

**TPB PAPER NO. 9645**  
**FOR CONSIDERATION BY**  
**THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD ON 28.4.2014**

**CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS**  
**IN RESPECT OF DRAFT SO LO PUN**  
**OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/NE-SLP/1**

**CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS  
IN RESPECT OF DRAFT SO LO PUN  
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/NE-SLP/1**

<b>Group No.</b>	<b>Subject of Representations</b>	<b>Representaters</b>	<b>Commenters</b>
<b>1</b>	<u>Oppose</u> to the <u>insufficient</u> “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone	<p><b><u>Total: 880</u></b></p> <p><i>Village Representatives (VRs) and related organisations:</i>  <b>R10736:</b> 鎖羅盆村村務委員會聯同曾家裘測量師有限公司  <b>R10747:</b> Sha Tau Kok District Rural Committee (STKDRC)  <b>R10737, R10742 to R10746:</b> VRs of various indigenous villages</p> <p><i>Individuals:</i>  <b>R1 to R798, R10738 to R10741 and R10748 to R10817</b></p>	<p><b><u>Total: 8</u></b></p> <p><u>Support representations opposing to the insufficient “V” zone</u></p> <p><i>Individuals:</i>  <b>C3669 to C3676</b></p>
<b>2</b>	<u>Oppose</u> to the <u>excessive</u> “V” zone	<p><b><u>Total: 9,978</u></b></p> <p><i>Legislative Councillors:</i>  <b>R10543:</b> Hon Chan Ka Lok  <b>R10600:</b> Hon Albert Chan  <b>R10825:</b> Hon Wu Chi Wai</p> <p><i>Green/ concern groups:</i>  <b>R799:</b> Designing Hong Kong Limited  <b>R10544:</b> Friends of Sai Kung  <b>R10545:</b> nine ecologists of University of Hong Kong  <b>R10578:</b> Gaia Association  <b>R10605:</b> Land Justice League  <b>R10818:</b> Green Sense  <b>R10819:</b> The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society  <b>R10820:</b> WWF-Hong Kong  <b>R10821:</b> Kadoorie Farm &amp; Botanic Garden  <b>R10822:</b> The Conservancy Association  <b>R10823:</b> Eco-Education &amp; Resources Centre  <b>R10824:</b> Friends of Hoi Ha  <b>R10827:</b> Sea Shepherd Conservation Society</p>	<p><b><u>Total: 3,669</u></b></p> <p><u>Support representations opposing to the excessive “V” zone (3,657)</u></p> <p><i>Green/ concern groups:</i>  <b>C3640:</b> Friends of Sai Kung  <b>C3641:</b> Designing Hong Kong</p> <p><i>Individuals/ other organisations:</i>  <b>C1 to C3639, C3642 to C3655, C3661 and C3677</b></p> <p><u>Object to the draft OZP (12)</u></p> <p><i>Green/ concern group:</i>  <b>C3657:</b> Hong Kong Countryside Foundation</p> <p><i>Individuals/ other organisations:</i>  <b>C3656, C3658 to C3660 and 3662 to 3668</b></p>

Group No.	Subject of Representations	Representaters	Commenters
		<b>R10842:</b> Hong Kong Entomological Society  <i>Individuals/ other organisations:</i> <b>R800 to RR10542, R10547 to R10577, R10579 to R10599, R10601 to R10604, R10606 to R10735, R10826, R10828 to R10841 and R10843 to R10858</b>	
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>10,858</b>	<b>3,677</b>

Note: The representations and comments on representations made by the Legislative Councillors, green/ concern groups, villagers and related organisations in the above table as well as samples of some standard letters/ e-mails are attached at **Annexes I-1 to I-29 and II-1 to II-5**. A CD-ROM containing names of all representers and commenters<sup>1</sup> as well as their submissions is enclosed at **Annex VII** (for TPB Members only).

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 27.9.2013, the draft So Lo Pun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-SLP/1 (the Plan) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 10,858 representations were received. On 24.1.2014, the representations were published for three weeks for public comment. Upon expiry of the publication period on 14.2.2014, a total of 3,677 comments were received.
- 1.2 On 28.3.2014, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to consider the representations and comments in two groups:

### Group 1

- (a) collective hearing of the first group comprising 880 representations (**R1 to R798 and R10736 to R10817**) and eight comments (**C3669 to C3676**) submitted by the villagers and related organisations including 鎖羅盆村村務委員會聯同曾家裘測量師有限公司, STKDRC, VRs of various indigenous villages and other individuals, etc. mainly in relation to the insufficient “V” zone; and

### Group 2

- (b) collective hearing of the second group comprising 9,978 representations (**R799 to R10735 and R10818 to R10858**) and 3,669 comments (**C1 to C3655, C3661, C3677, C3656 to C3660 and C3662 to C3668**) submitted by the Legislative Councillors, green/ concern groups and other individuals mainly in relation to the excessive “V” zone.

<sup>1</sup> The names of all representers and comments can be found at the Board’s website at [http://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/plan\\_making/S\\_NE-SLP\\_1.html](http://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/plan_making/S_NE-SLP_1.html)

- 1.3 This paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations and comments. The representers and commenters have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

## **2. The Representations**

- 2.1 All the representations object to the draft OZP and their views could be generally categorized into two groups.

### **Group 1**

- (a) The first group, which comprises 880 representations (**R1 to R798 and R10736 to R10817**) submitted by the villagers and related organizations as well as other individuals, mainly objects to the insufficient “V” zone to satisfy the demand for Small House developments and the inclusion of a large amount of private land within the “Conservation Area” (“CA”) zone. They propose to expand the “V” zone to the middle and upper sections of the river valley for Small House development. In addition, a comprehensive zoning proposal to facilitate eco-tourism is proposed.

### **Group 2**

- (b) The second group, which comprises 9,978 representations (**R799 to R10735 and R10818 to R10858**) submitted by Legislative Councillors, green/ concern groups and other individuals, mainly objects to the excessive “V” zone on the grounds that it is based on unrealistic Small House demand figures without verification. Provision of Small House would pose a severe threat to the important habitats and species of the area. Hence, they propose that the “V” zone should be minimized to the existing village cluster, and the upper section of So Lo Pun stream and its riparian zone should be zoned as “CA” so as to separate the ecologically sensitive stream from adverse effects of developments. Above all, the Administration should strengthen control over development in Country Park enclaves by incorporating them into Country Parks.
- 2.2 The representations made by the Legislative Councillors, green/ concern groups, villagers and related organisations as well as samples of some standard letters/ e-mails are attached at **Annexes I-1 to I-29**. A full set of the representations is saved in the CD-ROM attached at **Annex VII** for Members’ reference. A set of hard copy is also deposited at the Secretariat of the Board for Members’ inspection. The grounds of representations and their proposals as well as the Planning Department (PlanD)’s responses are summarised at **Annexes III-1 to III-2** with relevant locations shown on **Plans H-1 and H-1a**.

