impact on the next generation (**SCP**) (“without reclamation, the next generation has no place to live”), 762 about economic impact (**SCP**) (“should be the preferred option as the most economical”), 669 about the potential for land development (“supply a large amount of land in one go”), 613 about the time required (435 longer (“will take at least 10-30 years to provide land for housing”), 140 shorter (“quickest way to increase the land supply is to reclaim from the sea”)), 610 on the impact on sea transport (**SCP**) (“will reduce the size of the harbour and affect vessels operation”), 453 about housing development (“could accommodate up to 1.1 million people”), 386 about construction issues (**SCP**) (“The waters are relatively shallow making reclamation easier and more feasible”), 296 about the supporting infrastructure (“requires

massive amount of infrastructure”), 290 about the development priority (182 high (“ELM provide the most land and should be given the priority”) and 104 low (“ELM should be the last resort as it severely affects the marine ecology”)), 268 about public interest (**SCP**) (“oppose ELM unless there is an overriding public need for reclamation”), 170 about the reclamation area (90 larger (“expand ELM to 2,200 hectares to prepare for population growth and economic development”) and 50 smaller (“with new urban design concepts, only 500 ha is required”)), 140 about stakeholder interests (“most effective option as less existing stakeholders would challenge”), 105 about transport network (“real challenge is to build 3 tunnels and 3 railways to connect ELM”), 92 about the impact on residents (“should consider traffic impact on western Hong Kong Island”), 84 on the need for in-depth implementation study (“government should conduct a detailed feasibility study”) and 52 claiming there is no land shortage (“With so much unused land, there's no need to reclaim”).

Of the 141,501 comments about the periphery of country parks, 63,307 were about general attitude (1,340 positive (“should focus on the development of Country park margin areas”), 61,762 negative (**SCP**) (“country park peripheral areas should be preserved as they are treasures of Hong Kong”)) and 78,137 were about reasons and concerns, of which 49,682 were about negative conservation/environmental impact (**SCP**) (“if country parks are developed, it will set a bad precedent and reduce the green areas of the city”), 14,760 were about the impact on public recreation (**SCP**) (“stop developments in country parks, they are for the public to enjoy the great outdoors”), 4,198 were about the impact on the next generation (**SCP**) (“Hong Kong needs country parks preserved for further generations”), 3,772 were about other feasible options (**SCP**) (“other land supply options can meet the demand”), 301 were about the legal constraints (**SCP**) (“Country Parks are an important natural environment protected under the Country Parks Ordinance”), 294 on housing development (“support development of country parks periphery areas and the construction of public housing and supporting facilities there”), 183 about the potential for development (“country parks resolve most of the land shortage problem even if only one-tenth of the total area is utilised”), 140 about development priority (32 high (“develop the periphery of the country park first as it does not involve too much compensation or rehousing”) and 107 low (“Priority should be given to reclamation outside Victoria Harbour, with periphery of country parks of lower priority”)), 124 on liveability (“Country Parks make our densely-packed high-rise urban environment much more liveable”), 115 about supporting infrastructure (“Country Parks are located in the mountains, which lack transportation, electricity supply and other facilities”), 94 about time taken (41 longer (“development of country parks for housing takes an extremely long time”), 51 shorter (“development at the periphery of Country Parks is the most time-saving option as there are traffic networks nearby”)) and 62 about regulations for development (“consider a limit of utilising only 2% to 3% of periphery areas of country parks for public housing development, building community or elderly facilities”).

Of the 137,636 comments about near-shore reclamation outside Victoria Harbour, 66,290 were about general attitude (4,675 positive (“Reclamation outside Victoria Harbour needs to be considered”), 61,040 negative (**SCP**) (“reclamation will cause irreversible harm to Hong Kong's environment and natural resources”)) across locations, 517 specifically about Ma Liu Shui (111 positive (“strongly support Ma Liu Shui where traffic network is in place”), 374 negative (**VCF**) (“strong objection to Ma Liu Shui that bring insurmountable traffic, environmental and visual impacts to the surroundings”)), 353 specifically about Lung Kwu Tan

(87 positive (“Strongly support reclamation at Lung Kwu Tan”), 246 negative (**SCP**) (“if highly polluting industries are moved to Lung Kwu Tan, it will make the air worse, so oppose reclamation”)), 87 about Siu Ho Wan (50 positive (“In favour of reclamation at Siu Ho Wan”), 27 negative (“bound to affect The Brothers Marine Park”)), 72 about Sunny Bay (53 positive (**WS**) (“support development at Sunny Bay”), 13 negative (“oppose reclamation at Sunny Bay”)) and 61 about Tsing Yi Southwest (48 positive (**WS**) (“reclaim Tsing Yi Southwest and use for relocation of Kwai Tsing Container Terminal”), 9 negative (“greatly increases the traffic burden in Tsing Yi.”)). Another 70,256 comments were about concerns or reasons, including 49,188 about conservation/environmental impact (89 positive (“reclamation is the ultimate solution without destroying our environment”), 48,924 negative (**SCP**) (“reclamation will cause irreversible damage to our marine environment, biodiversity and fishery resources”)), 3,817 about other feasible options (**SCP**) (“There are other ways to manage the housing problem, reclamation is not a sustainable way forward”), 629 about the potential for land development (“reclamation outside Victoria Harbour ensures unlimited supplies of land in the future”), 586 about the time to provide land (397 longer (“reclamation will take longer time but seems unavoidable”), 154 shorter (“reclamation of land in HK is quicker than to buy from existing land owners”)), 487 about supporting infrastructural/community facilities (“If Ma Liu Shui is chosen, start planning a new tunnel from NT to Kowloon”), 449 about housing development (“reclamation is necessary for adequate housing development”), 426 about impact on residents (**SCP**) (“after reclamation at Ma Liu Shui, the stench of the Shing Mun River will be extended and affect residents greatly”), 289 about the development priority (173 high (“reclamation option is the highest priority”), 111 low (“reclamation is the last option”)), 275 about cost (182 higher (“supply of reclamation fill material will be very expensive and hence the construction cost will be highly inflated”) and 65 lower (“reclamation is a quick and inexpensive way to greatly increase land supply”)), 153 about stakeholder interests (“most effective way to increase land supply as less existing stakeholder to challenge the decision”), 149 about the reclamation area size (73 larger (“increase the size of near-shore reclamation outside Victoria Harbour to about 1,000 hectares”) and 48 smaller (“Ma On Shan reclamation area should be reduced”)), 147 about construction issues (“The technical issues of reclamation are much more complicated than the development on existing land”), 134 about economic impact (“reclamation has had a large negative impact on the fishing industry”), 93 about the need for in-depth implementation study (“support carrying out detailed planning and engineering studies for reclamation”), 64 about liveability (“reclamation will block the sea breeze and the polluted air cannot be blown away, making Lung Kwu Tan un-liveable”), 60 about impact on the next generation (“benefit our next generation by giving Hong Kong great potential for further development”), 55 about the impact on transport (“near-shore reclamation reduces the number of sea routes”) and 52 about the public interest (“Reclamation is actually the most feasible option which balance the interests of all parties and causes least impact on people’s life”).

Of the 2,336 comments about caverns and underground space, 1,056 were about general attitude (741 positive (“encourage underground shopping mall and office facilities, leaving more above ground space for residential needs”), 250 negative (“caverns require very high investment and technology, but the amount of land that can be released is limited and thus it is not a desirable option”)) and 1,280 about reasons or concerns including 134 about relocation (“move water and sewage treatment to the caverns and use the vacated space for housing”), 98 about land development potential (“potential for land development is limited”),

72 about higher cost (**WS**) (“caverns take a long time and are costly”) and 53 about housing development (“using underground space for water treatment plants will spare land for public housing development”).

Of the 1,913 comments about new development areas (NDAs) in the NT, 906 were about general attitude (812 positive (**WS**) (“government should concentrate on developing the NT”), 55 negative (**WS**) (“do not develop new towns in the New Territories because it is very crowded already”) and 1,007 about reasons or concerns, including 73 about supporting infrastructure (“Government should greatly improve social support and transport in the districts.”) and 67 about the potential for development (“more NDAs in the NT could provide a major source of long-term land supply especially for housing”).

There were 1,383 comments about developing the River Trade Terminal site (RTT), including 662 about general attitude (484 positive (**WS**) (“RTT should be used to replace storage on brown field sites”), 148 negative (**WS**) (“existing under-utilisation of RTT could be related to unnecessary lease restrictions”)) and 721 about reasons and concerns (“unless the industry has fully moved to the mainland, it is not recommended to utilise the RTT land”).

2.6 Qualitative analysis of conceptual options in the PE booklet

Table 2.6 Comments about conceptual options in the PE booklet

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.03 Conceptual options in Public Engagement booklet	1312	4154	137961	30	1555	1780	6812	153604
A.3.2 Developing more areas on the periphery of country parks	578	1197	131940	10	641	1234	3892	139492
A.3.2.0 General attitude towards “Developing more areas on the periphery of country parks”	237	520	59314	5	257	591	1869	62793
A.3.2.0.1 Positive	91	216	0	3	106	246	427	1089
A.3.2.0.2 Negative	110	277	59314	2	110	313	1383	61509
A.3.2.0.3 Neutral	36	27	0	0	41	32	59	195
A.3.2.1 Reasons or concerns for “Developing more areas on the	341	677	72626	5	384	643	2023	76699

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
periphery of country parks”								
A.3.2.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	77	133	49621	0	91	89	347	50358
A.3.2.1.2a Positive	11	4	0	0	12	4	7	38
A.3.2.1.2b Negative	60	112	49030	0	50	75	312	49639
A.3.2.1.2c Neutral	6	17	591	0	29	10	28	681
A.3.2.1.14 Impact on public enjoyment value / recreational potential	34	36	13746	0	29	22	69	13936
A.3.2.1.17 Impact on next generation	6	12	4129	0	4	7	36	4194
A.3.2.1.22 There are other feasible options	10	26	3689	0	6	12	20	3763
A.3.2.1.80 No reason	60	224	1219	4	53	289	1107	2956
A.3.2.1.08 Housing development issue	24	56	0	1	39	78	81	279
A.3.2.1.19 Comments related to the Laws of Hong Kong, e.g. Country Parks Ordinance	12	11	222	0	16	7	10	278
A.3.2.1.09 Potential for land development	19	26	0	0	46	24	45	160
A.3.2.1.15 The development priority of this option	11	25	0	0	17	20	59	132
A.3.2.1.15a High priority	0	10	0	0	2	5	15	32

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.3.2.1.15b Low priority	11	15	0	0	14	15	44	99
A.3.2.1.15c Neutral	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
A.3.2.1.16 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	4	19	0	0	4	8	82	117
A.3.2.1.05 Time required to provide land	14	13	0	0	18	26	22	93
A.3.2.1.5a Take longer time	12	6	0	0	12	8	4	42
A.3.2.1.5b Take shorter time	2	7	0	0	6	17	18	50
A.3.2.1.5c Neutral	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
A.3.2.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	21	19	0	0	17	14	20	91
A.3.2.1.13 Comments about land development, e.g. To set up regulations in controlling of land development	11	11	0	0	5	8	19	54
A.3.2.1.24 Impact on Hong Kong's reputation / image / overall interests	4	6	0	0	2	1	24	37
A.3.2.1.20 Compensation mechanism	5	6	0	0	11	2	10	34
A.3.2.1.18 Stakeholders and their interests, e.g. Involving less of	2	9	0	0	4	10	9	34

