

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO
THE DRAFT SO LO PUN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/NE-SLP/1
INCORPORATING THE AMENDMENTS AS SHOWN ON PLAN NO.
R/S/NE-SLP/1-A2
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

- Item A – Rezoning of two areas to the north-east and south of the village clusters at So Lo Pun from “Village Type Development” to “Agriculture”.

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

Deletion of ‘Market’ from Column 2 of the Notes for the “Village Type Development” zone.

Town Planning Board

3 April 2020

List of Representers
In respect of the draft So Lo Pun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-SLP/3

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-1	Marry Mulvihill (also C59)
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-2	The Hong Kong Countryside Foundation
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-3	Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-4	The Conservancy Association (also C54)
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-5	Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (also C55)
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-6	Designing Hong Kong Limited
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-7	Friends of Hoi Ha
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-8	Friends of Sai Kung
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-9	Andrew Bowden Brown
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-10	Gary William John Ades
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-11	Ann Marie Davy-Hou
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-12	Thomas Han San Hou
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-13	Yip Tsz Lam
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-14	Ruy Barretto
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-15	鄭杏芬
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-16	新界鄉議局
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-17	North District Council
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-18	新界沙頭角區鄉事委員會
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-19	鎖羅盆村委員會 (also C61)
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-20	Wong Hing Cheung (Indigenous Inhabitant Representative of So Lo Pun Village) (also C62)
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-21	Wong Wayne Chun Wing (also C63)
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-22	Wong Shui Fong (also C64)
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-23	Wong Yuk Fai
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-24	Wong Wai Chung
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-25	Wong Chen Man
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-26	Wong Chi Hong
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-27	Eric Wong Wai Ming
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-28	Ian Wong Cherk Wai
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-29	Eric Wong
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-30	Wong Sau Wan
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-31	Emily Wong Hei Yee

TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-32	黃素珍
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-33	Wong Chiu Lun
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-34	Wong Kwai Tan
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-35	Wong Chee Yeung (also C65)
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-36	Cheng Lan Ying
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-37	黃羅月英
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-38	黃瑞清
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-39	沈桂梅
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-40	黃智建
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-41	黃瑞葦
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-42	黃瑞芬
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-43	Wong Ka Kit
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-44	Wong Ka Yi
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-45	Wong Ka Man
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-46	Wong Chung Hing
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-47	黃瑞冰
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-48	黃瑞婷
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-49	黃文培
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-50	Wong Yin Shun
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-51	黃俊文
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-52	黃健祺
TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-53	黃湘齡

List of Commenters
In respect of the draft So Lo Pun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-SLP/3

Comment No.	Name of ‘Commenter’
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C1	Leung Sau Mei Teresa
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C2	Ka Hei Fung
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C3	Ka Hei Fung
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C4	Leung Lok Sum
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C5	Kong Wai Lam William
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C6	Ng Pak Ming
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C7	Leung Chun Ho
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C8	馮潤林
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C9	Lai Mei Ling
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C10	Pang Wai Lun
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C11	羅子琛
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C12	鄭卓安
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C13	Chung Chi Keung
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C14	邱潔詩
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C15	Chow Chi Wai
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C16	Lee Wai Ying
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C17	Chow Suet Yan
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C18	Lau Man Lai
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C19	Law Chi Ming
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C20	Lui Wing Yat Christopher
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C21	Poon Po Yan Ambrose
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C22	Chan Kin Yui
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C23	張進誼
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C24	Leung Lok Shan
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C25	Eric Wong
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C26	Cheung Kit Ling
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C27	Yip Ching Han
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C28	Ho Wai Yee Paula
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C29	Chu Lap Shun
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C30	伍曼怡
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C31	Kwok Yim Fong
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C32	Chow Oi Chuen

TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C33	Lo Chun Wah
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C34	Law Wing Fai Teddy
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C35	陳杏怡
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C36	Shek Yuen Nam
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C37	Cheung Ho Kuen
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C38	Wong Kin Yip
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C39	Wong Shing Tat
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C40	Tang Yiu Ying
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C41	Mak Hei Man
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C42	Tsang Shui Hing
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C43	朱偉明
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C44	Ng Ellen
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C45	鄺筠慧
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C46	彭康臧
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C47	Tam Ho Chuen
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C48	Sung Siu Kong
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C49	A Ha
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C50	Li Man Yi
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C51	Tse Lok Yan
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C52	Chan Yee Ting
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C53	Hung Yuk Chun
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C54	The Conservancy Association (also R4)
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C55	Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (also R5)
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C56	港九工團聯合總會
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C57	Leung Hin Yan
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C58	陳嘉琳
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C59	Mary Mulvihill (also R1)
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C60	Fung Kam Lam
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C61	So Lo Pun Village Committee (鎖羅盆村委員會) (also R19)
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C62	Wong Hing Cheung (Indigenous Inhabitant Representative of So Lo Pun Village) (also R20)
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C63	Wong Wayne Chun Wing (also R21)
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C64	黃瑞芳 (Wong Shui Fong) (also R22)
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C65	Wong Chee Yeung (also R35)
TPB/R/NE-SLP/3-C66	Wai Yan Wong

Summary of Representations
In respect of the Draft So Lo Pun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-SLP/3

