

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO
THE DRAFT PAK LAP OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/SK-PL/1
INCORPORATING THE AMENDMENTS AS SHOWN ON PLAN NO.
R/S/SK-PL/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 an area to the south of the village cluster at Pak Lap from “Village Type Development” to “Government, Institution or Community (1)” (“G/IC(1)”).
- Item B – Rezoning of an area to the further south of the village cluster at Pak Lap from “G/IC” to “Conservation Area”.

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “G/IC” zone to incorporate the development restriction for the “G/IC(1)” sub-zone.

Town Planning Board

3 April 2020

**Annex II of TPB
Paper No. 10673**

List of Representers in respect of Draft Pak Lap Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-PL/3

Representation No.	Name of Representer
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-1	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-2	The Hong Kong Countryside Foundation
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-3	Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-4	The Conservancy Association
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-5	Hong Kong Bird Watching Society
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-6	Designing Hong Kong Limited
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-7	Friends of Hoi Ha
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-8	Friends of Sai Kung
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-9	Andrew Bowden Brown
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-10	Gary William John Ades
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-11	Ann Marie Davy-Hou
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-12	Thomas Han San Hou
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-13	Yip Tsz Lam
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-14	Ruy Barretto
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-15	鄭杏芬
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-16	新界鄉議局
TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-17	西貢區鄉事委員會

**Annex III of TPB
Paper No. 10673**

List of Commenters in respect of Draft Pak Lap Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-PL/3

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

TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C32	Chow Oi Chuen
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C33	Lo Chun Wah
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C34	Law Wing Fai Teddy
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C35	陳杏怡
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C36	Shek Yuen Nam
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C37	Cheung Ho Kuen
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C38	Wong Kin Yip
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C39	Wong Shing Tat
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C40	Tang Yiu Ying
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C41	Mak Hei Man
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C42	Tsang Shui Hing
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C43	朱偉明
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C44	Ng Ellen
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C45	鄭筠慧
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C46	彭康臧
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C47	Tam Ho Chuen
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C48	Sung Siu Kong
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C49	A Ha
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C50	Li Man Yi
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C51	Tse Lok Yan
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C52	Chan Yee Ting
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C53	Hung Yuk Chun
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C54	The Conservancy Association
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C55	Hong Kong Bird Watching Society
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C56	港九工團聯合總會
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C57	Leung Hin Yan
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C58	陳嘉琳
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C59	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C60	Fung Kam Lam
TPB/R/SK-PL/3-C61	梁里 (西貢區議員)

Summary of Representations in respect of Draft Pak Lap Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-PL/3

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
R1 (also C59)	Mary Mulvihill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supports Amendment Items A & B • based on the conservation-oriented approach on Country Park Enclaves (CPEs) and the general approach adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board) in delineating “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, a balance between enhancing conservation of the area and meeting needs of Small House development has been struck • rezone “V” to “Government, Institution or Community (1)” (“G/IC(1)”) and “G/IC” to “Conservation Area” (“CA”) is a sensible arrangement 	Nil
R2	The Hong Kong Countryside Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • raise adverse comments on designation of “V” zone • the Board has failed to make a meaningful review of the genuine need for housing by indigenous villagers which has been highlighted as a statutory duty in the Court’s judgment on the previous judicial review (JR) • no estimate has been given on the potentially entitled villagers’ need for housing at Pak Lap and no independent assessment has been made on the validity of the Small House demand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to reduce the “V” zone to cater for no more than four houses (i.e. no. of outstanding Small House applications)

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>figures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the extent of “V” zone upon amendment is determined without demonstrating the genuine need • the former unused farmland has been trashed and degraded, which is the classic approach to trash and degrade the land, thus losing environmental benefit and ask for Small House development. In the era of Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP) and particular in Country Park Enclaves (CPEs), this type of action should not be condoned, the land should not be rezoned for unjustified Small House development 	
R3	Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • raises adverse comments on designation of “V” zone • 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 vacant area of the “V” covered by soil is still possible to be used for agriculture • the conservation approach adopted in Tai Long Wan, which confines the “V” zone to the existing village settlements and approved Small House sites, should be adopted in Pak Lap • the vacant “V” zone is next to the watercourse, which drains to Pak Lap Wan, the Board is urged to recall the numerous 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to confine the “V” zone to only cover the existing village settlement and approved Small Houses • to provide a buffer zone separating the watercourse and “V” zone