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
the holders' interests								
A.3.2.1.01 Financial cost of development	6	8	0	0	3	4	11	32
A.3.2.1.1a Relative higher	4	5	0	0	1	2	9	21
A.3.2.1.1b Relative lower	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	10
A.3.2.1.1c Neutral	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.3.2.1.10 Comments about landscape and aesthetic value	3	10	0	0	0	3	14	30
A.3.2.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	2	7	0	0	5	5	11	30
A.3.2.1.11 Impact on existing infrastructure	8	5	0	0	0	8	5	26
A.3.2.1.23 To have in-depth study of the implementation of this option	4	7	0	0	4	0	3	18
A.3.2.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	1	5	0	0	6	2	3	17
A.3.2.1.21 Hong Kong still has plenty of land	2	2	0	0	3	3	7	17
A.3.2.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	1	1	0	0	1	1	9	13
A.3.8 Reclaiming part of Plover Cove Reservoir for new town development	193	639	2675	0	124	73	827	4531

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.3.8.0 General attitude towards “Reclaiming part of Plover Cove Reservoir for new town development”	86	289	820	0	47	36	401	1679
A.3.8.0.1 Positive	17	68	7	0	7	13	49	161
A.3.8.0.2 Negative	56	199	813	0	32	22	340	1462
A.3.8.0.3 Neutral	13	22	0	0	8	1	12	56
A.3.8.1 Reasons or concerns for “Reclaiming part of Plover Cove Reservoir for new town development”	107	350	1855	0	77	37	426	2852
A.3.8.1.15 Comments about the stability and reliability of the water supply in Hong Kong	41	98	813	0	23	10	88	1073
A.3.8.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	13	46	813	0	10	2	52	936
A.3.8.1.2a Positive	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	4
A.3.8.1.2b Negative	8	42	813	0	7	1	49	920
A.3.8.1.2c Neutral	3	4	0	0	2	0	3	12
A.3.8.1.80 No reason	21	106	7	0	15	16	239	404
A.3.8.1.10 Comments about landscape and aesthetic value	0	3	222	0	0	0	2	227
A.3.8.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	7	19	0	0	1	1	4	32

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.3.8.1.01 Financial cost of development	2	8	0	0	5	0	8	23
A.3.8.1.1a Relative higher	2	6	0	0	2	0	8	18
A.3.8.1.1b Relative lower	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.3.8.1.1c Neutral	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	4
A.3.8.1.14 Impact on public enjoyment value / recreational potential	1	11	0	0	3	0	8	23
A.3.8.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	6	8	0	0	4	1	3	22
A.3.8.1.09 Potential for land development	1	9	0	0	4	2	5	21
A.3.8.1.08 Housing development issue	4	4	0	0	4	1	5	18
A.3.8.1.17 There are other feasible options	1	9	0	0	1	2	0	13
A.3.8.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	5	5	0	0	0	1	2	13
A.3.8.1.16 The development priority of this option	0	7	0	0	2	1	2	12
A.3.8.1.16b Low priority	0	7	0	0	2	1	2	12
A.3.8.1.11 Impact on existing infrastructure	4	5	0	0	1	0	1	11

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.3.8.1.05 Time required to provide land	0	5	0	0	4	0	2	11
A.3.8.1.5a Take longer time	0	3	0	0	3	0	2	8
A.3.8.1.5b Take shorter time	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
A.3.8.1.5c Neutral	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
A.3.8.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
A.3.8.1.13 To set up regulations in controlling of land development	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
A.3.4 Topside development of existing transport infrastructure	82	324	3066	2	115	83	405	4077
A.3.4.0 General attitude towards “Topside development of existing transport infrastructure”	36	151	1533	1	50	39	195	2005
A.3.4.0.1 Positive	30	131	1533	1	40	36	164	1935
A.3.4.0.2 Negative	1	8	0	0	3	1	23	36
A.3.4.0.3 Neutral	5	12	0	0	7	2	8	34
A.3.4.1 Reasons or concerns for “Topside development of existing transport infrastructure”	46	173	1533	1	65	44	210	2072
A.3.4.1.80 No reason	16	76	1533	1	13	16	115	1770

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.3.4.1.08 Housing development issue	5	33	0	0	15	17	56	126
A.3.4.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	9	7	0	0	11	4	7	38
A.3.4.1.09 Potential for land development	5	10	0	0	5	4	8	32
A.3.4.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	4	14	0	0	3	0	3	24
A.3.4.1.01 Financial cost of development	1	6	0	0	4	0	4	15
A.3.4.1.1a Relative higher	0	1	0	0	2	0	4	7
A.3.4.1.1b Relative lower	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	5
A.3.4.1.1c Neutral	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
A.3.4.1.05 Time required to provide land	2	4	0	0	3	3	1	13
A.3.4.1.5a Take longer time	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	5
A.3.4.1.5b Take shorter time	1	2	0	0	1	3	0	7
A.3.4.1.5c Neutral	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.3.4.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	2	2	0	0	2	0	5	11
A.3.4.1.2a Positive	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.3.4.1.2b Negative	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5
A.3.4.1.2c Neutral	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4
A.3.4.1.10 Comments about urban environment	1	5	0	0	1	0	3	10
A.3.4.1.11 Comments about road network	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	8
A.3.4.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	1	0	0	0	4	0	3	8
A.3.4.1.14 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	0	4	0	0	2	0	1	7
A.3.4.1.12 The development priority of this option	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	4
A.3.4.1.12a High priority	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	4
A.3.4.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
A.3.4.1.13 Concerns about the fairness and transparency for the government	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
A.3.4.1.90 Others	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.3.3 Increasing development intensity of “Village Type Development zones”	150	459	90	8	162	131	787	1787
A.3.3.0 General attitude towards Increasing development intensity of “Village Type	64	203	45	4	62	59	366	803

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
Development zones”								
A.3.3.0.1 Positive	46	160	45	4	46	54	309	664
A.3.3.0.2 Negative	6	33	0	0	3	2	27	71
A.3.3.0.3 Neutral	12	10	0	0	13	3	30	68
A.3.3.1 Reasons or concerns for Increasing development intensity of “Village Type Development zones”	86	256	45	4	100	72	421	984
A.3.3.1.80 No reason	21	77	45	3	6	14	151	317
A.3.3.1.08 Housing development issue	14	54	0	1	17	15	107	208
A.3.3.1.12 Comments about Small House Policy	13	49	0	0	20	23	71	176
A.3.3.1.11 Comments about land resumption and development approaches	7	21	0	0	18	5	34	85
A.3.3.1.09 Potential for land development	5	13	0	0	14	10	22	64
A.3.3.1.10 Rural land uses / rural environment	7	16	0	0	6	1	12	42
A.3.3.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	7	10	0	0	7	3	6	33
A.3.3.1.04 Construction /	1	4	0	0	5	1	0	11

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
engineering and technical issue								
A.3.3.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	3	2	0	0	0	0	4	9
A.3.3.1.2b Negative	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5
A.3.3.1.2c Neutral	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	4
A.3.3.1.05 Time required to provide land	4	1	0	0	1	0	2	8
A.3.3.1.5a Take longer time	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
A.3.3.1.5b Take shorter time	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
A.3.3.1.5c Neutral	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
A.3.3.1.13 The development priority of this option	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	7
A.3.3.1.13a High priority	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5
A.3.3.1.13b Low priority	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
A.3.3.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	6
A.3.3.1.14 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	6
A.3.3.1.01 Financial cost of development	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	6
A.3.3.1.1a Relative higher	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
A.3.3.1.1c Neutral	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.3.3.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	4
A.3.3.1.16 Concerns about the fairness and transparency for the government	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
A.3.3.1.15 Comments about the boundary of “Village Type Development zones”	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.3.6 Relocation of Kwai Tsing Container Terminals	130	650	58	2	243	108	369	1560
A.3.6.0 General attitude towards “Relocation of Kwai Tsing Container Terminals”	53	276	29	1	90	47	174	670
A.3.6.0.1 Positive	35	188	29	1	60	32	118	463
A.3.6.0.2 Negative	8	55	0	0	14	9	47	133
A.3.6.0.3 Neutral	10	33	0	0	16	6	9	74
A.3.6.1 Reasons or concerns for “Relocation of Kwai Tsing Container Terminals”	77	374	29	1	153	61	195	890
A.3.6.1.80 No reason	13	97	29	0	10	19	94	262
A.3.6.1.14 Comments about location to relocate the terminals	19	62	0	0	26	5	27	139
A.3.6.1.03 Economic considerations /	9	42	0	0	26	5	16	98

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
impact on some industries								
A.3.6.1.09 Potential for land development	4	28	0	0	26	4	9	71
A.3.6.1.08 Housing development issue	2	24	0	1	19	6	15	67
A.3.6.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	4	28	0	0	8	0	6	46
A.3.6.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	3	16	0	0	5	9	3	36
A.3.6.1.2a Positive	2	2	0	0	3	2	0	9
A.3.6.1.2b Negative	1	10	0	0	0	7	1	19
A.3.6.1.2c Neutral	0	4	0	0	2	0	2	8
A.3.6.1.11 Comments about terminal operations	7	15	0	0	9	0	5	36
A.3.6.1.01 Financial cost of development	4	18	0	0	4	2	6	34
A.3.6.1.1a Relative higher	4	15	0	0	2	1	5	27
A.3.6.1.1c Neutral	0	3	0	0	2	1	1	7
A.3.6.1.05 Time required to provide land	3	11	0	0	7	2	2	25
A.3.6.1.5a Take longer time	2	9	0	0	3	1	1	16

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.3.6.1.5b Take shorter time	1	2	0	0	2	1	1	7
A.3.6.1.5c Neutral	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
A.3.6.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	1	10	0	0	5	5	2	23
A.3.6.1.13 The development priority of this option	3	9	0	0	1	0	3	16
A.3.6.1.13a High priority	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	6
A.3.6.1.13b Low priority	2	6	0	0	1	0	0	9
A.3.6.1.13c Neutral	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.3.6.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	3	6	0	0	1	4	2	16
A.3.6.1.12 Land resumption and compensation	2	6	0	0	5	0	3	16
A.3.6.1.15 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
A.3.6.1.10 Comments about urban environment	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
A.3.6.1.90 Others	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.3.7 Topside development of Kwai Tsing Container Terminals	118	459	58	2	192	114	250	1193
A.3.7.0 General attitude towards “Topside development of Kwai Tsing	47	196	29	1	74	54	121	522

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
Container Terminals”								
A.3.7.0.1 Positive	24	102	29	1	28	17	45	246
A.3.7.0.2 Negative	15	67	0	0	24	29	69	204
A.3.7.0.3 Neutral	8	27	0	0	22	8	7	72
A.3.7.1 Reasons or concerns for “Topside development of Kwai Tsing Container Terminals”	71	263	29	1	118	60	129	671
A.3.7.1.80 No reason	16	81	29	1	12	13	77	229
A.3.7.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	9	29	0	0	14	4	10	66
A.3.7.1.2a Positive	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
A.3.7.1.2b Negative	9	23	0	0	12	4	9	57
A.3.7.1.2c Neutral	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	7
A.3.7.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	6	21	0	0	15	11	3	56
A.3.7.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	6	18	0	0	9	4	13	50
A.3.7.1.08 Housing development issue	8	16	0	0	13	7	4	48
A.3.7.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	8	19	0	0	3	4	6	40