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
R1 (also C59)	Mary Mulvihill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support Amendment Item A. ● The conservation-oriented approach as adopted in drawing up the land use proposals for the area is supported. ● The number of Small Houses that could be provided in the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone upon amendment is more than adequate. ● The “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone as designated is appropriate. 	Nil
R2	The Hong Kong Countryside Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide adverse representations as follows: ● The Town Planning Board (the Board) has failed to make a meaningful review of the genuine need for housing by indigenous villagers which has been highlighted as its statutory duty in the Court's judgment on the previous judicial review (JR). ● The extent of “V” zone upon amendment is determined without demonstrating the genuine need. ● In the spirit and context of Hong Kong's Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP) and the protection of Country Park Enclaves (CPE), there is no justification to vary the “V” zone to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To move ‘Agricultural Use’ from Column 1 to Column 2 use under “AGR” zone.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>accommodate unjustified Small House demand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For the “AGR” zone, ‘Agricultural Use’ should be placed in Column 2 in order to prevent ecological damages to the surrounding areas and stream courses. 	
R3	Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide adverse representations as follows. ● The Board has not properly reviewed the size of “V” zone based on the most up-to-date data and information relating to the genuine need for Small House and has not responded to the relevant issues as stated in the JR judgment. ● The conservation approach adopted in Tai Long Wan, which confines the “V” zone to only the existing village settlements and approved Small House sites, should also be adopted in So Lo Pun. ● The “V” zoning for a vacant land around a shrine, which is covered with vegetation and adjacent to dense woodland, is not justified. ● A “Green Belt” (“GB”)/”GB(1)” zoning is more appropriate than “AGR” to provide a buffer to the “Conservation Area” (“CA”) zone in So Lo Pun as there is a general presumption against development in “GB” zone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The “V” zone should be reduced to confine to the existing village settlements. ● The “AGR” zone in So Lo Pun should be rezoned to “GB”/”GB(1)” to provide the buffer function.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
R4 (also C54)	The Conservancy Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide adverse representations as follows. ● The Board has not made proper inquiry into the genuine need for Small House development. The genuine need for Small House development has still not been proved when designating the size of “V” zone. ● The size of “V” zone is not well-justified. Some land in “V” zone, even located near the existing village settlement, is not suitable for Small House development. All village development in future should be confined within the existing village houses. ● A stringent control on permanent structures built on area zoned “AGR” is considered more appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The “V” zone should be reduced to confine to the existing village settlements. ● To replace ‘House (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) only, other than rebuilding of NTEH or replacement of existing domestic building by NTEH permitted under the covering Notes)’ by ‘House (Redevelopment only)’ in Column 2 under “AGR” zone.
R5 (also C55)	Hong Kong Bird Watching Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support the conservation approach to reduce the “V” zone but provide adverse representations as follows. ● The Board has failed to properly inquire into the genuine need for Small House as required according to the JR Judgment, by taking into account the Small House demand forecast by IIRs without verification. ● The amendment does not provide sufficient protection to the natural environment of So Lo Pun. The conservation approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The “V” zone should be reduced to confine to the existing village settlements. ● To rezone the area under Amendment Item A from “AGR” to “GB(1)”. ● To rezone the portion of “V” zone near the shrine to “GB(1)”.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>adopted in Tai Long Wan, which restricts the “V” zone to only covering the existing settlements, should also be adopted in So Lo Pun.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The “V” zoning for the land near the shrine is not suitable for village development due to the potential impacts on the mature trees and water bodies including watercourses flowing into the reed beds and an ecologically important stream (EIS). Adverse sewage impacts from Small House development should not be overlooked. ● The “AGR” zoning is inadequate to serve as a buffer between village settlements and “CA” as village development and undesirable land uses may still be permitted in the “AGR” zone. ● The surrounding natural habitats of So Lo Pun support a diverse populations of birds, including the undisturbed EIS with the scare species Crested Kingfisher (冠魚狗), and the mangroves and reed bed near the shore of Kat O Hoi with waterbirds. The Board should take into consideration the ecological value of the natural habitats and the associated species during the plan making process so as to protect them from any destructive development and human disturbances. ● The “GB” zoning for the hillslopes at the northwestern, southwestern and northeastern sides of the OZP is inadequate to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To rezone the areas currently under “GB” to “GB(1)”. ● To include So Lo Pun into Plover Cove Country Park.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>protect the natural features against development as house development may still be permitted on application to the Board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consideration should be given to including So Lo Pun into Plover Cove Country Park following detailed assessment and public consultation. 	
R6	Designing Hong Kong Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Welcome the reduction of “V” zone but provide adverse representations as follows. ● The Board has the duty to enquire and review the genuine need for Small House development but it has failed its duty by accepting the Small House demand forecast made by the IIR. ● Given no Small House application in So Lo Pun, the “V” zone should be greatly reduced and cover only the existing village. ● The “V” zoning for the area around a shrine is not suitable as the area is surrounded by tall trees where Small House development will bring adverse impact to the landscape and natural habitat. ● “AGR” zone, in which Small House development may be permitted, is insufficient to serve as a buffer to protect and preserve the natural environment in So Lo Pun. A “GB” or “CA” zoning is more appropriate than “AGR”. ● The Board should take a stringent restrictive approach towards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To further reduce the “V” zone to cover only the existing village. ● The “V” zone around the shrine should be rezoned to protect the landscape and natural habitat. ● The area zoned “AGR” should be rezoned to “GB” and “CA” for strict control on development.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		permitted land uses and development in country park enclaves to protect the existing environment.	
R7	Friends of Hoi Ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide adverse representations as follows. ● The Board has not fulfilled the requirements of the JR to enquire into and properly deal with the genuine need for Small Houses of the indigenous villagers. It has used the same flawed methodology as before to designate the extent of the “V” zone by assessing the land which is seen as “suitable” for housing rather than assessing the genuine need for housing. ● For the “AGR” zone, it should be rezoned to “CA” or the ‘Agricultural Use’ should be placed in Column 2 in order to prevent ecological damages to the surrounding areas and stream courses. ● The Board has failed to fulfill the obligations under the Convention on Biodiversity Article 8e in relation to the sustainable development of enclave areas, and various requirements under the Hong Kong’s BSAP 2016-21, including Action 3c on regulation of sewage effluents near ecological sensitive areas and Action 9 on incorporating biodiversity considerations in planning and development process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To confine the “V” zone to area currently occupied by ruined buildings. ● To rezone the areas outside the ruined buildings as “CA”. ● If “AGR” is retained, ‘Agricultural Use’ should be placed under Column 2 for better protection of the surrounding Country Park.
R8	Friends of Sai Kung		