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		presentations regarding the water pollution impacts on the watercourses	
R4 (also C54)	The Conservancy Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not support only Amendment Items A and B to the OZP • 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 “V” zone which is sufficient to build 16 houses is excessive and not justified, it also violates the incremental approach in confining “V” zone in CPEs • some areas of conservation need are not zoned as conservation zonings on the draft Pak Lap OZP, even located near the existing village settlement, are considered not suitable for Small House development having regard to other planning factors, particularly the outstanding Small House applications, Small House demand and areas of ecological importance • the OZP amendments are minor and are not in line with the background of the OZP review (i) to review on the genuine need of Small House development; and (ii) to review the land use zonings on the OZP taking into account latest circumstances • the current “V” zone next to the existing village cluster in Pak 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to confine the “V” zone to only cover the existing village settlement • to rezone the “AGR” zone to conservation zonings, e.g. “Green Belt (1)” (“GB(1)”) or “CA”

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>Lap was sold to a developer in 1993, 1994, 1996 and 2001, the genuine need for Small House development in Pak Lap is highly doubtful</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the vacant land within “V” zone was subject to land excavation and vegetation clearance before implementing the Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan of Pak Lap; the unused former farmland has been trashed and degraded, which is the classic approach to trash and degrade the land thus losing environmental benefit and ask for Small House development • the designation of “AGR” zone in Pak Lap is wrong decision, as it fails in promoting any genuine agricultural activities and offers no protection for the environment. There was land excavation, with turf paved on the remaining ‘regenerated grassland’ • there is suspected illegal discharge connecting to the natural stream and the river band has been largely modified 	
<p>R5 (also C55)</p>	<p>Hong Kong Bird Watching Society</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support Amendment Item B of increasing “CA” but the reduction of “V” zone by 0.03 ha (Amendment Item A) does not provide sufficient protection to the natural environment of Pak Lap and is not in line with the general planning intention. The conservation approach adopted in Tai Long Wan, which restricts the “V” zone to only cover the existing settlements, should also be adopted in Pak Lap 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to confine the “V” zone to only cover the existing village settlement and to rezone the remaining area to “GB(1)” zone • to rezone the “AGR” zone to “GB(1)” zone

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 current “V” zone next to the existing village cluster in Pak Lap was sold to a developer in 1990s, the current “V” zone might facilitate the abuse of Small House Policy which is against its planning intention • the proposed extent of “V” zone would lead to sewage impacts affecting the nearby aquatic organism and streams. The portion of “V” zone near the stream is considered not suitable for village development due to the direct impact to the riparian of the stream and the potential sewage impacts on the connecting water bodies • Pak Lap which is encircled by Sai Kung East Country Park (SKECP) supports diverse population of different fauna groups and is ecologically linked to the SKECP. It also supports protected species of ardeids, waterbirds and raptors. High diversity of butterflies (37 species) and birds (55 species) have been recorded in Pak Lap, including two uncommon butterfly species, Bush Hopper <i>Ampittia dioscorides etura</i> and Silver Streak Blue <i>Iraota timoleon timoleon</i> and 11 bird species of conservation interest 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the wet agricultural land with water fern which is of conservation significance and under Class II national protection was turned to dry land due to unauthorized land excavation/filling activities and drainage works. The historic background of “destroy first, build later” has been ignored and the Board was misled that the land within “AGR” has not any ecological potential • the <i>Ceratopteris thalictroides</i> (water fern) was once recorded in the current “AGR” zone but the ‘destroy first, build later’ activities occurred at the site, a stringent zoning should be applied to deter undesirable developments and to allow rehabilitation of the ecosystem • the permitted land uses under “AGR” zone would pose undesirable environmental problems to Pak Lap and the natural habitats connect with the country park • consideration should be given to including Pak Lap into SKECP following detailed assessment and public consultation 	
R6	Designing Hong Kong Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • welcomes the Amendment Items A and B • raises adverse comments on designation of “V” zone • the Board has the duty to enquire and review the genuine needs for Small House development but it has failed its duty by accepting the Small House demand forecast made by the IIR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to confine the “V” zone to only cover the existing village settlement and approved Small Houses