## **Grounds of Representations**

### **Group 1**

- 2.3 The grounds of representations in **Group 1** are summarised below:

Inadequate land within the "V" zone

- (a) The proposed "V" zone could not satisfy the future demand for Small House development. Due to topographical constraints, inadequate land is available for Small House development.

**Group 2**

2.4 The grounds of representations in **Group 2** are summarised below:

Designation of "V" zone

*Small House demand*

- (a) The proposed "V" zone with an area of about 4.12ha is considered excessive. There will be 134 houses in the proposed "V" zone with a planned population of 1,000. According to the 2011 Census, the population at So Lo Pun was zero and there is no outstanding small house application. The government should provide justification for the designation of such a large "V" zone.
- (b) The demand for Small House is infinite and has been determined without any justifications and verification. The prevailing Small House Policy is unsustainable and majority of applications are abusing the Policy. Designation of "V" zones should be based on a more realistic estimation of the need for Small Houses.
- (c) Certificate of proof of need and residence should be required in each Small House application. Restraints on alienation of ancestral or inherited village land should be enforced so that Small Houses remain within the ownership of the indigenous villagers as far as possible.

*Environmental impact on the local habitats and the surrounding areas*

- (d) Development in the area will have adverse impact to the habitat of Crab-eating mongoose (食蟹獾), *Prionailurus bengalensis* (豹貓) in So Lo Pun. The Greater Bamboo Bat *Tylonycteris robustula* (褐扁顱蝠), a rare local species, would be affected due to the high light intensity generating from the small house development in the excessive "V" zone.
- (e) So Lo Pun is not provided with public sewage system. The sewage from small houses could only be treated by on-site septic tanks and soakaway (STS) systems. Also, there is no road access to the area and proper maintenance of the STS is in doubt. Pollutants will eventually discharge into water bodies nearby and pollute the environment.
- (f) The underlying surface sediment in So Lo Pun comprises porous and highly permeable deposits, which allows for rapid drainage. As such, adequate purification cannot be achieved by STS system before the wastewater reaches the sea. There is no geology assessment on the cumulative sewage percolation to the surrounding areas.

- (g) The STS can only provide a minimum level of sewage treatment. The effluent from a septic tank still carries a very high nutrient, organic and microbiological loads which can only be effectively attenuated in circumstances where the ground conditions are suitable and development density is low. STS system is often not effective in removing pollutants in the long run because of inadequate maintenance and with the increase in number of septic tanks.
- (h) As the Crooked Harbour outside So Lo Pun is within the Mirs Bay Water Control Zone (WCZ) and it is located in close proximity to Yan Chau Tong Marine Park (about 1km) and the Ap Chau Fish Culture Zone (about 1.5km), the cumulative impacts to water quality from the STS systems in the proposed “V” zone of So Lo Pun will pollute the ecologically sensitive habitats at So Lo Pun and the surrounding sensitive area, including Yan Chau Tong Marine Park.

*Notes of “V” zone*

- (i) Stricter planning control should be imposed requiring planning permission for ‘NTEH’, ‘Eating Place’ and ‘Shop and Services’ uses and any demolition, addition, alteration and/or modification to an existing building in “V” zone.

*Cumulative impact assessment*

- (j) There is a lack of relevant surveys/assessments, including environmental, drainage, landscape, and traffic on the potential cumulative impact of the additional Small Houses on the area. The carrying capacity for individual enclave sites and the overall capacity of all Country Park enclaves must be carefully studied before an informed and responsible decision on land use and small house numbers can be made.
- (k) There is also no plan to improve the infrastructure (e.g. sewage, road access, car parking and public transport) to support new developments at So Lo Pun and visitors to the Area. Village layout plan and public works programme should be drawn up to improve the infrastructure and facilities of So Lo Pun and to prevent the existing village from polluting the area.

Adequacy of “GB” zone

- (l) The lower section of So Lo Pun Stream is a designated Ecologically Important Stream (EIS). The “GB” zone adjoining the upper section of the stream should be zoned to “CA” as it is ecologically significant<sup>2</sup>. The real planning intention of “GB” zone may not be conservation-led as planning permission is often given to Small House development in “GB”, which may induce irreversible impacts on the wetland and the riparian zone in future.

---

<sup>2</sup> Previous surveys have shown that Big-headed Frog (*Limnonectes fujianensis*) (大頭蛙), Chinese Bull Frog (*Hoplobatrachus chinensis*) (虎紋蛙), Crab-eating Mongoose (*Herpestes urva*) (食蟹獾) and Japanese Eel (*Anguilla japonica*) (日本鰻鱺) could be found in the middle and upper section of So Lo Pun Stream

*Notes of “GB” and “CA” Zones*

- (m) To prevent environmentally sensitive land from being destroyed in ecological terms (e.g. bogus agricultural activities) prior to applying for a change of land use, ‘Agricultural Use’, ‘On-Farm Domestic Structure’, ‘Barbecue Spot’, ‘Picnic Area’, ‘Public Convenience’ and ‘Tent Camping Ground’ in “CA” and “GB” zones should not be allowed or should be Column 2 uses requiring planning permission of the Board.

Ecological information

- (n) The representations made by the green/ concern groups contain ecological information to justify the conservation value of the area, which are mainly summarized below:
  - (i) A study from Kadoories Farm & Botanic Garden (KFBG) has recorded a total of 244 vascular plant species including 7 species of conservation concern, one dragonfly species with conservation concern, 11 native fish species including 3 species of conservation concern, 2 Amphibian species and 3 Mammal with conservation concern in So Lo Pun.
  - (ii) Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and others have recorded 38 species of birds in and around So Lo Pun. In particular, 10 species of birds are of conservation interest including Common Emerald Dove (綠翅金鳩), Grey Treeple (灰樹鵲) and Crested Kingfisher (冠魚狗). The water fern, a protected plant in China under State Protection (Category II), can be found in the freshwater marshes located in close proximity to the proposed “V” zone, where the rice fish, species of conservation concerns, is recorded too.
  - (iii) The seahorse *Hippocampus kuda*, the species listed as Vulnerable under the IUCN, could be found at Kat O Hoi, which is under threat by water pollution from the village houses.