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.3.7.1.01 Financial cost of development	1	17	0	0	6	4	7	35
A.3.7.1.1a Relative higher	1	16	0	0	4	4	5	30
A.3.7.1.1c Neutral	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	5
A.3.7.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	4	17	0	0	9	1	1	32
A.3.7.1.11 Comments about terminal operations	1	12	0	0	8	3	4	28
A.3.7.1.05 Time required to provide land	2	5	0	0	8	4	2	21
A.3.7.1.5a Take longer time	1	5	0	0	4	2	2	14
A.3.7.1.5b Take shorter time	1	0	0	0	3	2	0	6
A.3.7.1.5c Neutral	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
A.3.7.1.09 Potential for land development	2	8	0	0	5	2	2	19
A.3.7.1.12 Land resumption and compensation	1	3	0	0	8	1	0	13
A.3.7.1.13 The development priority of this option	3	7	0	0	1	0	0	11
A.3.7.1.13a High priority	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	5
A.3.7.1.13b Low priority	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	6
A.3.7.1.10 Comments about	1	7	0	0	2	1	0	11

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
urban environment								
A.3.7.1.14 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	2	0	0	0	5	1	0	8
A.3.7.1.15 Comments about relocate other facilities	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
A.3.7.1.90 Others	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.3.5 Utilising the development potential of public utilities sites	31	185	74	2	42	18	166	518
A.3.5.0 General attitude towards “Utilising the development potential of public utilities sites”	15	86	37	1	18	9	82	248
A.3.5.0.1 Positive	13	70	37	1	13	7	64	205
A.3.5.0.2 Negative	1	8	0	0	1	2	15	27
A.3.5.0.3 Neutral	1	8	0	0	4	0	3	16
A.3.5.1 Reasons or concerns for “Utilising the development potential of public utilities sites”	16	99	37	1	24	9	84	270
A.3.5.1.80 No reason	10	54	37	1	4	5	52	163
A.3.5.1.08 Housing development issue	2	8	0	0	7	1	13	31
A.3.5.1.09 Potential for land development	0	8	0	0	5	2	5	20
A.3.5.1.11 Comments about relocate OR accommodate	0	4	0	0	2	0	7	13

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
public utilities facilities								
A.3.5.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	0	5	0	0	3	0	2	10
A.3.5.1.05 Time required to provide land	1	2	0	0	1	0	2	6
A.3.5.1.5a Take longer time	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
A.3.5.1.5b Take shorter time	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
A.3.5.1.02 Conservation / environmental impact	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
A.3.5.1.2a Positive	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.3.5.1.2b Negative	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
A.3.5.1.2c Neutral	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
A.3.5.1.12 The development priority of this option	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	5
A.3.5.1.12a High priority	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4
A.3.5.1.12b Low priority	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.3.5.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5
A.3.5.1.01 Financial cost of development	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	4
A.3.5.1.1a Relative higher	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	4

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.3.5.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3
A.3.5.1.13 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
A.3.5.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
A.3.5.1.10 Comments about urban environment	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.3.1 Developing the River Trade Terminal site and its surroundings in the long term	30	241	0	4	36	19	116	446
A.3.1.0 General attitude towards “Developing the River Trade Terminal site and its surroundings in the long term”	13	115	0	2	14	9	57	210
A.3.1.0.1 Positive	9	95	0	2	8	3	35	152
A.3.1.0.2 Negative	2	14	0	0	1	5	19	41
A.3.1.0.3 Neutral	2	6	0	0	5	1	3	17
A.3.1.1 Reasons or concerns for “Developing the River Trade Terminal site and its surroundings in the long term”	17	126	0	2	22	10	59	236
A.3.1.1.80 No reason	6	84	0	2	1	5	46	144
A.3.1.1.06 Supporting infrastructural facilities /	1	7	0	0	3	3	1	15

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
community facilities								
A.3.1.1.08 Housing development issue	1	5	0	0	2	1	3	12
A.3.1.1.03 Economic considerations / impact on some industries	3	6	0	0	3	0	0	12
A.3.1.1.10 Comments about release lands from other areas	1	5	0	0	3	0	1	10
A.3.1.1.09 Potential for land development	0	6	0	0	2	1	1	10
A.3.1.1.04 Construction / engineering and technical issue	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	6
A.3.1.1.11 Comments about rationalise the land uses along the entire western coastal area of Tuen Mun	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	4
A.3.1.1.12 The development priority of this option	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
A.3.1.1.12a High priority	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
A.3.1.1.12b Low priority	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
A.3.1.1.13 Comments about relocate River Trade Terminal site	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4
A.3.1.1.02 Conservation /	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	4

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
environmental impact								
A.3.1.1.2b Negative	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
A.3.1.1.2c Neutral	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
A.3.1.1.01 Financial cost of development	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
A.3.1.1.1a Relative higher	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
A.3.1.1.05 Time required to provide land	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3
A.3.1.1.5a Take longer time	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
A.3.1.1.5c Neutral	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
A.3.1.1.07 Impact on communities / residents	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
A.3.1.1.14 Comments about living quality, e.g. liveability	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
A.3.1.1.90 Others	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

As seen in Table 2.6, there were 153,604 comments about the conceptual options in the PE document, including 139,492 about additional peripheral areas of country parks, 4,531 about reclaiming part of Plover Cove reservoir, 4,077 about topside development of existing transport infrastructure, 1,787 about increased intensity of village development zones, 1,560 about relocating the container terminals, 1,193 about topside development of the container terminals, 518 about public utilities sites and 446 about developing the River Trade Terminal site and its surroundings.

Of the 139,492 comments about additional peripheral areas of country parks, 62,793 were about general attitude (1,089 positive (“development of the periphery areas of country parks is worthwhile, residents can enjoy the fresh air from country park”), 61,509 negative (**SCP**) (“oppose development of the periphery of the parks”)) and 76,699 about reasons or concerns, including 49,369 about the negative conservation/environmental impact (**SCP**) (“natural environment should not be destroyed”), 13,936 about the impact on recreational potential

(SCP) (“will destroy the stunning beauty of the city and ruin Hong Kongers way of life and leisure/stress release activities”), 4,194 about the impact on the next generation (SCP) (“preserve for the next generation to enjoy”), 3,763 about other feasible options (SCP) (“not necessary with so many alternatives”), 279 about housing development (“use periphery of country park to build 300,000 flats over next 20 years”), 278 about the Country Park Ordinance (SCP) (“a bad precedent will be set, contrary to the legislative intention of the Country Parks Ordinance”), 160 about land development potential (“most effective in providing more land for development”), 132 about development priority (32 high (“can be speeded up”) and 99 low (“should be the last resort”)), 117 about liveability (“Hong Kong would no longer be a high living quality city”), 93 about time to provide land (42 longer (“will take at least 20 years to materialise”) and 50 shorter (“development of periphery of Country Parks is the fastest”)), 91 about supporting infrastructure (“build low-density facilities which would not bring much traffic at the country parks to reduce damage to nature”) and 54 about development regulations (“government can promise that they will only be used for the construction of subsidized housing and public facilities”).

Of the 4,531 comments about reclaiming part of Plover Cove reservoir, 1,679 were about general attitude (161 positive (“reclaim land from the reservoir is a good option”), 1,462 negative (SCP) (“oppose because the water is a necessity”)) and 2,852 were about reasons or concerns, including 1,073 about the reliability of the water supply (SCP) (“Reservoirs are a contingency water supply, should never be used for development”) and 920 about negative conservation/environmental impact (SCP) (“will damage the environment and very popular local tourist area”) and 227 about aesthetic value (SCP) (“This is beautiful countryside and very popular picnic site”).

Of the 4,077 comments about topside development of existing transport infrastructure, 2,005 were about general attitude (1,935 positive (SCP) (“Build on top of existing highways, road systems, public utility buildings, car parks, railway stations like New York”), 36 negative (“Not support, long negotiation period, not natural habitation”)) and 2,072 about reasons or concerns, including 126 about housing development (“consider housing construction with advanced engineering technology”).

Of the 1,787 comments about increased intensity of village development zones, 803 were about general attitude (664 positive (“village type development zone helps to improve the and planning, traffic and sewage treatment in the villages”), 71 negative (“difficult to develop at a high density, and cost/benefit is disproportionate”)) and 984 about reasons or concerns, including 208 about housing development (“study Village type development zone for housing development as soon as possible”), 176 about the Small House Policy (“set the number of years to abolish the Small House policy and convert the three-storey small houses into multi-storey buildings”), 85 about land resumption approaches (“Compensate the small house concessionary rights” with public housing units to vacate land”) and 64 about land development potential (“can provide a large amount of land for housing”).

Of the 1,560 comments about relocating the container terminals, 670 were about general attitude (463 positive (“relocation is more practical than topside development above the terminal”), 133 negative (“not recommended because of the complexity of the project and risk to increase the cost of freight transport,”)) and 890 about reasons or concerns including

139 about the location for the relocation (“Container Terminal relocated to Lantau Island”), 98 about economic impact (“relocation of the container terminal can enhance the efficiency”), 71 about land development potential (“potential to release up to 500 hectares”) and 67 about housing development (“ideal location for supplying land to solve the housing issue”).

Of the 1,193 comments about topside development of the container terminals, 522 were about general attitude (246 positive (“Support building houses on the topside of the container terminal”), 204 negative (“not possible to achieve a mutually beneficial win-win situation”)) and 671 about reasons or concerns, including 57 about negative environmental impact (“serious air, noise and light pollution and also adverse health effects on the working people”), 56 about construction issues (“impose construction and engineering difficulty building on the topside of the container terminal”) and 50 about economic impact (“lose the chance to modernize operations if we use the topside of existing terminal for development”).

Of the 518 comments about development potential of public utilities sites, 248 were about general attitude (205 positive (“Support to release the potential land value of the public utility facilities”), 27 negative (“should not be pursued”)) and 270 were about reasons or concerns (“provide less housing and would increase the local living density”).

There were 446 comments about developing the River Trade Terminal site (RTT) and its surroundings in the long term, including 210 about general attitude (152 positive (**WS**) (“land utilization rate is only 20%, so the land should be better utilized for housing”), 41 negative (“cannot support”)) and 236 about reasons or concerns (**WS**) (“RTT provides low cost transportation service from Mainland China/Macau and Hong Kong”).