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
R9	Andrew Bowden Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide adverse representations as follows. ● The “V” zone is still too large as the Board has not properly addressed the issue regarding the genuine need for Small House as raised by the Court in the previous JR. ● The conservation approach adopted in Tai Long Wan, which confines the “V” zone to only the existing village settlements and approved Small House sites, should also be adopted in So Lo Pun. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To confine the “ V” zone to the existing village settlements and approved Small House sites. ● To rezone the vacant area surrounding the shrine, which is currently zoned “V”. ● To rezone the “AGR” zone to “GB” or “GB(1)”.
R10	Gary William John Ades		
R13	Yip Tsz Lam		
R11	Ann M. Davy- Hou	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide adverse representations as follows. ● The amendment is not in compliance with the Court's judgment in the previous JR as the Board has not verified the genuine need for housing for each of the male indigenous villagers individually. ● The Board has failed to fulfill the obligations under the Convention on Biodiversity Article 8e in relation to the sustainable development of enclave areas, and various requirements under the Hong Kong's BSAP 2016-21, including Action 3c on regulation of sewage effluents near ecological sensitive areas and Action 9 on incorporating biodiversity considerations in planning and development process. 	Nil
R12	Thomas Han San Hou		

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
R14	Ruy Barretto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide adverse representations as follows. ● The Board has made no reference to the evidence against excessive “V” zone as contained in the previous 10,000 submissions on the OZP. ● The Board has failed to make a meaningful review of the genuine need for housing by indigenous villagers, which has been highlighted as its statutory duty in the Court’s judgment on the previous JR. ● The “V” zone is excessive and it is an inflated and incredible proposal rather than an assessment of the genuine need for housing. ● The use of septic tanks and soakaway (STS) systems by Small Houses will cause pollution problems for the water bodies, channels and streams. The current administration of the STS system requiring proper percolation tests is poorly enforced. ● The Board has not made reference to the conservation approach adopted in Tai Long Wan, which reduces the “V” zone to become conservation zones and incorporates more stringent control on housing development in “V” zone. ● The land owned by development companies should not be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To confine the “V” zone to the land on or near existing housing sites. ● To rezone the northern parcel of the “V” zone which is mostly used for a shrine and has more trees. ● The Tai Long Wan conservation approach should be followed by (a) reducing the “V” zone to become conservation zone, (b) moving ‘NTEH’ from Column 1 to Column 2 in “V” zone, (c) deleting ‘House other than NTEH’ from Column 2 of “V” zone, and (d) adding the requirement to seek planning permission for demolition, addition, alteration and/or modification of an existing building in the Remarks of the Notes for “V” zone. ● The proposed “AGR” zone

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>included in “V” zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● The “AGR” zone will encourage further degradation of the agricultural land, making way for future Small House development. It should be rezoned to “GB(1)” as a buffer for the “CA”.● The Board has failed to fulfill the obligations under the Convention on Biodiversity Article 8e in relation to the sustainable development of enclave areas, and various requirements under the Hong Kong's BSAP 2016-21, including Target 2 on the conservation of ecologically important habitats outside the existing protected areas; Target 3 on the enhancement of natural streams conservation; and Target 9 on incorporating biodiversity considerations in planning and development process. The Board has failed to strike a balance between Small House development and conservation.● The amendment has emphasized the agricultural potential but it has not taken into account the ecological, recreation and landscape potentials of the area.	<p>under Item A should be zoned “GB(1)” to be a buffer for the “CA” zone; and the stream course should be zoned “CA” for 15m on either bank.</p>
R15	鄭杏芬	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Oppose to the OZP.● The designation of “V” zone has violated the Block Government Lease (BGL) and the Small House Policy. The Board shall not	Nil