Designation of country park enclave as country park

- (o) The objective of country park enclave (CPE) policy is to protect the enclaves against “immediate development threats” from “incompatible developments” such as extensive new Small Houses built on agricultural land and near forests and streams. However, most of the OZPs prepared for the enclaves have included expanded “V” zone that will cause “immediate development threats” on a larger scale. This contradicts the stated CPE policy and fails to comply with the International Convention on Biological Diversity.

- (p) The CPEs are well connected with the adjoining Country Parks from ecological, landscape and recreational point of view. They should be incorporated in Country Parks so that developments would be subject to scrutiny by the Country and Marine Parks Board and AFCD, and put under active management including habitat and amenity improvements, regular patrols and surveillance, and enforcement actions against irregularities.

## Proposals

### Group 1

2.5 The proposals of the representations in **Group 1** are summarised below:

- (a) The “V” zone should be expanded to the adjoining areas in the middle and upper sections of the river valley zoned “CA” and “GB”, with an area not less than 7.15 ha and should not cover any steep slope, stream and burial ground (**Drawing H-1 and Plan H-1a**).
- (b) To facilitate eco-tourism, the following rezoning proposals for the “CA” zone and part of the “GB” zone and road designation are proposed (**Drawing H-1 and Plan H-1a**):
- (i) The wetland including the part of the EIS adjacent to the breakwater should be rezoned from “CA” to “GB”.
- (ii) The wetland and the adjoining areas should be rezoned from “CA” and “GB” to “REC” to facilitate development of low-density recreational uses including field study/ education/ visitor centre with a view to promote ecological tourism.
- (iii) The ex-school site and the adjoining areas should be rezoned from “CA” and “GB” to “G/IC” to facilitate development of village committee office and tourist centre.
- (iv) The pond and various areas adjacent to proposed “V” zone including the terraced agricultural land should be rezoned from “CA” and “GB” to “AGR” to facilitate agricultural uses such as hobby farming.
- (v) In relation to the rezoning proposals above, a set of new Notes<sup>3</sup> for the “V”, “GB”, “REC”, “G/IC” and “AGR” zones has been proposed (**Annex VI**).

---

<sup>3</sup> When compared with the Notes of the current draft So Lo Pun OZP No. S/NE-SLP/1, there is no discrepancy in the Notes of the proposed “V” zone, whereas ‘Grave’ and ‘Zoo’ are added to Column 1 and Column 2 uses of the proposed “GB” zone respectively.

On the current draft OZP, there is no “REC”, “G/IC” and “AGR” zonings. A comparison between the Notes of the proposed “REC”, “G/IC” and “AGR” zonings and the MSN reveals the following discrepancies:

- Various uses, namely ‘Indoor Recreational Centre’, ‘Park’, ‘Light Refreshment Kiosk’, ‘Rowing Centre’, ‘Refuse Collection Point’, ‘Berthing space’, ‘Pier’, ‘Helipad’, ‘Aquarium’, ‘Botanical Garden’, ‘Water Sports Centre’, ‘School’, ‘Restaurant’ and ‘Shop and Services’ are



- (vi) The existing footpath and the adjoining areas with a minimum width of 2.5 m leading from the breakwater to proposed “V” zone should be shown as ‘Road’ on the OZP.

### **Group 2**

2.6 The proposals of the representations in **Group 2** are summarised below:

- (a) The “V” zone should be confined to the existing village structures/ building lots (within 20m around the existing ruined houses) and approved small house sites.
- (b) In order to strengthen the protection of the lower section of So Lo Pun Stream designated as EIS, the upper section of the stream and its tributaries together with the riparian zone with a minimum buffer of 30 m on both sides of the streams as well as the adjoining woodland should be rezoned from “V” and “GB” to “CA” (**Drawing H-2 and Plan H-1a**).
- (c) To rezone seagrass bed together with the adjacent mangrove community as SSSI from “CA” to “SSSI” (**Plan H-1a**).
- (d) So Lo Pun should be designated as country park to protect its ecologically sensitive areas and the DPA plan should be extend for at least one year to allow for the required process. In the interim, the “V”, “GB” and non-conservation zonings could be rezoned to “Undetermined” to protect the natural environment.

## **3. Comments on Representations**

- 3.1 Among the 3,677 comments received, a total of eight comments (**C3669 to C3676**) were submitted by villagers and individuals in support of the representations opposing to the insufficient “V” zone in **Group 1** on similar grounds. They also object to the representations opposing to the excessive “V” zone in **Group 2**.
- 3.2 The remaining 3,669 comments were submitted by green/ concern groups and individuals with similar grounds put forth by the representations opposing to the excessive “V” zone in **Group 2**. Amongst these comments, a total of 3,657 comments (**C1 to C3655, C3661 and C3677**) support the representations in **Group 2**, whereas the remaining 12 comments (**C3656 to C3660 and C3662 to C3668**) do not indicate the representations on which the comments are related to but raise objection to the draft OZP.

- 
- added to Column 1 uses of the proposed “REC” zone
  - ‘Indoor Recreational Centre’, ‘Park and Garden’ and ‘Shrine’ uses are added in Column 1 uses and ‘Bank’, ‘Fast Food Shop’, ‘Garden of Remembrance’, ‘Restaurant’, ‘Staff Quarters’ and ‘Warehouse’ are added to Column 2 uses of the proposed “G/IC” zone.
  - ‘Government Use (Police Reporting Centre only)’ is revised to ‘Government Use (Police Reporting Centre only/ **Police Post**)’ under Column 1 uses of the proposed “AGR” zone.

- 3.3 A summary of comments on representations and PlanD's response is at **Annex IV** and all the submissions are saved in the CD-ROM attached in **Annex VII** for Members' information.

#### **4. Background (Plans H-1, H-2 and H-3)**

##### Preparation of So Lo Pun DPA Plan

- 4.1 On 1.9.2010, under the power delegated by the Chief Executive, the Secretary for Development directed the Board, under section 3(1)(b) of the Ordinance, to prepare a Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan for the So Lo Pun area.
- 4.2 On 30.9.2010, the draft So Lo Pun DPA Plan No. DPA/NE-SLP/1 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. During the plan exhibition period, a total of 14 representations and five comments were received. After giving consideration to the representations and comments on 8.4.2011, the Board decided not to meet the representations and not to propose any amendment to the draft DPA Plan.
- 4.3 On 8.11.2011, the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C), under section 9(1)(a) of the Ordinance, approved the draft So Lo Pun DPA Plan, which was subsequently renumbered as DPA/NE-SLP/2. On 18.11.2011, the approved So Lo Pun DPA Plan No. DPA/NE-SLP/2 was exhibited for public inspection under section 9(5) of the Ordinance.