2.7 Qualitative analysis of additional land supply options

Table 2.7 Comments about options other than the ones proposed in the PE document

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.04 Other suggested options	382	1208	5905	1	393	2005	5516	15410
A.04a Development of type of land	141	405	5882	0	132	459	1979	8998
A.4a.001 Military land	67	126	3776	0	61	184	865	5079
A.4a.1.1 Positive	64	123	3776	0	58	182	864	5067
A.4a.1.2 Negative	3	3	0	0	3	2	1	12
A.4a.005 Development of areas along railways	2	2	1515	0	1	4	29	1553
A.4a.004 Other country parks areas other than the two options about the periphery of country parks	34	164	0	0	44	196	762	1200
A.4a.4.1 Positive	12	42	0	0	11	56	201	322

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.4a.4.2 Negative	12	116	0	0	26	134	536	824
A.4a.4.3 Neutral	10	6	0	0	7	6	25	54
A.4a.006 Rural area OR green belt OR deserted villages - no specific area	22	48	591	0	15	29	144	849
A.4a.6.1 Positive	14	31	0	0	13	23	97	178
A.4a.6.1 Negative	6	17	591	0	2	5	34	655
A.4a.6.1 Neutral	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	16
A.4a.007 Floating development (e.g. Floating housing, floating city)	3	23	0	0	8	8	55	97
A.4a.003 Other water catchment areas other than Plover Cove Reservoir	7	13	0	0	1	14	50	85
A.4a.3.1 Positive	3	8	0	0	0	7	12	30
A.4a.3.2 Negative	4	5	0	0	1	7	36	53
A.4a.3.3 Neutral	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
A.4a.002 Landfill sites, excluding Tseung Kwan O Area 137	5	22	0	0	0	6	40	73
A.4a.009 Development of restricted areas	1	4	0	0	2	6	18	31
A.4a.008 Development of underwater city	0	2	0	0	0	10	10	22
A.4a.010 Development of coastal areas	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	7
A.4a.011 Development of surrounding areas of reservoirs	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
A.04b Other suggested reclamation site	62	332	23	0	105	953	1222	2697
A.4b.0c Reclamation sites -- New Territories	17	108	23	0	33	163	288	632
A.4b.c03 Near-shore reclamation at Tolo Harbour area	6	32	0	0	14	81	90	223
A.4b.c3.1 Positive	5	32	0	0	14	81	90	222
A.4b.c3.2 Negative	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.4b.c01 Tseung Kwan O / Junk Bay	3	18	0	0	5	22	74	122
A.4b.c11 Tuen Mun	0	12	0	0	3	15	18	48
A.4b.c08 Sai Kung	1	5	0	0	2	3	29	40
A.4b.c10 Castle Peak Bay	1	7	23	0	0	0	5	36
A.4b.c02 Deep Bay / Shenzhen Bay	1	3	0	0	2	15	12	33
A.4b.c04 From Tseung Kwan O to Tung Lung Chau	1	5	0	0	1	1	18	26
A.4b.c13 Tsing Yi	1	3	0	0	2	5	8	19
A.4b.c05 New Territories West	0	2	0	0	3	4	8	17
A.4b.c06 Shing Mun River	0	2	0	0	0	4	8	14
A.4b.c07 Areas around Tai Lam / Siu Lam / Pillar Point / Butterfly Beach	0	4	0	0	0	3	2	9
A.4b.c09 Tuen Mun Ferry Pier	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	6
A.4b.c14 Sham Tseng	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	6
A.4b.c16 From Tsing Yi to Lantau Island	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	6
A.4b.c15 Ma Wan	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	5
A.4b.c12 Lau Fau Shan	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	5
A.4b.c17 From Ma Wan to Lantau Island	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	5
A.4b.c18 Sha Tau Kok Hoi	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	5
A.4b.c.20 Areas near Plover Cove Reservoir	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5
A.4b.c19 Lam Tsuen River	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
A.4b.0e Reclamation sites at Victoria Harbour	11	36	0	0	11	349	224	631
A.4b.e1 Positive	6	27	0	0	8	320	189	550
A.4b.e2 Negative	5	9	0	0	3	29	35	81

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.4b.0d Reclamation sites-- Outlying Islands	8	59	0	0	15	110	275	467
A.4b.0a Reclamation sites-- Hong Kong Island	13	46	0	0	12	214	163	448
A.4b.a02 Southern areas of Hong Kong Island, e.g. Cyberport, Ap Lei Chau	4	23	0	0	4	161	90	282
A.4b.a03 From Southern areas of Hong Kong Island to Lamma Island / East Lamma Channel	3	13	0	0	2	33	38	89
A.4b.a05 Eastern areas of Hong Kong Island, e.g. Shau Kei Wan	2	4	0	0	1	12	24	43
A.4b.a01 Shek O and Big Wave Bay	3	3	0	0	1	3	5	15
A.4b.a04 Tathong Channel	1	3	0	0	4	1	5	14
A.4b.a06 From Stanley to Po Toi Island	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	5
A.4b.0g No specific location	7	49	0	0	26	73	136	291
A.4b.0f Reclamation sites-- Other areas	6	34	0	0	8	44	136	228
A.4b.f02 Other artificial Islands	3	8	0	0	4	23	96	134
A.4b.f03 Offshore reclamation	0	12	0	0	0	9	13	34
A.4b.f04 Typhoon shelters	1	9	0	0	2	5	15	32
A.4b.f07 Habitats of Chinese white dolphins	2	2	0	0	2	1	4	11
A.4b.f7.2 Negative	2	2	0	0	2	1	4	11
A.4b.f05 From Tseung Kwan O to Chai Wan	0	3	0	0	0	3	1	7
A.4b.f06 Areas along railways	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
A.4b.f08 Rivers	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.4b.f01 Periphery of Marine Parks	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
A.04c Development of other specific locations	117	308	0	0	115	275	1719	2534
A.4c.0e Development locations -- Other areas	54	88	0	0	53	142	735	1072
A.4c.e01 Request land currently in Mainland for development	54	88	0	0	53	142	735	1072
A.4c.0d Development locations -- Outlying Islands, excluding reclamation at Outlying Islands	27	88	0	0	33	43	618	809
A.4c.d1 Lantau Island	19	30	0	0	28	29	315	421
A.4c.d2 Other outlying islands	8	58	0	0	5	14	303	388
A.4c.0c Development locations -- New Territories	31	112	0	0	29	64	298	534
A.4c.c02 Development of border areas	11	19	0	0	5	13	117	165
A.4c.c07 Development of New Territories North (excluding current or proposed NDAs / no specific locations)	4	14	0	0	3	7	37	65
A.4c.c05 Development of Tuen Mun	3	14	0	0	3	6	22	48
A.4c.c09 Development of New Territories West	3	9	0	0	2	6	21	41
A.4c.c11 Development of surrounding areas of Tolo Harbour	1	7	0	0	1	3	13	25
A.4c.c06 Development of Sai Kung	0	5	0	0	0	1	18	24
A.4c.c17 Tsing Yi	0	5	0	0	1	5	13	24

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.4c.c10 Development of New Territories East	2	4	0	0	1	5	7	19
A.4c.c19 Shatin	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	19
A.4c.c20 Development of Tso and Tong Land	3	7	0	0	6	0	3	19
A.4c.c18 Tsueng Kwan O	0	6	0	0	1	1	9	17
A.4c.c01 Development of Nam Sang Wai	1	1	0	0	0	5	4	11
A.4c.c1.1 Positive	1	1	0	0	0	5	3	10
A.4c.c1.2 Negative	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
A.4c.c12 Development of Tsuen Wan District	0	7	0	0	0	1	3	11
A.4c.c08 Development of Kam Tin	1	2	0	0	1	3	3	10
A.4c.c03 Development of Ma Wan	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	9
A.4c.c13 Development the land of Kwai Tsing Container Terminals	1	4	0	0	2	0	2	9
A.4c.c14 Development of Lau Fau Shan	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	7
A.4c.c15 Kwai Chung	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	6
A.4c.c04 Development of Shap Sze Heung	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	5
A.4c.0a Development locations -- Hong Kong Island	3	10	0	0	0	17	51	81
A.4c.a05 Southern areas of Hong Kong Island	3	6	0	0	0	6	27	42
A.4c.a01 Development of Peak	0	1	0	0	0	7	14	22
A.4c.a04 Development of	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	8

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
Western areas of Hong Kong Island								
A.4c.a03 Development of Eastern areas of Hong Kong Island, e.g. Shau Kei Wan	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6
A.4c.a02 Development of Red Hill	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
A.4c.a06 Ex-Shek O Quarry	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.4c.0b Development locations -- Kowloon	2	10	0	0	0	9	17	38
A.4c.b02 Re-development of West Kowloon Cultural District	0	2	0	0	0	5	5	12
A.4c.b01 Development of Stonecutters Island	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	9
A.4c.b03 Development of area near Old Kai Tak Airport, e.g. Kowloon Tong, Kowloon City	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	6
A.4c.b08 Development of Eastern areas of Kowloon	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	5
A.4c.b06 Development of Western areas of Kowloon	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
A.4c.b04 Development of Kowloon Peak	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
A.4c.b07 Cha Kwo Ling Village	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.4c.b05 Development of Tsz Wan Shan	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.4.014 Relocation	24	73	0	0	19	168	280	564
A.4.14.01 Relocation of / demolition of theme parks and race courses	2	26	0	0	4	115	101	248

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.4.14.04 Relocation of prisons	11	15	0	0	12	11	87	136
A.4.14.09 Relocation of universities	3	8	0	0	0	25	32	68
A.4.14.05 Relocation of cemeteries OR crematoria	2	6	0	0	0	10	37	55
A.4.14.08 Relocation of Hong Kong International Airport	0	5	0	0	0	3	4	12
A.4.14.06 Relocation of / demolition of existing transport infrastructure	4	4	0	0	1	0	2	11
A.4.14.02 Relocation of Oil Depot	0	2	0	0	1	1	6	10
A.4.14.10 Relocation of / demolition of Kai Tak Cruise Terminal	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	10
A.4.14.03 Relocation of Dock	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5
A.4.14.07 Relocation of Tuen Mun Public Cargo Working Area	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
A.4.14.11 Power station	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
A.4.14.12 Facilities of Environmental Protection Industry at Tuen Mun	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
A.4.14.13 Relocation of primary or secondary schools	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.4.14.14 Relocation of Yau Ma Tei Wholesale Fruit Market	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.4.14.15 Relocation of Hong Kong Science Park	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.4.017 Levelling of mountains	11	43	0	0	11	106	185	356
A.4.17.80 No specific location	11	36	0	0	11	85	179	322
A.4.17.10 Victoria Peak	0	2	0	0	0	13	1	16
A.4.17.11 Tai Mo Shan	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	5
A.4.17.09 Kowloon Peak	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	5

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.4.17.13 Lion Rock	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4
A.4.17.05 Pat Sin Leng	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
A.4.17.12 From Tai Sheung Tok to Razor Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
A.4.007 Topside development	26	45	0	1	11	41	131	255
A.4.7.01 Topside development of existing building	4	11	0	0	2	7	42	66
A.4.7.11 Topside development of public facilities e.g. fire station, municipal services building, library	8	13	0	1	1	1	28	52
A.4.7.07 Topside development of sites under Private Recreational Leases / Land-extensive recreational facilities	6	6	0	0	4	7	20	43
A.4.7.04 Topside development of river	1	7	0	0	2	2	7	19
A.4.7.05 Topside development of cemeteries	0	0	0	0	0	13	2	15
A.4.7.09 Topside development of non-vacant primary or secondary school premises	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	13
A.4.7.02 Topside development of typhoon shelters	1	2	0	0	0	1	7	11
A.4.7.03 Topside development of reservoir	2	1	0	0	0	0	7	10
A.4.7.12 Topside development of the sea, e.g. Victoria Harbour	1	1	0	0	1	4	3	10
A.4.7.06 Topside development of theme parks and race courses	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	7
A.4.7.10 Topside development of brownfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.4.7.08 Topside development of Hong Kong International Airport	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
A.4.7.13 Topside development of Wholesale Market	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
A.4.900 Other options	1	2	0	0	0	3	0	6

Of these 15,410 comments about land supply options other than the ones proposed in the PE document, shown in detail in Table 2.7, 8,998 comments were about developing types of land, 2,697 were about other reclamation sites, 2,534 were about specific locations not covered in the PE booklet, 564 were about relocation, 356 about levelling of mountains and 255 about other topside development.