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>prepare any plan under Town Planning Ordinance (Cap 131) for an area covered by BGL before the Government has resumed the concerned lot under Lands Resumption Ordinance (Cap 124). Also, according to the Small House Policy, the resumed lots shall only be re-granted to a lessee for Small House development after the Government has completed the planning of roads and other public facilities and updated the boundary of the remaining portion of the lot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● All development should be stopped as it would adversely affect the ecology of the area.	
R16	新界鄉議局	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Oppose Amendment Item A.● The reduced “V” zone could not meet the Small House need in So Lo Pun and it contravenes the lawful traditional rights and interests of the indigenous inhabitants of the New Territories as protected under Article 40 of Basic Law.● The Board has under-estimated the need for Small Houses by focusing on the number of past applications for Small House, and overlooking the villagers' efforts over years to restore the basic amenities in the village and the intention of those indigenous villagers residing overseas to move back to the village.● The area zoned “AGR” under the Item A is not suitable for	Nil

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>agricultural use for having no water source and road access. Zoning the land as “AGR” is a waste of land resources which could better be used for housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The designation of over 95% of land as “CA”, “GB” and “AGR”, leaving only 4% of land as “V” zone, is not a people-oriented approach of planning. 	
R17	North District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● The area designated as “V” zone is insufficient to meet the Small House demand in So Lo Pun. ● There is no need to designate “CA” zone in So Lo Pun as the area is surrounded by Plover Cove Country Park, which is difficult to access and has no potential for large scale development. The “CA” should be rezoned to “V” to meet the Small House demand. The left-over land after satisfying Small House demand should be rezoned to “AGR” to promote agricultural rehabilitation or development of eco-tourism. ● The “CA” zone is too close to agricultural land. The use of pesticides and generation of sewage in agricultural activities would pollute the underground water and surrounding environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sufficient land should be reserved for “V” zone to meet the demand for Small House development by indigenous villagers. ● To rezone area zoned “CA” to “V” or “AGR”.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
R18	新界沙頭角區 鄉事委員會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide adverse representations as follows. ● The “V” zone is reduced on the basis that there was no application for Small Houses in the past 10 years. However, the reason for having no Small House applications is the lack of access and infrastructure instead of no Small House demand. ● There are 229 male indigenous villagers entitled for Small House in So Lo Pun and their entitlement is supported by a document made under oath. The reduced “V” zone could only meet a very small portion of Small House demand. It contravenes the lawful traditional rights and interests of the indigenous inhabitants of the New Territories as protected under Article 40 of Basic Law. ● The rezoning of “V” to “AGR” is not justified as it is not practical to undertake farming in So Lo Pun which has no infrastructure nor population. 	Nil
R19 (also C61)	鎖羅盆村委員會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● The reduced “V” zone could only provide an area to satisfy 13% of the total Small House demand by the villagers. It contravenes the villagers’ right to build houses in their village as protected under Basic Law. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To enlarge the “V” zone so that at least 1/3 of the Small Houses demand could be met. ● To rezone the agricultural lots in “CA” and “GB” zones (at least the areas where the villagers have planted hundreds of citrus

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
			trees and undertaken weeding annually) for agricultural use.
R20 (also C62)	Wong Hing Cheung (IIR of So Lo Pun Village)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● The OZP is biased towards nature conservation without addressing the villagers' rights in building houses. The Small House demand could be supported by a list made under oath by him to show the names of all male indigenous villagers who are entitled for Small House grant. ● The reason for having no Small House application in So Lo Pun Village in the past years is the lack of infrastructure. The villagers have all along paid efforts to revitalize the village by undertaking planting, weeding, building a village office and applying for redevelopment of village house in the village. These show their intention to return back to the village to live. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To expand the "V" zone so that all Small House demand could be met. ● To rezone the private agricultural lots in "CA" and "GB" zones to 「農地」.
R21 (also C63)	Wong Wayne Chun Wing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● So Lo Pun Village has over 350 registered villagers. It is the villagers' rights to be allocated land for village type development. ● Oppose the deletion of 'market' use from Column 2 of the Notes for "V" zone. There is a need to have a market place for the potential population in the village to buy and sell food and daily 	Nil