##### Preparation of So Lo Pun OZP

- 4.4 On 11.1.2013, under the power delegated by the Chief Executive, the Secretary for Development directed the Board, under section 3(1)(a) of the Ordinance, to prepare an OZP to cover the So Lo Pun area. On 26.4.2013, the Town Planning Board (the Board) gave preliminary consideration to the draft So Lo Pun OZP and agreed that the draft OZP was suitable for submission to the North District Council (NDC) and the STKDRC for consultation.
- 4.5 The NDC and STKDRC were consulted in May 2013. The NDC and STKDRC strongly opposed to the "CA" zoning as the land involved was mostly private land owned by the villagers. Besides, only about 9% of land was designated for "V" zone which could not meet the Small House demand. The planned "V" zone would eradicate the village and this deprives the rights of the private landowners. There was a lack of vision for the future planning of the Area as planning should be "people-oriented" and some agri- and eco-tourism and recreational activities should be promoted to boost the local economy. Hence, the current three zonings (i.e. "CA", "GB" and "V" zones) on the draft OZP seemed inadequate to cater for the villagers' wish to revive the village. Instead, "AGR", "REC" and "G/IC" should also be incorporated, and hence a balance should be struck between conservation and development right of landowners in the planning of the rural area.

- 4.6 Comments from green groups<sup>4</sup> were received. They in general supported the draft OZP as many areas of conservation importance at the Area were covered with conservation zonings.
- 4.7 Taking into account the divergent views on the draft OZP, in particular the proposed “V” and “CA” zonings, the zonings for the Area were revised after further consultation with relevant departments, including the DAFC. While the ecological importance of the wetland complex and the surrounding natural woodland with dense vegetated hillslopes and major natural stream were proposed to be retained as “CA” and “GB” zones, about 1.6 ha of land<sup>5</sup> were proposed for the “V” (with an increase of total area from about 2.52ha to about 4.12ha). DAFC had no objection to rezoning the two sites for village expansion should there be genuine need to expand the “V” zone.
- 4.8 On 9.8.2013, the revised draft So Lo Pun OZP incorporating the proposed extension of the “V” zone, together with the comments received from the NDC, STKDRC, villagers and green groups were submitted to the Board for further consideration. The Board noted the comments and agreed that the revised draft OZP was suitable for exhibition for public inspection. On 27.9.2013, the draft So Lo Pun OZP No. S/NE-SLP/1 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. The NDC and STKDRC were consulted in September and October 2013, they strongly opposed to the “CA” zoning as the land involved was mostly private land owned by the villagers and relevant infrastructure should be provided to support the village.
- 4.9 Subsequently, the VRs of relevant indigenous villages and STKRC submitted representations opposing to the draft OZP<sup>6</sup>.

## **5. Planning Consideration and Assessments**

### **The Representation Sites and their Surrounding Areas (Plans H-1, H-2 and H-3)**

- 5.1 The representation sites cover the whole OZP area (**Plan H-1a**).

### **Planning Scheme Area**

---

<sup>4</sup> Including Designing Hong Kong, World Wide Fund for Hong Kong, Conservancy Association and Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden

<sup>5</sup> Including a piece of land at the north-eastern part of the Area and a long stretch of level land at the south-western part of the Area.

<sup>6</sup> Representations submitted by 鎖羅盆村村務委員會聯同曾家裘測量師有限公司 (**R10736**), VR of Kop Tong (**R10737**), VR of Mui Tsz Lam (**R10740**), VR of Fung Hang (**R10742**), VRs of Kuk Po (**R10743 and R10744**), VR of Yim Tso Ha (**R10745**), VR of Ngau Shi Wu and STKDRC (**R10747**)

- 5.2 The Planning Scheme Area (the Area) covers a total land area of about 27.68 hectares. It is encircled by the Plover Cove Country Park on three sides and fronts the scenic coastline of Kat O Hoi to the north-east. The boundary of the Area is shown by a heavy broken line on the Plan (**Plan H-1**).
- 5.3 So Lo Pun Village is the only recognized village in the Area which is currently largely uninhabited. Village developments are mainly concentrated on the lower hillslopes in the northern part of the Area. Most of the village houses have become ruins, except a few one to two-storey houses which are in dilapidated condition and left vacant.
- 5.4 The southern, western and northern parts of the Area are mainly covered by woodland and shrubland. The wooded areas along the hillside form a continuous stretch of well-established vegetation with those located at the adjacent Plover Cove Country Park and complement the overall natural environment and landscape beauty of the surrounding country park. Fallow agricultural land in lower slopes and at lowland is mainly covered with grass and shrubs. Some freshwater marshes are evolved from abandoned wet agricultural fields at the flat land in the central part of the Area which are covered by wet vegetation and shrubs. Estuarine mangrove/mudflat habitat are found on the seaward side of the Area along the coastline of Kat O Hoi. A pond fringed by reeds are found to the south-west of the estuarine mangrove. A natural stream flows across the Area in the south-west to north-east direction, the downstream part of which is identified by the AFCD as an EIS. .

### **Planning Intention**

- 5.5 The general planning intention of the Area is to protect its high conservation and landscape value which complements the overall naturalness and the landscape beauty of the surrounding Plover Cove Country Park.
- 5.6 Apart from the environmental and ecological considerations, development in the Area is constrained by limited transport and infrastructural provisions. It is also intended to consolidate village so as to avoid undesirable disturbances to the natural environment and overtaxing the limited infrastructure in the Area.
- 5.7 The planning intention of the “V” zone is to designate both existing recognized village and areas of land considered suitable for village expansion. Land within this zone is primarily intended for development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers. It is also intended to concentrate village type development within this zone for a more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services. Selected commercial and community uses serving the needs of the villagers and in support of the village development are always permitted on the ground floor of a New Territories Exempted House (**Annex V**).
- 5.8 The planning intention of the “GB” zone is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone (**Annex V**).

- 5.9 The planning intention of the “CA” zone is to protect and retain the existing natural landscape, ecological or topographical features of the area for conservation, educational and research purposes and to separate sensitive natural environment such as Country Park from the adverse effects of development. There is a general presumption against development in this zone (**Annex V**).
- 5.10 For “GB” and “CA” zones, any diversion of streams, filling of land/pond or excavation of land shall not be undertaken without the permission from the Board whilst for “V” zone, any diversion of streams, filling of pond requires planning permission from the Board (**Annex V**).