Of the 8,998 comments about developing types of land, 5,079 were about military land (**SCP**) (all but 12 negative) ("Free up some of its military-controlled land for Hong Kong housing"), 1,553 were about developments along railways (**SCP**) ("Make use of space above and near the MTR railway"), 1,200 were about other country park areas (322 positive ("Use one-third of country park land for subsidised housing"), 824 negative ("Country parks and their peripheries, as well as land reclamation should never be an option for development")), 849 about unspecified rural areas (178 positive ("Expand the Urban area by developing the park/green areas nearby"), 655 negative (**SCP**) ("Preserve the green belts, agricultural sites and villages for the next generation")), 97 about floating developments ("Adopt the "floating city" concept and develop temporary housing on pontoons using containers"), 85 about water catchment areas other than Plover Cove (30 positive ("Lower Shing Mun Reservoir, which is not part of the country parks, can be filled for residential development"), 53 negative ("Do not reclaim any reservoirs in Hong Kong")) and 73 about other landfill sites ("use filled landfill sites for housing development").

Of the 2,697 comments about other reclamation sites, they included 223 in Tolo harbour ("Tolo Harbor is shallow, infrastructure is nearby and ready for extension"), 122 in Tseung Kwan O ("Reclaim Junk Bay in large scale"), 631 about locations in Victoria harbour (550 positive (**SNM**) ("Reclaim from sea between Green Island and HK Island") and 81 negative ("No reclamation around the areas protected by the Harbour Ordinance")), 467 about reclamation in outlying islands (**VCF**) ("Can consider developing outlying islands and their coastline"), 282 comments about reclamation in southern areas of Hong Kong Island (**SNM**) ("Reclaim land near Apleichau"), 89 in Hong Kong Island to the West ("Reclaim land from Bel Air to Lamma Island") and 134 comments about other artificial islands (**VCF**) ("Build artificial island at Tolo harbour").

Of the 2,534 comments about specific locations not covered in the PE booklet, 1,072 were about requesting land currently in the Mainland for development (**VCF**) ("Lease land from Shenzhen"), 809 about locations in Outlying islands (other than reclamation) (**VCF**) ("Fully

utilize the land on Lantau Island”), 165 about border areas (**VCF**) (“Develop unused land of Shenzhen river border areas”) and 65 about NT North beyond the locations already proposed (**VCF**) (“Develop northern New Territories first”).

Of the 564 comments about relocation, 248 were about relocation of theme parks or race courses (“Build public housing at the two race courses”), 136 about relocation of prisons (“Relocate the prisons to outlying islands”), 68 about relocation of universities (“Retrieve the land occupied by the university dormitories”) and 55 about relocation of cemeteries or crematoria (“Retrieve all cemeteries for housing”).

Of the 356 comments about levelling of mountains, 322 mentioned no specific location (**VCF**) (“level the hills to reclaim the sea will have double benefit: hills being levelled will yield flat land and to add areas for the sea being reclaimed”).

Of the 255 comments about other topside development, 66 mentioned existing buildings (“Build temporary housing on top of carparks”) and 52 mentioned public facilities (“municipal buildings can be rebuilt with subsidised housing on top and wet market below”).

2.8 Qualitative analysis of opinions about land reserve

Table 2.8 Comments about land reserve

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.05 Opinion about land reserve	37	158	0	1	78	18	43	335
A.5.1 Whether agree Hong Kong need additional land to build a land reserve	37	158	0	1	78	18	43	335
A.5.1.1 Agree	29	64	0	1	65	10	38	207
A.5.1.2 Disagree	1	89	0	0	2	7	4	103
A.5.1.3 Neutral	7	5	0	0	11	1	1	25

Table 2.8 shows only 335 comments about land reserve, of which 207 agreed (“We need to build a land reserve”) and 103 disagreed (**WS**) (“I disagree that there is a need for a land bank, it would not be the most efficient or economical way of achieving the goal”).

2.9 Qualitative analysis of opinions about current strategy and initiatives

Table 2.9 Comments about current land supply strategy and initiatives

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.06. Opinion about current land supply strategy and ongoing initiatives	490	1067	7115	2	505	527	4098	13804
A.6.03 Better use of sites under short-term tenancy, temporary government land allocation and vacant government sites	67	194	4085	1	72	78	511	5008
A.6.3.1 Rate this ongoing initiative positively	3	8	0	0	8	0	33	52
A.6.3.2 Rate this ongoing initiative negatively	4	2	0	0	5	7	14	32
A.6.3.3 Further suggestion	60	184	4085	1	59	71	464	4924
A.6.07 Urban renewal	116	283	1666	0	112	172	1379	3728
A.6.7.1 Rate this ongoing initiative positively	3	11	0	0	18	18	87	137
A.6.7.2 Rate this ongoing initiative negatively	20	8	0	0	11	22	19	80
A.6.7.3 Further suggestion	93	264	1666	0	83	132	1273	3511
A.6.10 Other medium-to-long term projects	29	73	995	0	43	24	36	1200
A.6.10.1 Kwu Tung North and Fanling North NDAs	8	23	889	0	14	10	19	963
A.6.10.5 Railway Property Developments - Potential Projects in Medium-to-Long Term, including Pat Heung Maintenance Centre and Siu Ho Wan Depot	3	3	106	0	5	1	1	119
A.6.10.3 Hung Shui Kiu NDA	11	22	0	0	13	3	8	57
A.6.10.4 Yuen Long South Development	3	16	0	0	6	3	4	32

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.6.10.2 Tung Chung New Town Extension	4	9	0	0	5	7	3	28
A.6.10.6 Topside Development at the Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities Island of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
A.6.02 Increasing development intensity	65	130	0	1	73	38	719	1026
A.6.2.1 Rate this ongoing initiative positively	4	13	0	0	4	6	30	57
A.6.2.2 Rate this ongoing initiative negatively	3	3	0	0	1	0	8	15
A.6.2.3 Further suggestion	58	114	0	1	68	32	681	954
A.6.05 Better use of Government, Institution or Community sites	57	95	110	0	27	142	476	907
A.6.5.1 Rate this ongoing initiative positively	0	2	0	0	5	0	18	25
A.6.5.2 Rate this ongoing initiative negatively	2	1	110	0	3	5	4	125
A.6.5.3 Further suggestion	55	92	0	0	19	137	454	757
A.6.06 Better use of industrial buildings	76	126	0	0	34	27	490	753
A.6.6.1 Rate this ongoing initiative positively	2	4	0	0	7	0	44	57
A.6.6.2 Rate this ongoing initiative negatively	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	7
A.6.6.3 Further suggestion	73	121	0	0	26	25	444	689
A.6.04 Better use of vacant school premises	40	68	234	0	36	29	264	671
A.6.4.1 Rate this ongoing initiative positively	0	0	0	0	2	0	28	30

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.6.4.2 Rate this ongoing initiative negatively	1	3	0	0	3	5	2	14
A.6.4.3 Further suggestion	39	65	234	0	31	24	234	627
A.6.08 Reviewing and streamlining Development control procedures	28	49	0	0	66	0	86	229
A.6.8.1 Rate this ongoing initiative positively	1	3	0	0	5	0	0	9
A.6.8.2 Rate this ongoing initiative negatively	6	5	0	0	17	0	20	48
A.6.8.3 Further suggestion	21	41	0	0	44	0	66	172
A.6.01 Land use review, including Ex-Cha Kwo Ling Kaolin Mine Site, Anderson Road Quarry Site and Kam Tin South Public Housing Development	8	28	25	0	33	6	78	178
A.6.1.1 Rate this ongoing initiative positively	0	2	0	0	4	1	2	9
A.6.1.2 Rate this ongoing initiative negatively	1	1	0	0	9	2	4	17
A.6.1.3 Further suggestion	7	25	25	0	20	3	72	152
A.6.09 Other short-to-medium term projects	2	19	0	0	7	11	49	88
A.6.9.01 Kai Tak Development	2	15	0	0	6	11	48	82
A.6.9.09 Energizing Kowloon East	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
A.6.9.08 Ex-Lamma Quarry Site	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.6.9.07 Diamond Hill Comprehensive Development Area Site	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
A.6.9.10 New Central Harbourfront	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.6.11 Other long-term projects-- Tseung Kwan O Area 137	2	2	0	0	2	0	10	16

As seen in Table 2.9, there were 13,804 comments about current land supply strategy and initiatives, of which 5,008 were about better use of short-term, temporary and vacant government sites (**SCP**) (“make better use of vacant government lands, land under short-term tenancy, vacant school premises”), 3,728 were about urban renewal (“Public housing redevelopment is too slow, follow Singapore in constructing temporary accommodation to speed things up”), 1,200 were about other medium-to-long term sites including 963 about Kwu Tung North and Fanling North NDAs (**SCP**) (“hope to see the development of Kwu Tung North, Fanling North and other NDAs accelerated”) and 119 about rail projects (**SCP**) (“at least 14,000 public housing units can be built on 30 hectares at Siu Ho Wan Depot”), 1,026 were about increasing development intensity (**VCF**) (“not appropriate to increase the housing density, should focus on reflecting the surrounding environment and achieving development objectives”), 907 were about better use of GIC sites (“after conversion of GIC land into residential land, there may be a shortage of GIC land”), 753 about better use of industrial buildings (“Change the land use right of exiting industrial buildings or land to residential”), 671 about better use of vacant school premises (“resumption of vacant primary school land”), 229 about reviewing development control procedures (“simplify some complex planning and approval procedures”), 178 about land use review (“even if land is found, re-zoning process can be slow”), and 88 about other short-to-medium term projects, including 82 about Kai Tak (“preferable that all the residential flats in Kai Tak are HOS or public housing”).

2.10 Qualitative analysis of selection criteria for land supply options

Table 2.10 Comments about selection criteria for land supply options

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.07 Selection criteria about land supply options	443	414	55986	4	391	153	1073	58464
A.7.02 Conservation / environmental impact	64	114	40510	0	59	28	278	41053
A.7.2.1 Positive	10	23	0	0	5	3	37	78
A.7.2.2 Negative	12	8	0	0	17	13	31	81
A.7.2.3 Neutral	42	83	40510	0	37	12	210	40894
A.7.06 Land use and planning	72	54	15366	0	134	33	203	15862
A.7.6.1 Positive	5	12	0	0	6	1	8	32
A.7.6.2 Negative	10	4	0	0	31	1	9	55

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.7.6.3 Neutral	57	38	15366	0	97	31	186	15775
A.7.08 Supporting infrastructural facilities / community facilities	147	99	110	0	94	55	292	797
A.7.8.1 Positive	6	26	0	0	4	4	12	52
A.7.8.2 Negative	6	3	0	0	28	11	2	50
A.7.8.3 Neutral	135	70	110	0	62	40	278	695
A.7.05 Housing development issue	22	49	0	3	21	16	120	231
A.7.5.1 Positive	5	23	0	3	8	0	19	58
A.7.5.2 Negative	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	8
A.7.5.3 Neutral	16	23	0	0	13	16	97	165
A.7.07 Time required to provide land	49	19	0	1	22	4	46	141
A.7.7.1 Positive	6	7	0	0	2	0	5	20
A.7.7.2 Negative	7	2	0	1	8	2	6	26
A.7.7.3 Neutral	36	10	0	0	12	2	35	95
A.7.01 Financial cost of development	34	16	0	0	14	3	35	102
A.7.1.1 Positive	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	5
A.7.1.2 Negative	4	4	0	0	3	0	14	25
A.7.1.3 Neutral	30	11	0	0	9	3	19	72
A.7.03 Public interest	9	9	0	0	13	6	51	88
A.7.3.1 Positive	1	5	0	0	3	0	4	13
A.7.3.2 Negative	1	1	0	0	1	3	7	13
A.7.3.3 Neutral	7	3	0	0	9	3	40	62
A.7.04 Impact on communities / residents	15	24	0	0	12	2	21	74
A.7.4.1 Positive	4	10	0	0	0	0	5	19
A.7.4.2 Negative	3	5	0	0	3	0	3	14
A.7.4.3 Neutral	8	9	0	0	9	2	13	41
A.7.09 Economic considerations	13	15	0	0	16	5	23	72
A.7.9.1 Positive	2	5	0	0	2	1	0	10
A.7.9.2 Negative	2	4	0	0	1	1	0	8
A.7.9.3 Neutral	9	6	0	0	13	3	23	54

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.7.10 Construction / engineering and technical issue	4	12	0	0	4	1	4	25
A.7.10.1 Positive	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	6
A.7.10.2 Negative	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
A.7.10.3 Neutral	3	7	0	0	3	1	2	16
A.7.11 Potential for land development	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	16
A.7.11.3 Neutral	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	16
A.7.90 Others	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3

As seen in Table 2.10, there were 58,464 comments about selection criteria for land supply options, including 41,053 about conservation or environmental impact (**SCP**) (“every option should have environmental factors at the forefront”), 15,862 about land use and planning (**SCP**) (“There should be a well-planned land development programme to build communities with proper infrastructure and recreational facilities”), 797 about supporting infrastructure and community facilities (“build the roads, trains and map out bus routes before building the housing estates”), 231 about housing development issues (“Increasing the plot ratio of residential buildings can reduce the waiting time for public housing and HOS flats”), 88 about public interest (“government decision and determination to defend the public interest is crucial”), 141 about the time to provide land (“think more about how to speed up the process, and choose the most uncontroversial option which would be quickest”), 102 about financial cost (“consider cost efficiency”), 74 about the impact on residents (“should choose options that do not affect the lives of citizens”) and 72 about other economic considerations (“should include housing, economic and education, medical and other aspects in a holistic planning approach”).