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		necessities.	
R22 (also C64)	Wong Shui Fong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● The land in So Lo Pun belongs to the villagers. 	Nil
R23	Wong Yuk Fai	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● The ancestral heritage of So Lo Pun must be preserved as a testament to Hong Kong's culture. ● The reason for having no development in So Lo Pun is the lack of road access. The accessibility to the area should be improved for development by villagers and also for enjoyment of the natural beauty by visitors. ● It is unreasonable to provide only 1.11 ha and 2.02 ha of land for village development and agricultural use respectively, while zoning more than 10 ha of original agricultural land as "GB" or "CA". There is an imbalance between conflicting needs that should be rectified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To restore the area of "V" zone to 4.12 ha (i.e. the "V" zone area as shown on S/NE-SLP/1).
R27	Eric Wong Wai Ming		
R28	Ian Wong Cherk Wai		
R29	Eric Wong		
R30	Wong Sau Wan		
R31	Emily Wong Hei Yee		
R24	Wong Wai Chung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● The villagers need more development rather than agricultural or conservation land to make the true thriving community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To rezone the "CA" for village development.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
R25	Wong Chen Man	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● The amendment would exacerbate the existing problem of insufficient land to meet the Small House demand. ● The old housing sites have mostly fallen into ruins and are inaccessible and dangerous to build on. (R26) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To rezone the “GB”, “CA” and “AGR” for village type development. (R25) ● To rezone the area under Amendment Item A for village development. (R26)
R26	Wong Chi Hong		
R32	黃素珍	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● In the lack of road access and infrastructure, large scale housing development in So Lo Pun is not feasible. It is groundless for people to accuse the villagers of intending to build a large number of Small Houses in the “V” zone. ● Most of the young male indigenous villagers do not own land in So Lo Pun as the ownership of many old houses is still under their deceased fore-fathers. With the reduction in “V” zone, they would find it more difficult to apply for Small Houses. The chance of getting planning permission for Small House in “AGR” zone is also very low. ● The villagers have all along paid efforts to enhance the environment of the village by seeking Government's actions to restore the basic amenities, restoring a shrine and removing the fallen trees and bushes. These show their desire to rebuild their 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To expand the “V” zone. ● To rezone the private agricultural lots in “CA” and “GB” zones to 「農地」.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The zoning of 10.91 ha of private agricultural land to “CA” and “GB” is in conflict with the Board’s claim to encourage agricultural activities. The reduction of “V” zone is also in conflict with the objective to identify suitable land for village expansion. ● So Lo Pun is unique to the villagers while many of the wildlife species can be found elsewhere. The environmentalists’ claims for conservation should not override the villagers’ interests. 	
R33	Wong Chiu Lun	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● Many villagers want to rebuild houses in So Lo Pun but it is not possible because of lack of access and infrastructure, etc. More land for village type development is required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To rezone more land to “V”.
R34	Wong Kwai Tan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● Most of the male indigenous villagers do not own land in So Lo Pun. The “V” zone could not provide sufficient land to meet the Small House demand. ● The villages have all long paid efforts to revitalize the village. Their right should not be taken away. (R34) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To expand the “V” zone. (R34 and R37) ● To restore the area of “V” zone to 4.12 ha (i.e. the “V” zone area as shown on S/NE-SLP/1). (R40 and R51)
R37	黃羅月英		
R40	黃智建		
R51	黃俊文		