### **Responses to Grounds of Representations**

- 5.11 As far as the boundaries of the “V” zone is concerned, local villagers, STKDRC and NDC consider that the “V” zone is not sufficient to meet the Small House demand. On the other hand, the green/ concern groups and large number of individuals consider the extent of “V” zone excessive as it has been based on unrealistic Small House demand figures without verification. It also fails to respect the high ecological value of the area and the possible adverse environmental impact on the local habitats and the surrounding areas, including Yan Chau Tong Marine Park.

#### Designation of “V” zone

- 5.12 The representations in **Group 1** propose to expand the “V” zone to the adjoining “CA” and “GB” zones, whereas those in **Group 2** propose to confine the “V” zone to existing structures/ building lots and approved Small House sites. Responses to the two divergent views over the designation of “V” zone are set out below.
- (a) According to the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC), the wetland system (i.e. the intertidal habitats with mangrove and seagrass bed, reed pond, a natural stream identified as Ecologically Important Stream (EIS) and the freshwater marsh, etc.) is of ecological importance. A relatively high diversity of fish and a number of species of conservation interest including water fern *Ceratopteris thalictroides* (水蕨), seagrass *Zostera japonica* (矮大葉藻) and a bat species *Tylonycteris robustula* (褐扁顛蝠), as well as the uncommon dragonfly *Orthetrum poecilops poecilops* (班灰蜻) and a fish species *Oryzias curvinotus* (弓背青鱗), have been recorded in the wetland complex. According to the available information, the EIS and its adjoining freshwater marsh is one of the remaining habitats in Hong Kong that support a healthy and natural population of *Oryzias curvinotus* (弓背青鱗). In addition, the water fern *Ceratopteris thalictroides* (水蕨), which was a protected plant in China, has been recorded throughout the marsh. These important habitats for a variety of rare and uncommon flora and fauna should be protected. AFCD considers that “CA” zoning for the wetland complex in So Lo Pun is appropriate for the wetland system so that the rich ecological and biological features in the areas can be protected and preserved.

- (b) The surrounding wooded areas and a traditional burial ground at the eastern part of the hillslopes in the northern part of the Area, which form a continuous stretch of well-established vegetation of the natural woodlands adjoining the Plover Cove Country Park providing a buffer between the development and conservation areas or Country Park. As such, the “CA” and “GB” zones are to protect the local ecological resources as well as to prevent the adjacent country park area from being impacted by incompatible developments.
- (c) An incremental approach for designating “V” zone for Small House development has been adopted with an aim to confining small house development at suitable locations adjacent to existing village cluster. Discounting the environmentally sensitive areas zoned “CA” and “GB” zones, the residual area covered by the current “V” zone is mainly occupied by the existing village clusters and the adjoining relatively disturbed, young woodland and shrubby grassland developed from abandoned agricultural land, which is considered suitable for village development. The boundaries of the “V” zone for the So Lo Pun Village, a recognised village within the Area has been drawn up after considering the village ‘environ’ (‘VE’), local topography, settlement pattern, Small House demand forecast, areas of ecological importance, as well as other site specific characteristics. During the course of preparing the draft OZP, views and comments from stakeholders including NDC, STKDRC, villagers and green/ concern groups and government departments had been sought.
- (d) The “V” zone on the draft OZP has an area of about 4.12 ha which is smaller than the ‘VE’ of So Lo Pun Village (about 5.58 ha<sup>7</sup>) by 26%. Within the “V” zone, about 3.36 ha of land is available, capable of meeting about 50% (134 houses) of the small house demand for 270 houses (**Table 1**).

**Table 1**

Small House Demand Figure in 2012		‘VE’ Area (ha) on draft OZP	“V” zone Area on draft OZP (ha)	Land required to meet the demand for 270 houses (ha)	Land available to meet the demand figure (ha)	Percentage of the demand met by available land (%)
Outstanding demand	10-year forecast (2013-2022)					
Nil	270	5.58	4.12	6.75	3.36 (134 houses)	50

<sup>7</sup> The ‘VE’ of So Lo Pun is about 8.58 ha. However, only about 5.58 ha of the ‘VE’ fall within the boundary of the Planning Scheme Area of the So Lo Pun OZP.

Small House demand

- (e) The Small House demand forecast is only one of the many references in considering the proposed “V” zones. The forecast is provided by the Indigenous Inhabitant Representatives to the Lands Department and could be subject to changes over time for reasons like demographic changes (birth/death) as well as aspiration of indigenous villagers currently living outside the village, local and overseas, to move back to So Lo Pun in future. Though there is no mechanism at the planning stage to verify the figures, the respective District Lands Office would verify the status of the Small House applicant at the stage of Small House grant application.

Environmental impact on the local habitats and the surrounding areas

- (f) The ecological value of So Lo Pun and the surrounding areas are well recognised and it has been an important consideration in the drawing up of the draft OZP. As indicated in paragraph 8.1 the Explanatory Statement of the draft OZP, the Area “*forms an integral part of the natural system of the natural woodlands in the adjoining Plover Cove Country Park with a wide spectrum of natural habitats including, inter alia, woodland, hillside scrubland, mangrove, reedpond, freshwater marshes and an EIS, which support some rare/uncommon flora and fauna of the Area and should be preserved and protected*”. Conservation zones, including “GB” and “CA” under which there is a general presumption against development, have been designated at suitable locations to protect the natural environment of So Lo Pun and the ecologically linked Plover Cove Country Park and the surrounding areas under the statutory planning framework.
- (g) As there is no existing sewer or planned public sewer for the Area, Small House development within “V” zone would have to rely on on-site STS system. The sewage disposal including STS system of Small House will be considered by concerned departments (including EPD, Drainage Service Department (DSD), Water Service Department (WSD), AFCD and PlanD) during the processing of the Small House application by Lands Department (LandsD). The arrangement of sewage disposal works should comply with the requirements from the relevant government departments.