2.11 Qualitative analysis of opinions about consequences of insufficient land supply

Table 2.11 Comments about consequence of insufficient land supply

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.09 Consequences of insufficient land supply	164	159	110	0	683	134	91	1341
A.9.01 Soaring property prices and rents / Difficulty in purchasing residential property	63	59	0	0	316	67	54	559
A.9.03 Poor living conditions / overcrowded living space	48	48	0	0	166	35	28	325

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.9.02 Longer waiting time for public rental housing	36	27	0	0	167	22	5	257
A.9.04 Inadequate of GIC facilities	6	12	110	0	11	7	1	147
A.9.05 Affect economic / business environment	8	9	0	0	21	2	2	42
A.9.06 Insufficient land for infrastructural facilities	3	3	0	0	2	1	1	10
A.9.90 Other consequences	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

As seen in Table 2.11, there were 1,341 comments about the consequences of insufficient land supply, including 559 about rising property prices or rents (**M**) (“affordable living space in Hong Kong is inhuman.”), 325 about poor living conditions (**M**) (“shame to have so many HK citizens living in such poor condition (e.g. subdivided units)”), 257 about longer waiting time for public housing (**M**) (“more than 300,000 people are waiting for public housing, partly due to the land supply shortage”) and 147 about inadequate GIC facilities (**SCP**) (“Inadequate community facilities should also be of concern”).

2.12 Qualitative analysis of opinions about definitions of the options

Table 2.12 Comments about definition of the options

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
A.10 Comments about definition of the options	23	14	3668	0	16	18	8	3747
A.10.3 Comments about the definition of 'periphery of country parks'	21	13	3668	0	15	18	8	3743
A.10.2 Comments about how to treat NT land, e.g. whether NT land is treated as agricultural land, NDA or brownfield	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	4

As seen in Table 2.12, there were 3,747 comments about the definition of the options of which 3,743 were about the definition of the periphery of country parks (**SCP**) (“boundaries of country parks are very clear and there is no core or periphery to be distinguished”).

2.13 Qualitative analysis of opinions about land use strategy

Table 2.13 Comments about land use strategy

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
B.1 Comments about land use strategy	726	1332	4486	13	1221	1593	4369	13740
B.1.1 Comments about housing policy	619	1204	4486	13	1156	1554	4136	13168
B.1.1.01 Comments about the relative ratios between public and private housing	100	158	1692	5	181	101	345	2582
B.1.1.04 Comments about measures and policies on property market	105	223	181	2	339	344	951	2145
B.1.1.05 Comments about the land sale, e.g. relaxed the requirements for triggering land	22	51	1731	0	30	40	186	2060
B.1.1.02 Other comments about public housing / subsidized housing	153	292	72	1	243	431	816	2008
B.1.1.03 Comments about Small House Policy	56	154	0	3	65	268	1011	1557
B.1.1.12 Comments about speculation	35	100	779	0	67	147	185	1313
B.1.1.80 Other comments about housing policy	54	93	31	0	128	118	318	742
B.1.1.11 Comments about the liquidity of property, e.g. people hoard on property for investment purpose	19	44	0	0	39	63	164	329
B.1.1.15 New suggestion on housing land use, e.g. Modular housing, container housing	39	46	0	2	33	22	48	190
B.1.1.06 Comments about the proportion of land supply for housing	20	24	0	0	13	7	52	116
B.1.1.07 Further assessment on housing needs	8	7	0	0	9	5	31	60
B.1.1.14 Change of commercial property for housing uses	4	5	0	0	2	1	16	28
B.1.1.08 Comments about government budget on housing development	3	3	0	0	4	5	7	22
B.1.1.13 Irrational herd behaviour	1	3	0	0	3	2	6	15
B.1.1.90 Others	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
B.1.4 Comments about urban planning	66	75	0	0	41	31	185	398
B.1.2 Comments about land use other than housing	41	53	0	0	24	8	48	174

As seen in Table 2.13, there were 13,740 comments about land use strategy, including 13,168 about housing policy (in turn made up of 2,582 about the ratio between public and private housing (**SCP**) (“support building more rental public housing estates with minimal release for

home ownership and private development”), 2,145 comments about the existing property market measures (“Impose vacancy tax”), 2,060 about land sales (**SCP**) (“Housing Department should resume or buy back land and use it for public housing development”), 2,008 about public/subsidised housing (“prevent abuse of public housing”), 1,557 about Small House policy (“cancel Small House policy which is unfair”), 1,313 about speculation (**SCP**) (“legislate against speculation with high capital gain tax on house sale within 10 years”), 329 about the liquidity of property (“increase property taxes to prevent hoarding property and inflating the housing market”), 190 comments about new housing suggestions (“increase the use of pre-fabricated houses”), 116 about the proportion of land used for housing (“more housing supply”) and 60 about assessment of housing needs (**VCF**) (“government miscalculated the demand for housing”), 398 about urban planning (“improve urban planning”) and 174 about land use other than housing (“apart from housing, allocate some land for medical and elderly care facilities”).

2.14 Qualitative analysis of opinions about causes of land supply shortage

Table 2.14 Comments about causes of shortage

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
B.2 Causes of land shortage / Other concerns about land supply	392	608	20	1	529	2304	2561	6415
B.2.03 Population policy / Growth in population / Ageing population	114	332	20	1	89	1766	1986	4308
B.2.06 Comments about the private land banks / hoarded land	26	73	0	0	82	107	197	485
B.2.12 Comments about collusion between the Government and businesses	21	31	0	0	70	204	90	416
B.2.13 Poor planning about housing, land or urban	58	57	0	0	49	61	55	280
B.2.22 Balance the development of all aspects	27	27	0	0	16	5	76	151
B.2.05 Slowed down in land development	21	12	0	0	63	31	8	135
B.2.23 Comments about resumption process	29	10	0	0	21	8	61	129
B.2.20 Comments about quality of life of the people	11	14	0	0	24	6	46	101
B.2.02 Reduced size of reclamation	11	8	0	0	40	28	7	94
B.2.14 There are different attitudes towards land development in the society	19	7	0	0	15	25	8	74

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
B.2.21 The Government should communicate more with the stakeholders	28	8	0	0	22	0	10	68
B.2.11 Complex consultation process	11	5	0	0	17	25	4	62
B.2.10 Dealing with environmental issues, such as EIA	7	8	0	0	9	21	6	51
B.2.01 No more new town was developed in Hong Kong after the 2000s	8	7	0	0	11	9	1	36
B.2.04 Increase of the number of domestic households	1	7	0	0	1	8	6	23
B.2.90 Others	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

As seen in Table 2.14, there were 6,415 comments about causes of land shortage, including 4,308 about population (“control population growth, such as reducing the number of one-way permits”), 485 about private land banks (“heavy tax on land banks and compulsory purchase of development land”), 416 about collusion between government and business (“land will not be used to house the poor, it will be sold to mainland property speculators”), 280 about poor planning (“mistakes in town planning have raised property prices tremendously”), 151 about balanced development (“government should balance competing economic, social and environmental needs in pursuit of the best interests of the city”), 135 about slowed land development (“pace of land creation has slowed down considerably in recent years”), 129 about the resumption process (“government should compensate the private land owner and recover the private land to build houses”), 101 about improving quality of life (“TFLS should have focused on living conditions, reduction of accommodation costs and sustainable living”), 94 about reduced size of reclamation (“in recent years, the size of reclamation has been greatly reduced by 80%”), 74 about diverging attitudes towards land development (“everyone has different views”), 68 about the need for government to communicate (“government should hold consultation in the districts to communicate with the residents before making any decisions for the district”), 62 about the complexity of consultation (“Hong Kong government consulted the public on everything and should learn from Singapore to be executive-led in finding land”) and 51 about environmental issues (“all reclamation projects require a comprehensive EIA and mitigation or compensation measures should be made when necessary”).

2.15 Qualitative analysis of opinions about the public consultation

Table 2.15 Comments about the public consultation

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
C.1 Comments on public consultation	694	888	496	3	1155	696	6039	9971
C.1.2 Comments about the materials of the PE document	178	163	110	1	188	35	1033	1708
C.1.2.1 Positive	9	45	0	0	10	2	43	109
C.1.2.2 Negative	87	77	0	1	146	21	702	1034
C.1.2.3 Other comments	82	41	110	0	32	12	288	565
C.1.14 No need to consult public / Fake consultation	60	46	386	0	183	305	451	1431
C.1.6 Whether agree with the assumptions behind land supply, e.g. insufficient land supply in Hong Kong	76	158	0	2	234	130	301	901
C.1.6.1 Yes	40	37	0	2	56	35	55	225
C.1.6.2 No	27	116	0	0	134	88	194	559
C.1.6.3 Other comments	9	5	0	0	44	7	52	117
C.1.18 Comments about implement / launch feasible options	57	96	0	0	91	48	585	877
C.1.1 Comments on questionnaire, e.g. questionnaire design	38	33	0	0	101	55	575	802
C.1.1.1 Positive	0	0	0	0	5	2	38	45
C.1.1.2 Negative	28	29	0	0	86	44	389	576
C.1.1.3 Other comments	10	4	0	0	10	9	148	181
C.1.19 Comments on the publicity, e.g. insufficient publicity	19	63	0	0	14	8	617	721
C.1.4 Comments about consultation channels	23	36	0	0	29	11	498	597
C.1.4.1 Positive	1	7	0	0	4	0	77	89
C.1.4.2 Negative	8	13	0	0	13	8	134	176
C.1.4.3 Other comments	14	16	0	0	12	3	287	332
C.1.3 Comments about target audience of consultation	24	30	0	0	22	9	279	364
C.1.3.1 Positive	2	3	0	0	1	1	54	61
C.1.3.2 Negative	14	7	0	0	10	6	48	85