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the allocation of land which is sufficient to build 16 Small Houses exceeds the real demand of Small Houses according to the applications received by Lands Department • the main village cluster in Pak Lap was sold to a developer between 1993 and 2001, it is inconsistent with the claims by the IIRs that there is a high demand for housing • the Board should take a stringent restrictive approach towards 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"> • raise adverse comments on designation of “V” zone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to reduce the “V” zone to cater for no more than four houses (i.e. no. of outstanding Small House applications)
R8	Friends of Sai Kung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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 requirements under Action 3c on regulation of sewage effluents near ecological sensitive areas, and Action 9 on incorporating biodiversity considerations in planning and development process of the Hong Kong's Biodiversity Strategy and Action 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		Plan 2016-21 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a rational consideration of the genuine need for housing should take into account the number of Small House application in the past 10 years; number of outstanding Small House applications; and number of potentially entitled indigenous villagers residing in Hong Kong who need to be housed in Pak Lap 	
R9	Andrew Bowden Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • raise adverse comments on designation of “V” zone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to confine the “V” zone to only cover the existing village settlement and approved Small Houses
R10	Gary William John Ades	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	
R13	Yip Tsz Lam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Pak Lap • the “V” zone with no existing Small Houses would still be arable and should not be zoned to “V” 	
R11	Ann M. Davy Hou	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • raise adverse comments on designation of “V” zone 	--
R12	Thomas Han San Hou	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>individually</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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 • a rational consideration of the genuine need for housing should take into account the number of Small House application in the past 10 years; number of outstanding Small House applications; number of potential entitled indigenous villagers residing in Hong Kong who need to be housed in Pak Lap; the fact that potentially entitled villagers have not seen the need to apply for housing in Pak Lap 	
R14	Ruy Barretto SC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • raises adverse comments on designation of "V" zone • no objection on Amendment Item B which moves the "G/IC" near the village so the "CA" forest can be saved • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to reduce the "V" zone to cater for no more than four houses (i.e. no. of outstanding Small House applications) / no more than 0.01ha • the Tai Long Wan conservation approach should be followed by (a) reducing the "V" zone to

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>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 Small House demand forecast made by the IIR has not been verified, the demand for Small House is unknown which proves no demand. There is no evidence of genuine need for Small House development in Pak Lap</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is no demand for 16 Small Houses for 16 resident males, the allocation of "V" land sufficient to build 16 houses is contrary to current evidence, unsubstantiated, irrational and unlawful • a rational consideration of the genuine need for housing should be based on the facts and evidences including zero application in the past 10 years; four outstanding applications and only 0.01 ha. of available land is required; no demand forecast has been known or submitted for five years; whether the overseas residents have demonstrated a genuine intention to return to Hong Kong to live; the relatively small number (i.e. two) of the potentially entitled indigenous villagers living in Hong Kong; no vehicular, marine access nor sewerage system; whether a genuine balance of enhancing, public interest in recreation, education, enjoyment of landscape and nature conservation of the area with meeting the genuine needs of the indigenous inhabitants has been made; and the Board should not encourage the degradation of the environment which took 	<p>become conservation zone, (b) moving 'New Territories Exempted House' ('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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the wet areas and the "AGR" land should be zoned "GB(1)" • to provide a 15m buffer which zoned "CA" on either bank of the stream • to reduce the new proposed "G/IC" zone to an appropriate size

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>place to advance the planning and development process by granting expanding development zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. Planning assessment of the sewage impact should be done before designating the “V” zone • 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, and such approach should be also be adopted in Pak Lap • lax administration and ineffective enforcement has contributed to incremental degradation lead construction works at Pak Lap. Inspection photos in mid-May 2020 reveal a mechanical excavator/backhoe on site, concrete works in the “AGR” zone and structures and platforms built on the grassover “AGR” zone, unauthorized works on the seashore and behind the beach, a vehicle track cut and constructed through “CA”, government land and wooded areas linking Pak Lap to the shore, works on the water course • the Board has failed to fulfill the obligations under the 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>Convention on Biodiversity Article 8e in relation to the sustainable development of enclave areas, and various requirements under the Hong Kong's Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (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</p>	
R15	鄭杏芬	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opposes the designation of “V” zone • the designation of “V” zone has violated the Block Government Lease (BGL) and the Small House Policy. The Board shall not 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 • all development should be stopped as it would adversely affect the ecology of the area 	Nil