- (h) As stated in paragraph 9.1.5 of the Explanatory Statement of the draft OZP, under the current practice and in accordance with the Environmental, Transport and Works Bureau's Technical Circular (Works) (ETWBTC(W)) No. 5/2005, for development proposals/submissions that may affect natural streams/rivers, the approving/processing authorities should consult and collate comments from AFCD and relevant authorities. The use of septic tank as a sewage treatment and disposal option in rural areas with small population is permitted under Section 5.2.8, Chapter 9, Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. For protection of the water quality of the area, the design and construction of on-site STS for any development proposals/submissions need to comply with relevant standards and regulations, such as Environment Protection Department (EPD)'s Practice Note for Professional Person (ProPECC PN) 5/93 *"Drainage Plans subject to Comment by the Environmental Protection Department"*. Operation and maintenance practices for septic tank (e.g. desludging practices) are also given in EPD's "Guidance Notes on Discharges from Village Houses".
- (i) According to EPD, in considering whether a site is suitable for septic tank construction for sewage treatment and disposal, a number of site-specific conditions need to be taken into account such as percolation test result, proximity of rivers/streams, depth of ground water table, topography, and flooding risks, etc. Site-specific information is essential, particularly if the soil characteristics such as the soil textures are believed to be highly variable even on the same site. The percolation test is one of the requirements set out in ProPECC PN 5/93 which have to be followed by authorized person to determine the absorption capacity of soil and hence the allowable loading of a septic tank. This test will allow relevant parties to ascertain whether the soil condition is suitable for a septic tank to function properly for effective treatment and disposal of the effluent. As such, the site-specific conditions of So Lo Pun will be taken account of in assessing the acceptability of proposed STS system.
- (j) The ProPECC also sets out the design standards, including soil percolation tests, and clearance distances between a septic tank and specified water bodies (e.g. ground water tables, streams, beaches, etc.), as well as clearance distances between buildings. These requirements will help identify the appropriate ground conditions suitable for the construction of septic tanks, and limit the density of houses to certain extent. Operation and maintenance practices for septic tank (e.g. desludging practices) are also given in EPD's Guidance Notes on Discharges from Village Houses.

Notes of the Plan

- (k) As the planning intention of the "V" zone is to provide land for New Territories Exempted House (NTEH), it is appropriate to put NTEH in Column 1 of "V" zone. As regards other proposed changes put forth by the representers,



- (i) AFCD has reservation on moving 'Agricultural Use' and 'On-Farm Domestic Structure' to Column 2 of conservation zones<sup>8</sup> from agricultural development point of view, as it would impose restrictions on agriculture and discourage agricultural development in the long run. Moreover, AFCD advises that permission from the Board is required for any works relating to diversion of streams, filling of land/pond or excavation of land which may cause adverse impacts on the natural environment. Taking into account the above factors, AFCD agrees that there is no strong justification for imposing more stringent control on Column 1 uses in the relevant zones.
- (ii) 'Barbecue Spot' and 'Picnic Area' refer to facilities operated by the Government and exclude sites that are privately owned and/or commercially operated, 'Public Convenience' refers to any latrine within the meaning of Section 2 of the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (Cap. 132) and any bathhouse maintained, managed and controlled by the Government for use of the public, and 'Tent Camping Ground' refers to any place open to the public where tents are put only for temporary lodging for recreational or training purpose. Again, this is a facility designated by the Government. AFCD considers that such activities may not have significant adverse impacts on sensitive habitats and thus there is no strong justification for putting these uses under Column 2 of "GB", "CA" and "CPA" zones.
- (iii) LandsD when processing Small House applications and applications for 'Eating Place' and 'Shop and Services', will consult concerned departments to ensure that all relevant departments would have adequate opportunity to review and comment on the applications. Moreover, if a food business is carried out at the premises, a food business licence is required to be obtained from FEHD under the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (Cap. 132). Licence will only be issued to a food business if the prescribed hygiene standards, building structure, fire safety, lease conditions and planning restrictions are confirmed. As such, there is no strong justification to place 'NTEH', 'Eating Place' and 'Shop and Services' under Column 2 of "V" zone.

#### Cumulative impact assessment

- (1) When considering the draft So Lo Pun OZP, the Board has already taken into account all relevant planning considerations, including the advice of the relevant Government departments and public views. Neither Transport Department (TD) nor Highways Department (HyD) raised any concern on the proposed "V" zone from the traffic and transport infrastructure points of view.

---

<sup>8</sup> Some representers suggested it should be deleted in all zones

- (m) LandsD when processing Small House applications will consult concerned departments including EPD, AFCD, TD, DSD, WSD), Fire Services Department (on emergency vehicular access issue), Civil Engineering Development Department (on slope issue) and PlanD to ensure that all relevant departments would have adequate opportunity to review and comment on the applications. LandsD would require the applicant to comply with relevant standards and regulations, such as ProPECC PN 5/93 in respect of on-site septic tank system for any development proposals/submissions.

5.13 Responses to other specific grounds of representations in **Group 2** are summarised as follows:

Adequacy of “GB” zone and ecological information

- (a) In advising PlanD on drafting the OZP, AFCD has emphasised more on the preservation of habitats with high conservation value rather than records of individual species or specimens of conservation interest. Important habitats such as mature native woodlands and the riparian zone of So Lo Pun Stream as well as the wetland, which could provide suitable habitats supporting a variety of species, are covered with conservation zonings. In general, these habitats are supporting various species of conservation interest.
- (b) AFCD considers that the proposed "GB" zone is appropriate since the area consists of relatively disturbed, young woodland that has developed from abandoned agricultural land and the upper section of So Lo Pun Stream is not an EIS.
- (c) It should be noted that “GB” is a conservation zone and there is a general presumption against development within “GB” zone. Any Small House development shall require planning permission from the Board which would scrutinize and consider each application on its own merits. Relevant departments including EPD, AFCD and CTP/UD&L, PlanD would be consulted to ensure that no adverse environmental, ecological and landscape impacts, among others, would be brought about to the surroundings including So Lo Pun Stream and the wetland.

Designation of Country Park Enclaves as Country Parks

- (d) As announced in the 2010-11 Policy Address, the Government undertook to either include the remaining 54 enclaves into country parks, or determine their proper uses through statutory planning, so as to meet the conservation and social development needs. For country park enclaves to be protected by statutory plans, the general planning intention of the country park enclaves is to conserve its natural landscape and conservation value, to protect its natural and rural character, and to allow for small house development by the indigenous villagers of the existing recognised villages within the areas.
- (e) Designation of the Country Park is under the jurisdiction of the Country and Marine Parks Authority governed by the Country Parks Ordinance (Cap. 208) which is outside the purview of the Board.

## **Responses to Representations' Proposals**

### **Group 1**

5.14 The comprehensive proposal to facilitate eco-tourism covers an extensive area including the wetland system<sup>9</sup> and the surrounding woodland. AFCD comments that the wetland system is identified of ecological importance and has been well recognized for the preparation in the OZP. Besides, the woodland at the peripheral of the Area is ecologically link with the wide stretch of natural vegetation in the Plover Cove Country Park. As such, the concerned area should remain as "CA" and "GB" zones with a view to protect the local ecological resources as well as to prevent the adjacent country park area from being impacted by incompatible developments. Responses to specific rezoning proposals are set out below.