Codes	Counts							
	E	WS	SCP	OS	M	SNM	VCF	Total
C.1.3.3 Other comments	8	20	0	0	11	2	177	218
C.1.25 Comments about TFLS	84	75	0	0	55	10	70	294
C.1.23 This consultation exercise is difficult to reach consensus	23	15	0	0	125	44	71	278
C.1.16 Comments on how to handle the questionnaires / submissions collected	38	25	0	0	23	11	114	211
C.1.12 Consultation need to be fair and impartial, including comments about the transparency of the public engagement exercise	24	26	0	0	8	14	137	209
C.1.5 Comments about consultation period	5	18	0	0	13	5	100	141
C.1.5.1 Appropriate	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4
C.1.5.2 Negative	3	14	0	0	11	4	52	84
C.1.5.2a Too long	2	7	0	0	11	3	20	43
C.1.5.2b Too Short	1	7	0	0	0	1	32	41
C.1.5.3 Other comments	2	2	0	0	2	0	47	53
C.1.11 Further consultation should be carried out / Should have another round of consultation before execution	8	8	0	0	3	5	56	80
C.1.22 To have study on other feasible options	8	16	0	0	3	1	49	77
C.1.21 Comments on staff of the public engagement	1	1	0	0	1	0	70	73
C.1.15 Need further study on options which have been reached consensus	6	13	0	0	16	0	22	57
C.1.13 It is better to consider local residents' concerns when promoting options	1	2	0	0	1	1	10	15
C.1.90 Overall evaluation of public engagement activities	21	64	0	0	45	4	1001	1135
C.1.90.1 Positive	11	47	0	0	17	0	847	922
C.1.90.2 Negative	10	17	0	0	28	4	154	213

As seen in Table 2.15, there were 9,971 comments about the public consultation, including 1,708 about the consultation materials (109 positive (“information is comprehensive and objective”), 1,034 negative (“statistics about current land holdings in Hong Kong were missing in the land supply document”) and 565 other comments (“clearer data can be rough estimate

of the number of residential flats that can be provided’’), 1,431 about whether there is a genuine consultation (‘‘fake consultation’’), 901 about agreeing or not with the land supply assumptions (225 agreed (‘‘there is a real shortage of land supply’’), 559 disagreed (‘‘Hong Kong does not really lack land but the consensus on how the city can make best use of its untapped land’’)), 877 about implementing feasible options (‘‘Accelerate the implementation’’), 802 about the VCF design (45 positive (‘‘new way to engage is good, do more promotion to encourage participation’’), 576 negative (**VCF**) (‘‘questionnaire design is very biased as it guides respondents to provide answers that government prefers’’), 181 other comments (‘‘suggest to let the participants assign priorities/votes to each option’’)), 721 about publicity (**VCF**) (‘‘too little publicity’’), 597 about the consultation channels (89 positive (**VCF**) (‘‘Web survey is good arrangement’’), 176 negative (**VCF**) (‘‘Too few public forums and places to hold’’), 332 other comments (**VCF**) (‘‘Questionnaires can be sent to persons on the electoral list’’)), 364 about the target audience (61 positive (**VCF**) (‘‘PE exercise is well-planned and allow many people to join’’)) and 85 negative (**VCF**) (‘‘not enough exposure to non-Chinese speaking citizens’’), 218 other comments (‘‘should particularly consider the advice from engineering and construction professionals’’), 294 about the TFLS (‘‘chairman and other members deserve public appreciation for their dedication in collecting public opinions during the PE’’), 278 about the difficulty in reaching consensus (‘‘Different groups of people will have different vested interests, is it possible to obtain a total compromise?’’), 211 about handling the submissions (**VCF**) (‘‘responses should be checked for possible multiple responses by individuals’’), 209 about impartiality and transparency of outcome (**VCF**) (‘‘transparency is important for a consultation that affects everyone in Hong Kong’’), 141 about the consultation period (43 too long (‘‘engagement period is a bit too long, considering the urgency of the matter’’)) and 41 too short (**VCF**) (‘‘Duration is quite short cannot discuss the issue deeply’’)), 80 about further consultation (**VCF**) (‘‘more proposals from the public can be incorporated and the public consulted on the new proposals’’), 77 about studying other feasible options (**VCF**) (‘‘government should look for further options’’), 73 about the staff of the public engagement (**VCF**) (‘‘staff were enthusiastic and patient’’) and 57 about the need for further study on options with consensus (‘‘More data or further research is needed to study the feasibility and address the difficulty for different options’’). Finally, there were 1,135 comments providing an overall evaluation of the PE activities (922 positive (**VCF**) (‘‘PE exercise is very comprehensive and easily accessible’’), 213 negative (**VCF**) (‘‘Too many options and materials for the general public to digest’’)).

Chapter 3 Conclusion

3.1 Basis for conclusions with different types of information

This chapter brings together all of the analysis in the earlier chapters to identify domains of consensus and domains with continuing disagreement. It is first important to understand the strengths and weaknesses of different sources of information. Telephone surveys, done well (i.e. with careful attention to questionnaire design, sampling and quality control), provide good pictures of the views of the general population about clearly defined and well understood topics. However, they are weaker when it comes to ensuring that the views are well informed or to ask open questions. In the telephone survey done by CUHK, the only concerns might be that firstly, only slightly more than half of respondents were aware of the PE activities, calling into some question how well they understand the issues, compared to those who completed the VCF and secondly, survey respondents were not provided feedback as to whether their choices yielded 1,200 ha or not. Conversely, the VCF reflect the views of those motivated enough to complete the forms and for the WBT (which comprise the majority of responses), there was a requirement to play at least part of the video informing people of the context and feedback provided about the amount of land generated by their choices. The VCF were designed to minimise the risk of multiple submissions from the same individuals, but that risk cannot be completely eliminated. In short, when comparing the telephone survey with the VCF, it is a trade-off between the views of the possibly less motivated and less informed general public (including the silent majority) versus the motivated and possibly better informed sector of the public who engages with the PE. It is also important to realize that the wording of signature campaigns and petitions are chosen by the organizers, so that, while the large numbers of signees reflect that the organizers have been able to arouse a strong public response, they do not necessarily reflect the views of those more engaged with the PE process, who have taken the time to express their informed personal views.

It is also important to understand the strengths and weaknesses of different analysis strategies. Quantitative analysis can provide precise answers to specific questions but cannot adequately address broader issues where it is not feasible to pre-define all the possible answers. In this PE context, the quantitative analysis is hence most useful and trustworthy in understanding responses to specific options identified in advance by the TFLS, but the qualitative analysis provides crucial information about other possible options and the reasoning behind choices, including the general criteria for selecting options.

3.2 Quantitative analysis of options

3.2.1 Introduction

All feedback about the specific land supply options covered in the Public Engagement (PE) View Collection Forms (VCF) (other than open-ended comments for Q1-4) was processed and analysed using quantitative methods. At the end of the PE, HKU-SSRC had received and processed 29,065 responses via the VCF, made up of 7,457 paper forms and 21,608 forms via the WBT. HKU-SSRC also included analysis and comparison of the telephone survey covering the land supply options, which TFLS commissioned from CUHK, which covered 2,005 landline

interviews and 1,006 mobile phone interviews of adults using random digit dialling with at least six contact attempts, weighted to address the overlap of landlines and mobile phones and also to match the age and gender distribution of the population, which should ensure a representative sample of the adult population with high coverage and sampling error of at most 1%.

3.2.2 Summary of quantitative results

Table 3.1 Quantitative analysis of specific PE options (copy of Table 1.5)

Option	Time Frame	VCF		Telephone survey	
		% of all responses	% of responses at least 1,200 ha	% of all responses	% of responses at least 1,200 ha
Brownfield (BRN)	SM ML	87	91	79	83
Private agricultural land reserve (PAL)	SM ML	68	79	61	68
East Lantau Metropolis (ELM)	ML	62	78	58	68
More new development areas in NT (NDA)	ML	61	75	78	88
Near-shore reclamation (NSR)	ML	49	58	61	68
Private Recreational Leases (PRL)	SM ML	54	54	61	62
River Trade Terminal site (RTT)	ML	41	46	65	68
Caverns & underground (CAU)	ML	43	45	66	68
Land-extensive recreational facilities (LRL)	SM ML	33	34	23	24
Peripheries of country parks (PCP)	ML	28	34	53	57

Given that 1,200 ha was presented in the PE documents as the minimal additional land supply needed, the primary analysis presented highlights responses that yielded at least 1,200 ha. As seen in Table 3.1, nearly 80% of responses to the VCF (22,652 out of 29,065) yielded at least 1,200 ha and the mean and median additional land supply yielded by all responses were

1,953 and 1,969 ha respectively (3,292 ha was the maximum, yielded by choosing all the options).

Amongst respondents through the VCF and telephone survey whose responses generated at least 1,200 ha, Brownfield has strong support through both channels; Private Agricultural Land reserve, East Lantau Metropolis and More New Development areas in NT have majority support; Near-shore reclamation and Private Recreational Leases have support from about half through both channels; River Trade Terminal site and Caverns & underground have support from a minority; while Land-extensive Recreational Facilities and Peripheries of Country Parks have weak support.

If we also include responses that did not meet the 1,200 ha criteria, then although the level of support drops for some options that generate more land (such as East Lantau Metropolis), the conclusions above do not change.

All of the conceptual options have support in the 34-49% range from the VCF and 44-67% from the telephone survey, with the notable exception of Plover Cove Reservoir (16% VCF and 23% telephone survey).

3.3 Other quantitative analysis

The telephone survey also covered some questions not included explicitly in the VCF, such as which factor should be considered first if Hong Kong needs to increase land supply, support for a land reserve and awareness of the PE activities. As regards the most important factor, 34% chose environmental impact, 21% chose speed of supply, 18% chose quantity of supply, with other choices getting less than 5% support. As regards support for a land reserve, 54% supported and 30% strongly supported this, with only 9% not supporting and 2% strongly not supporting this. As regards awareness of the PE activities, 56% had ever heard of or watched any PE activities (“聽過或者睇過土地供應專責小組嘅公眾參與活動或展覽內容”).

3.4 Qualitative analysis of options

3.4.1 Introduction

HKU-SSRC coded all the open-ended responses in the 29,065 VCF (using the WBT and paper forms) as well as all submissions received through other channels, based on a coding framework that was developed to reflect all the issues covered in the Public Engagement Booklet, and then extended to cover all the other relevant issues raised in the qualitative materials collected during the PE process. Where appropriate (i.e. there is some disagreement), comments are coded as positive, negative or neutral. It is impracticable to account for some individuals or organizations expressing their views through multiple channels, so the same view may be included in more than one channel.

3.4.2 Short-to-medium options

The option with most feedback was private recreational leases – over sixty thousand comments were in favour, although there were over five thousand comments against. In particular, there were many comments specific to Fanling golf course, over thirty thousand in favour, but over five thousand opposed, particularly for full development. The primary reason given in favour was the potential for land that can be used for housing. The primary reasons against were impact on Hong Kong image, sport development, contributions of sports clubs to society, economic and conservation impact and liveability.

The next option in terms of quantity of feedback was brownfield sites, for which the feedback was overwhelmingly positive (over sixty thousand in favour and less than two hundred against). The primary reason in favour was the land development potential for housing, with the main disagreement being whether to handle land resumption through PPP (the primary concern being conflict of interest) or the Lands Resumption Ordinance (the primary concern being how to handle compensation). Other concerns include how to accommodate existing businesses (some of which are illegal), the need to build infrastructure, minimising conservation and economic impact.