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The villagers' right to use their land should not be affected by environmental protection. (R51) 	
R35 (also C65)	Wong Chee Yeung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Item A. The "V" zone is too small to meet the Small House demand. (R35, R36 and R39) The shortage of land for Small House would cause disputes amongst villagers in allocating land resources. (R36, R39, R47 and R49) The villagers' right to use their land should not be affected by environmental protection. (R39, R41 and R43) It is unacceptable to reduce the "V" zone again and again. (R42 and R45) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To expand the "V" zone. (R36, R39, R43, R47 and R49) To restore the area of "V" zone to 4.12 ha (i.e. the "V" zone area as shown on S/NE-SLP/1). (R41, R42 and R45) To rezone the private agricultural lots in "CA" and "GB" zones to 「農地」. (R39, R43 and R49)
R36	Chen Lan Ying		
R39	沈桂梅		
R41	黃瑞葦		
R42	黃瑞芬		
R43	Wong Ka Kit		
R45	Wong Ka Man		
R47	黃瑞冰		
R49	黃文培		
R38	黃瑞清	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Item A. The reduction of "V" zone would affect revitalization of the village. Zoning most of the agricultural land as "GB" or "CA" is contradictory to the objective of encouraging agricultural 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To expand the "V" zone. To rezone the private agricultural lots in "CA" and "GB" zones to 「農地」. (R44)
R44	Wong Ka Yi		

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		development.	
R46	Wong Chung Hing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● Without expanding the “V” zone, there is insufficient land for building standard Small House (with a covered area of 700 sq ft). The chance of getting planning permission for Small House in “AGR” zone is also very low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To restore the “V” zone to 4.12 ha (i.e. the “V” zone area as shown on S/NE-SLP/1). (R46) ● To expand the “V” zone. (R48) ● To rezone the private agricultural lots in “CA” and “GB” zones to 「農地」. (R48)
R48	黃瑞婷		
R50	Wong Yin Shun	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● The “V” zone has been reduced again and again. The actual area available for use is even less because the land near the shrine and slopes could not be used for development. 	Nil
R52	黃健祺	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose Amendment Item A. ● Most of the male indigenous villagers do not own land in So Lo Pun as the ownership of many old house is still under their deceased fore-fathers. The “V” zone could not provide sufficient land for them to build Small Houses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To expand the “V” zone.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">● It is unacceptable to reduce the “V” zone again and again.● Zoning most of the agricultural land as “GB” or “CA” is contradictory to the objective of encouraging agricultural development.	
R53	黃湘齡	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Oppose Amendment Item A.● The conservation value of land within “GB” and “CA” and the real intention for these zonings is in doubt. The rights of land owners should not be overrode under the claim of nature conservation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● To restore the “V” zone to 4.12 ha (i.e. the “V” zone area as shown on S/NE-SLP/1).

Summary of Comments
In respect of the Draft So Lo Pun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-SLP/3

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-C)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
C1 to C53	Individuals (See Annex III)	R3 to R6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support the representations. ● The “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone should be reduced and part of it should be rezoned to “Green Belt (1)” (“GB(1)”) to protect the areas with ecological and landscape significance. ● Small House applications and permissions should not be allowed in “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone.
		R16, R18 to R53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose the representations. ● It is not justified to enlarge the “V” zone as the genuine need for Small House development cannot be verified. ● Reduction of “V” zone would not affect village development.
C54 (also R4)	The Conservancy Association	R16, R18 to R53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose the representations. ● It is not justified to enlarge the “V” zone as the genuine need for Small House development has still not been proven. ● To protect So Lo Pun and avoid undermining the ecological and landscape significance of Plover Cove Country Park, the areas of conservation zones such as

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-C)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
			“GB” and “CA” should not be reduced.
C55 (also R5)	Hong Kong Bird Watching Society	R2 to R4 and R6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support the representations. ● As the genuine need for Small House development in So Lo Pun has not yet been verified, the Town Planning Board (the Board) could not properly inquire into the issue as raised by the Court in the previous judicial review (JR). The “V” zone should be confined to the existing village clusters. ● The “AGR” zone is inadequate to serve as a buffer between village development and ecologically sensitive areas because undesirable land uses may still be permitted. A stringent control/zoning should be considered to conserve the ecology of So Lo Pun.
C56	港九工團聯合總會	Nil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The “V” zone area is excessive and village development would have adverse impact on “GB” and “CA” zones.
C57	Leung Hin Yan	R4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support the representation. ● The reduction of “V” zone is not sufficient to protect the area. ● The “V” zone area is not justified as the genuine need of villagers for Small House development is still doubtful.
C58	陳嘉琳	R5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support the representation. ● The “V” zone should be confined to the existing village clusters to allow revitalization of the village when necessary while protecting the ecological