#### **Rezoning of the wetland including part of the EIS adjacent to the breakwater from "CA" to "GB"**

- (a) The area adjacent to the breakwater proposed to be rezoned to "GB", which covers part of the EIS, wetland and mangrove stand, etc., is part of the wetland system of So Lo Pun with significant ecological value. AFCD considers that the current "CA" zoning for the area is appropriate.

#### **Rezoning of the wetland and the adjoining areas including part of the EIS from "CA" and "GB" to "REC"**

- (b) AFCD advises that part of the long stretch of level land comprising the wetland complex should be retained for conservation purpose while the adjoining natural habitats should be designated as "GB". Specifically, there is no concrete recreation proposals submitted by any interested parties so far. Should such recreational proposals be submitted, the Board would consider each case on its individual merits. In view of the above, there is no strong justification to rezone the wetland and adjoining areas from "CA" and "GB" to "REC".

---

<sup>9</sup> The wetland system in So Lo Pun includes the intertidal habitats at the coastal area with mangrove and seagrass bed, a reed pond, a natural stream identified as EIS and the freshwater marsh at the central part of the flat land.

Rezoning of the ex-village school and the adjoining area from “GB” and “CA” to “G/IC”

- (c) Regarding the proposal to convert an ex-school site (rezoned from “GB” and “CA” (a small part only) to “G/IC” zone) for village office and visiting centre, according to District Lands Officer/North (DLO/N) and District Officer/North (DO/N), the ex-school site was originally held under two pieces of privately-owned land but they were surrendered to Government in 1958 for the purpose of building the school. Presently, the ex-school site is partially vacant and partially occupied by a ruined structure constructed in 2009 before the gazette of the DPA Plan. Since there is presently no population in the area, and the total population upon full development is about 1,100 persons, there is no requirement for specific GIC facilities for the moment. Hence, the ex-school site is included in a larger “GB” zone. Notwithstanding, “Village Office” is always permitted in the “V” zone. For village office and visiting centre, they are under the Column 2 uses of the “GB” zone and could be considered by the Board on individual merits.

Rezoning of the pond and various areas including part of the EIS from “CA” and “GB” to “AGR”

- (d) AFCD advises that part of the long stretch of level land comprising the wetland complex should be retained for conservation purpose while the adjoining natural habitats should be designated as “GB”. Notwithstanding, agricultural use is a column 1 uses in all zones, which is always permitted.

Notes of the rezoning proposals

- (e) There is no detailed information in the submissions to justify the proposed rezoning to “GB”, “REC”, “G/IC” and “AGR”. Besides, the Notes of respective zonings should be based on the Master Schedules of Notes (MSN) agreed by the Board and there is no information provided to justify the additional uses in “GB”, “REC”, “G.IC” and “AGR” zones as proposed by the representers.

Designating areas shown as ‘Road’ on the OZP

- (f) According to relevant works departments, there is neither planned/committed access road to be proposed at the Area. Besides, according to the Notes of the draft OZP, geotechnical works, local public works, road works and such other public works co-ordinated or implemented by Government are always permitted.

**Group 2**

**Designating the upper section of So Lo Pun Stream and its tributaries, the riparian zones and the adjoining secondary woodland as “CA”**

- (g) According to AFCD, a natural stream flows across the Area in the south-west to north-east direction, the downstream part of which is identified by the AFCD as an ‘EIS’ and this part of the stream forms part of the wetland complex in the Area which has been proposed for “CA” zone. However, DAFC advises that the upper part of the stream is yet to be designated as ‘EIS’ which requires further investigation. In view of the above, it is not appropriate to designate the upper part of the natural stream as “CA” zone.
- (h) As stated in paragraph 5.12(g) to (j), for development proposals that may affect natural rivers/ streams and the requirement of on-site septic tank system, there is relevant regulatory mechanism including Environmental, Transport and Works Bureau’s Technical Circular (Works) (ETWBTC(W)) No. 5/2005 and Environmental Protection Department (EPD)’s Practice Note for Professional Person (ProPECC PN) 5/93.
- (i) The riparian zone and the adjoining woodland are zoned “V” and “GB” on the OZP. Except for those located near the village clusters which are considered suitable for village expansion, these wooded areas form a continuous stretch of well-established vegetation of the natural woodlands adjoining the Plover Cove Country Park. The “GB” zoning is considered appropriate for providing planning control and protection to the upstream area and woodland.

**Rezoning seagrass bed and the adjoining mangrove from “CA” to “SSSI”**

- (j) According to AFCD, the proposal of protecting the seagrass and mangrove by conservation zonings is supported. However, it is considered that there is currently insufficient justification to designate the area concerned as “SSSI” and AFCD does not have any plan to designate the area as SSSI. As such, the “CA” zoning is appropriate.

**Designation of country park enclave into country park**

- (k) The proposed incorporation of an area as “Country Park” is under the jurisdiction of the Country and Marine Parks Authority (the Authority) under the Country Parks Ordinance (Cap. 208) which is outside the purview of the Board.

## **Responses to Grounds of Comments**

5.15 Among the 3,677 comments received, eight comments (**C3669 to C3676**) support the representations in **Group 1**, 3,657 comments (**C1 to C3655, C3661 and C3677**) support the representations in **Group 2**, whereas the remaining 12 comments (**C3656 to C3660 and C3662 to C3668**) do not indicate the representations on which the comments are related to but raise objection to the draft OZP. The major grounds of the comments and PlanD's responses are at **Annex III-3**, which are similar to those raised by the representations.

## **6 Consultation**

6.1 Relevant government departments have been consulted and their comments have been incorporated in the above paragraphs.