The next option in terms of quantity of feedback was private agricultural land reserve in the New Territories, over seven thousand in favour and more than one thousand against. The primary reason in favour was the land development potential for housing. The primary concerns against were negative conservation/environmental impact and the need to retain agricultural land uses. The primary disagreement, similar to brownfield sites, was about how best to handle land resumption, with similar arguments about PPP versus the Lands Resumption Ordinance. There was also disagreement about whether this is a high or low cost option, which perhaps depends on whether the land is close to existing infrastructure.

For land-extensive recreational facilities, there were very mixed views (over five hundred in favour, over seven hundred opposed) with the primary reason in favour being housing development, while the primary reasons against were the impact on liveability, limited sports facilities. One other common comment was the potential to relocate some recreational facilities to locations unsuitable for housing.

3.4.3 Medium-to-long options

The option with most feedback was ELM with the majority being negative (over sixty thousand) although there were still many in favour (more than four thousand). The primary argument in favour is the potential to provide housing for up to at least half a million people, while the primary concerns were conservation/environmental impact, cost, time and need for supporting infrastructure.

The feedback on the periphery of country parks was strongly negative (over sixty thousand against versus less than two thousand in favour). The primary reason in favour was the land potential for housing without the need for compensation or relocation, while the arguments against were negative conservation/environmental impact, impact on public recreation, liveability, legal constraints. Similar to private agricultural land, there was also disagreement

about whether this is a high or low cost option, which perhaps depends on whether the land is close to existing infrastructure.

For near-shore reclamation outside Victoria Harbour, the majority of feedback was negative (over sixty thousand) although there were still many in favour (more than four thousand). Some of the negative feedback focussed on specific locations, such as Ma Liu Shui and Lung Kwu Tan. The primary reason in favour was the large land potential for housing, while the primary reason against was negative conservation/environmental impact. There was disagreement whether this is a fast or slow option, which perhaps depends on how slow purchasing existing land is considered to be in comparison. There was also feedback about the need to consider the supporting infrastructure in parallel.

For caverns and underground space, there was majority support (over seven hundred in favour, over two hundred against), given that moving water and sewage treatment underground can release land for housing, but with the important caveat that the land released is small, so this cannot solve much of the shortage. There was also feedback about the high cost.

The feedback about new development areas (NDAs) in the NT was largely positive (over eight hundred in favour, less than one hundred opposed), with the main reason for support being the potential to provide land for housing, while the main concern was the need to ensure that supporting infrastructure is in place.

The feedback about developing the River Trade Terminal site (RTT) was weakly positive (over four hundred in favour, over one hundred opposed). The concerns were varied, with the most common being that unless the industry has fully moved to the mainland, the RTT site is still needed.

3.4.4 Conceptual options

The feedback on additional peripheral areas of country parks was overwhelmingly negative (about one thousand in favour, but over sixty thousand opposed), with very similar concerns expressed to those for the specific peripheral areas of country parks mentioned under medium-to-long term options.

The feedback on reclaiming part of Plover Cove reservoir was strongly negative (less than two hundred in favour, but more than one thousand opposed), with the primary concerns being reliability of the water supply, negative conservation/environmental impact and destruction of aesthetic value.

The feedback on topside development of existing transport infrastructure was overwhelmingly positive (nearly two thousand in favour and less than forty opposed), with many comments specifically as regards housing.

The feedback about increased intensity of village development zones was largely positive (over six hundred in favour and less than one hundred opposed), with the primary reason for support being the large potential for land suitable for housing, while the primary concern was

cost/benefit. There was also considerable feedback about the Small House Policy and the need to find a fair way to compensate rights holders.

For relocating the container terminals, the majority of feedback was weakly positive (over four hundred in support and over one hundred opposed) with the main reasons for support being the land development potential for housing and the potential for increased efficiency, while the main concern was the risk of increasing the cost of freight transport after relocation.

The feedback on topside development of the container terminals was evenly balanced (over two hundred in support and a similar number opposed), with the support for additional housing matched by concerns about negative environmental and economic impact and engineering difficulty.

The feedback on development potential of public utilities sites was strongly positive (over two hundred in support and less than thirty opposed), with the main concern being the limited potential for housing.

The feedback on developing the River Trade Terminal site (RTT) and its surroundings in the long term, was weakly positive (over one hundred support and less than fifty opposed), although there was concern that RTT provides low cost transportation service.

3.4.5 Other land supply options

This section covers options not mentioned in the PE booklet with factual background, so the support mentioned below may not indicate what the support might be after discussion in the community.

For other types of land, popular suggestions were military land (over five thousand), developments along railways (over one thousand), floating developments (nearly a hundred) and other landfill sites (over seventy), which received almost entirely positive comments. Other country park areas (over three hundred in favour, more than eight hundred opposed), unspecified rural areas (over one hundred in favour and over six hundred opposed) and other water catchment areas (thirty positive and over fifty negative), all received mainly negative comments.

Other reclamation sites suggested included Tolo harbour (over two hundred), Tseung Kwan O (over one hundred), outlying islands (over four hundred), southern areas of Hong Kong Island (over two hundred), Hong Kong Island to the West (over eighty) and other artificial islands (over one hundred), which all received few negative comments, while locations in Victoria harbour also received many negative comments (over five hundred in favour, more than eighty opposed).

Other specific locations not covered in the PE booklet which were popular suggestions were requesting land currently in the Mainland for development (over one thousand), other locations in Outlying islands (other than reclamation) (over eight hundred), border areas (over one hundred) and NT North beyond the locations already proposed (over sixty).

Popular relocation suggestions were about relocation of theme parks or race courses (over two hundred), prisons (over one hundred), universities (over sixty) and cemeteries or crematoria (over fifty).

There were also many suggestions about levelling of mountains (more than three hundred).

There were many comments about other topside development, including existing buildings such as car parks (over sixty) and public facilities such as rebuilding municipal buildings (over fifty).

3.5 Other qualitative analysis

3.5.1 Current land supply strategy

Popular concerns about current land supply strategy and initiatives were about better use of short-term, temporary and vacant government sites, better urban renewal, more rail projects, concerns about increasing development intensity, better use of GIC sites and consequences, better use of industrial buildings, reviewing development control procedures, land use review and other short-to-medium term projects, such as Kai Tak.

3.5.2 Selection criteria for options

Popular suggestions for selection criteria for land supply options were conservation or environmental impact, land use and planning outcomes, need for supporting infrastructure and community facilities, potential for housing development, protecting the public interest, time to provide land, financial cost, impact on residents and other economic considerations.

3.5.3 Consequences of shortage

Popular comments about the consequences of insufficient land supply included rising property prices or rents, poor living conditions, longer waiting time for public housing and inadequate GIC facilities.

3.5.4 Land use strategy

Nearly all of the comments about land use strategy related to housing policy, such as the ratio between public and private housing, existing property market measures, land sales, public/subsidised housing, Small House policy, speculation measures, liquidity of property, new housing suggestions, the proportion of land used for housing and assessment of housing needs.

3.5.5 Causes of shortage

There were many comments about the causes of land shortage, including population policy, private land banks, collusion between government and business, poor planning, need for balanced development, slowed land development, the land resumption process, improving

quality of life, reduced size of reclamation, diverging attitudes towards land development, the need for government to communicate better, the complexity of consultation and environmental issues.

3.5.6 PE comments

There were many comments about the public consultation, including the consultation materials (over one hundred positive, over one thousand negative, largely wanting more information), questioning whether there is a genuine consultation (over one thousand), the land supply assumptions (over two hundred agreed and over five hundred disagreed with the assumptions), implementing feasible options (over eight hundred), about the VCF design (over forty positive and over five hundred negative), wanting more publicity (over seven hundred), about the consultation channels (over eighty positive, about double that number negative), about the target audience (over sixty positive, over eighty negative), supportive of the TFLS members (nearly three hundred), about the difficulty in reaching consensus (nearly three hundred), about fair handling of the submissions (over two hundred), about impartiality and transparency of outcome (over two hundred), about the consultation period (about forty stating too short and a similar number too long), about further consultation (over eighty), about studying other feasible options (over seventy), supportive of the staff of the public engagement (over seventy) and about the need for further study on options with consensus (over fifty). Finally, the comments providing an overall evaluation of the PE activities were largely positive (over nine hundred), although some negative comments (over two hundred) thought the materials were too much for the general public to digest.

3.6 Options overall

The quantitative analysis shows that the most popular specified options are Brownfield, Private Agricultural Land reserve, East Lantau Metropolis and More New Development areas in NT, which all have majority support through both the VCF and telephone survey. The qualitative analysis shows strong support for Brownfield and More New Development areas in NT, with many concerns about Private Agricultural Land reserve and East Lantau Metropolis, especially as regards negative conservation/environmental impact.

Land-extensive Recreational Facilities and Peripheries of Country Parks are the two most unpopular options through both channels of quantitative analysis and through the qualitative analysis.

The other specific options all have support from at least two fifths of responses from both channels of the quantitative analysis, while through the qualitative analysis, near-shore reclamation had attracted many concerns, largely because of negative conservation /environmental impact.

All of the conceptual options have support of a third to half of the VCF submissions and half to two thirds of the telephone survey respondents, with the notable exception of Plover Cove Reservoir (16% VCF and 23% telephone survey). Through the qualitative analysis both Plover Cove and the further peripheries of the country park attracted much negative feedback, while

the other options apart from topside development of the container terminals received largely positive feedback.

For new options, without factual background in the PE booklet, the support mentioned here may not indicate what the support might be after discussion in the community. However, new options with largely positive feedback included military land, developments along railways, floating developments and other landfill sites. Other reclamation sites suggested with few negative comments included Tolo harbour, Tseung Kwan O, outlying islands, southern areas of Hong Kong Island, Hong Kong Island to the West and other artificial islands. Other specific locations not covered in the PE booklet which were popular suggestions were requesting land currently in the Mainland for development, other locations in Outlying islands (other than reclamation), border areas and NT North beyond the locations already proposed. Popular relocation suggestions were relocation of theme parks or race courses, prisons, universities and cemeteries or crematoria. There were also suggestions about levelling of mountains and topside development beyond that proposed, including existing buildings such as carparks and public facilities such as rebuilding municipal buildings.

Popular suggestions for selection criteria for land supply options were conservation or environmental impact, land use and planning outcomes, need for supporting infrastructure and community facilities, potential for housing development, protecting the public interest, time to provide land, financial cost, impact on residents and other economic considerations.

3.7 PE feedback

Feedback about the public engagement covered the consultation materials (the majority commenting on this wanted more information), questioning whether there is a genuine consultation, the land supply assumptions (the majority commenting on this disagreed), implementing feasible options, the VCF design (the majority commenting on this were negative), wanting more publicity, the consultation channels (some positive, more negative), the target audience (some positive, similar numbers negative), supportive of the TFLS members, the difficulty in reaching consensus, need for fair handling of the submissions, impartiality and transparency of outcome, the consultation period (about equal numbers stating too short and too long), further consultation, studying other feasible options, supportive of the staff of the public engagement and the need for further study on options with consensus.

Finally, the comments providing an overall evaluation of the PE activities were largely positive, although some thought the materials were too much for the general public to digest.

List of Annexes:

Annex 1: Coding framework

Annex 1a: Tables for Options all VCF

Annex 1b: Tables for Options 1,200+ VCF

Annex 1c: Tables for Combination of Options 1,200+ VCF

Annex 2a: Tables for Options all Telephone Survey

Annex 2b: Tables for Options 1,200+ Telephone Survey

Annex 3c: VCF in Chinese

Annex 3e: VCF in English

Annex 4: List of Online media included in the analysis

Annex 5: List of Media included in the analysis