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-C)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
			environment. There is no imminent need for development in So Lo Pun and it is more reasonable to enhance conservation in the area, which is surrounded by Country Park.
C59 (also R1)	Mary Mulvihill	Nil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support those representations which raise that the Board has not sufficiently addressed the Court's ruling in the previous JR. There is no indication as to the actual valid and justified demand for Small House. ● The "V" zone should be confined to the existing village.
C60	Fung Kam Lam	R3 to R6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support the representations. ● The "V" zone should be reduced and part of it should be rezoned to "GB(1)". ● Small House applications and permissions should not be allowed in "Agriculture" ("AGR") zone. ● The Board should review whether the issue as raised by the Court in the previous JR have been duly addressed.
C61 (also R19)	So Lo Pun Village Committee (鎖羅盆村委員會)	Nil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Villagers of So Lo Pun have strong sentimental connection with their heritage. None of them has surrendered or sold their land to any non-villagers, and they keep on holding regular activities in the village e.g. Da Jiu and worshipping ancestors in Chung Yeung Festival. ● Their ancestors have proved that village development would not adversely affect the rural environment. The existing villagers will also take very good care of the

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-C)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
			<p>environment and revive the village. To do so, they need their land to be available for revival use, adequate “V” zone for building residence and sufficient farmland for agricultural activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The area of the enclaves is minimal compared with the Country Parks. It is unreasonable to further reduce the “V” zone and zone the majority of private agricultural land into “CA” or “GB”. The villagers are defending their lawful rights. The “V” zone should be reverted back to at least 4.12ha and all private agricultural land under “GB” and “CA” zoning should be rezoned so that they could be resumed for original agricultural use. ● The representers’ proposal to include So Lo Pun into Country Park is not reasonable as most of the enclaves are covered by statutory plans instead of being included into Country Parks. Revitalisation of village like the pilot scheme of Sustainable Lai Chi Wo is a more proper way to strike a balance between conservation and development, and preserve traditional rural setting and natural environment whilst allowing for sustainable rural development.
C62 (also R20)	Wong Hing Cheung (IIR of So Lo Pun Village)	R2 to R14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose the representations. ● So Lo Pun is a recognized village with long history. Building village houses is the villagers’ basic rights. Over half of the land in So Lo Pun is private land inherited by the villagers from their ancestors. They should keep such land for agricultural use.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/NE-SLP/3-C)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
C63 (also R21)	Wong Wayne Chun Wing	R1 to R15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oppose the representations. ● It is the ancestral rights of villagers to build houses in So Lo Pun. Non-villagers have no right to restrict how and when the villagers should use their land. ● The reason for having no Small House built in So Lo Pun is the lack of road access. It will be feasible for the villagers to rebuild their houses and live in the village when the Government has provided the road access.
C64 (also R22)	黃瑞芳 (Wong Shui Fong)	Nil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● So Lo Pun Village is an important heritage left by her ancestors. Villagers would hold activities in the village on Chung Yeung Festival and Lunar New Year. The village should be retained instead of being turned into a backyard of Hong Kong.
C65 (also R35)	Wong Chee Yeung	Nil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The only way to revive the local environment is to bring back the village community to restore the former ecology. The reduction of “V” zone would further deter villagers from returning to the village for living, and would jeopardise the revival of the local environment.
C66	Wai Yan Wong	Nil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It is not justified to accept the representers’ proposals to allow only redevelopment of Small House in the “V” zone, delete the “V” zone or zone the agricultural land as “CA” or Country Park. ● Without any remedial measures, the cultural heritage of So Lo Pun and other rural villages would disappear in 20-30 years.