6.2 The following government bureaux and departments have been consulted and they have no major comment on the representations:

- (a) Chief Engineer/Drainage Projects, Drainage Services Department;
- (b) Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department;
- (c) Chief Engineer/Sewerage Projects, Drainage Services Department;
- (d) Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department;
- (e) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department;
- (f) Chief Engineer/Development(2), Water Supplies Department;
- (g) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (h) Director of Fire Services;
- (i) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene;
- (j) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (k) Antiquities and Monuments Offices, Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (l) Marine Officer/Planning and Development Section, Marine Department;
- (m) Project Manager/New Territories East, Civil Engineering and Development Department;
- (n) Project Officer/School Building, Education Bureau; and
- (o) Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research, Planning Department

## **7 Planning Department's Views**

7.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 5 above and for the following reasons, the Planning Department does not support the Representations in both **Group 1** and **Group 2** and considers that no amendment should be made to the Plan to meet these representations:

**Group 1 and Group 2**

**Designation of “V” zone**

- (a) “V” zone has been designated at suitable locations to meet Small House demand of indigenous villagers in So Lo Pun, a recognised village within the Area. The boundaries of the “V” zone for the village has been drawn up having regard to the ‘VE’, local topography, settlement pattern, Small House demand forecast, areas of ecological importance, as well as other site specific characteristics.
- (b) The Small House demand forecast is only one of the factors in drawing up the proposed “V” zones and the forecast is subject to variations over time. An incremental approach for designating the “V” zone for Small House development has been adopted with an aim to confining Small House development at suitable locations.

**Group 1**

**Comprehensive proposal to facilitate eco-tourism**

- (c) The “CA” zone primarily covers the wetland system of So Lo Pun, which includes the intertidal habitats with mangrove and seagrass bed, reed pond, a natural stream identified as EIS and the freshwater marsh. These important habitats for a variety of rare and uncommon flora and fauna should be protected. The current “CA” zoning is considered appropriate.
- (d) The surrounding wooded areas, which form a continuous stretch of well-established vegetation of the natural woodlands adjoining the Plover Cove Country Park. The “GB” zone, which provides a buffer between the development and conservation areas or Country Park, is considered appropriate.
- (e) ‘Agricultural use’ is a column 1 use, which is permitted in all zones.
- (f) According to relevant works departments, there is neither planned/committed access road to be proposed at the Area. Besides, according to the Notes of the draft OZP, geotechnical works, local public works, road works and such other public works co-ordinated or implemented by Government are always permitted.

## **Group 2**

### **Environmental impact on the local habitats and the surrounding areas**

- (g) When considering the Plan, the Board have already taken into account all relevant planning considerations, including the advice of the relevant Government departments and public views. Conservation zones, including “GB” and “CA” under which there is a general presumption against development, have been designated to cover areas having ecological and landscape significance to protect the natural environment of So Lo Pun and the ecologically linked Plover Cove Country Park under the statutory planning framework. LandsD when processing Small House grant and applications will consult concerned departments including EPD, AFCD and PlanD to ensure that all relevant departments would have adequate opportunity to review and comment on the applications. The design and construction of on-site STS for any development proposals/submissions need to comply with relevant standards and regulations, such as Environment Protection Department (EPD)'s Practice Note for Professional Person (ProPECC PN) 5/93 *“Drainage Plans subject to Comment by the Environmental Protection Department”*.

### **Opposition to the “GB” zone**

- (h) The upper section of So Lo Pun Stream is not an EIS and the proposed “GB” zone is considered appropriate since the area consists of relatively disturbed, young woodland that has developed from abandoned agricultural land. There is a general presumption against development within the “GB” zone. Any Small House development shall require planning permission from the Board, and each case shall be considered on its individual merits.

### **Designating the upper section of So Lo Pun Stream and its tributaries, the riparian zones and the adjoining secondary woodland as “CA”**

- (i) The upper part of So Lo Pun Stream is not an EIS and it is not appropriate to designate the upper part of the natural stream as “CA” zone.
- (j) For development proposals that may affect natural rivers/ streams and the requirement of on-site septic tank system, there is relevant regulatory mechanism including Environmental, Transport and Works Bureau's Technical Circular (Works) (ETWBTC(W)) No. 5/2005 and Environment Protection Department (EPD)'s Practice Note for Professional Person (ProPECC PN) 5/93. As such, there is no need to excise the tributaries and their adjoining areas from the “V” zone and to be rezoned to “CA”.
- (k) The surrounding wooded areas and a traditional burial ground at the eastern part of the hillslopes in the northern part of the Area, which form a continuous stretch of well-established vegetation of the natural woodlands adjoining the Plover Cove Country Park providing a buffer between the development and conservation areas or Country Park. As such, the “GB” zones is considered appropriate.



Rezoning the seagrass bed and the adjoining mangrove from “CA” to “SSSI”

- (l) There is currently insufficient justification to designate the area concerned as “SSSI”. As such, the “CA” zoning is appropriate.

Designation of country park enclave as country park

- (m) Designation of the Country Park is under the jurisdiction of the Country and Marine Parks Authority governed by the Country Parks Ordinance (Cap. 208) which is outside the purview of the Board.

## **8 Decision Sought**

The Board is invited to give consideration to the representations and comments taking into consideration the points raised in the hearing session, and decide whether to propose/not to propose any amendments to the Plan to meet/partially meet the representations.

## **9 Attachments**

<b>Annexes I-1 to I-29</b>	Representations made by LegCo Councillors, green/concern groups, villagers and related organisations as well as samples of some representations in standard letters/ e-mails
<b>Annexes II-1 to II-5</b>	Comments on Representations made by green/concern groups and samples of some representations in standard letters/ e-mails
<b>Annex III-1</b>	Summary of Representations in <b>Group 1</b> and PlanD’s Responses
<b>Annex III-2</b>	Summary of Representations in <b>Group 2</b> and PlanD’s Responses
<b>Annex III-3</b>	Major Points of Representations
<b>Annex IV</b>	Summary of Comments on Representations and PlanD’s Responses
<b>Annex V</b>	Extracts of the Notes of the “V”, “GB” and “CA” zones of the draft So Lo Pun OZP No. S/NE-SLP/1
<b>Annex VI</b>	Proposed Notes for the “V”, “GB”, “ARG”, “REC” and “G/IC” submitted by 鎖羅盆村村務委員會聯同曾家裘測量師有限公司 (R10736) in <b>Group 1</b>
<b>Annex VII</b>	CD-ROM containing names of all representers and commenters as well as their submissions (for Members only)
<b>Drawing H-1</b>	Drawing submitted by 鎖羅盆村村務委員會聯同曾家裘測量師有限公司 (R10736) in <b>Group 1</b>
<b>Drawing H-1a</b>	Drawing submitted by <b>R1 to R798</b> in <b>Group 1</b>
<b>Drawing H-2</b>	Drawing submitted by WWF-Hong Kong (R10820) in <b>Group 2</b>
<b>Plan H-1</b>	Location plan
<b>Plan H-1a</b>	Representation proposals
<b>Plan H-2</b>	Development constraints

**Plan H-3**

Aerial photo

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
APRIL 2014**