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/SK-PL/3-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
R16	Heung Yee Kok New Territories	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opposes Amendment Item A • the amendment further reduces the land for indigenous villagers for building Small Houses • according to Basic Law (40) the legal rights of the indigenous villagers of the New Territories should be protected and there should be adequate land within “V” to satisfy the Small House demand of the future male indigenous villagers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “V” zone should not be reduced
R17	Sai Kung Rural Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opposes Amendment Items A and B • the amendments further reduce the land for indigenous villagers for building Small Houses • rezoning the land of Pak Lap Village to “CA” or “G/IC” neglects the development need of the village and the Small House demand of the male indigenous villagers • the legal tradition rights of the indigenous village in New Territories should not be neglected 	Nil

Summary of Comments in respect of Draft Pak Lap Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-PL/3

Comment No. (TPB/R/SK-PL/3-)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
C1 to C53	Individuals (see Annex III)	R2 to R8	<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)”) and “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zones to protect the areas with ecological and landscape significance • brownfield sites should be used. Housing supply should not be an excuse for land development, while no proper public housing is provided for Hong Kong residents (C47) • Hiram’s Highway has already reached its capacity, there is also insufficient community facilities in Sai Kung (C52)
		R16 and R17	<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
C54 (also R4)	The Conservancy Association	R16 and R17	<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. The Board should further reduce its size to the existing settlement • nearly all land lots in the periphery of “V” zone without any permanent structures have been

Comment No. (TPB/R/SK-PL/3-)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
			<p>solely owned by a developer, it is very doubtful if there are urgent genuine needs to increase the size of “V” zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to protect Pak Lap and avoid undermining the ecological and landscape significance of Sai Kung East Country Park, the areas of conservation zones such as “GB” and “Conservation Area” (“CA”) should not be further 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 Pak Lap has not yet been verified, the Board could not properly inquire into the issue as raised by the Court in the previous JR. The “V” zone should be confined to the existing village clusters • supports the increase of the area of “CA” zone, however the proposed reduction of “V” zone by 0.03 ha does not provide sufficient protection to the natural environment of Pak Lap
C56	港九工團聯合 總會	Nil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the “V” zone should be deleted from the OZP as its area is excessive and village development would have adverse impacts 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 adequate to protect the area • land within Pak Lap is mostly owned by a developer, and large scale of site formation was carried out for developer’s previous proposal of construction of an international school • the OZP amendment does not reflect the background of OZP review on genuine need of Small House development

Comment No. (TPB/R/SK-PL/3-)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
C58	陳嘉琳	R1 to R14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support the representations • on 19.5.2020, the Housing, Planning and Development Committee of Sai Kung District Council passed a temporary motion opposing the OZP as it reserved too much land for Small House development and urging the Government to improve the plan to protect the Country Park Enclave (CPEs) • the area of “V” zone on the OZP is unreasonable, the ecological environment is not protected and would have adverse impacts to the country park in the vicinity • District Lands Office has not received any Small House applications in the past 10 years, and the information on Small House demand forecasts over the years are not sufficient and the mechanism is not transparent • news and investigations carried out by local bodies reviewed that land within Pak Lap is mostly sold to a developer and there is also operation of holiday inn • the Board has undermined the adverse impact to the ecology of Pak Lap, large piece of wetland has turned to be grassland and the existing stream has been modified in Pak Lap
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 demand for Small House. The “V” zone should be confined to the existing village
C60	Fung Kam Lam	R2 to R8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support the representations • the “V” zone should be reduced and part it should be rezoned to “GB(1)” and “AGR” zones to protect the areas with ecological and landscape significance

Comment No. (TPB/R/SK-PL/3-)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
C61	梁里 (西貢區議員)	R1 to R14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support the representations • on 19.5.2020, the Housing, Planning and Development Committee of Sai Kung District Council passed a temporary motion opposing the OZP as it reserved too much land for Small House development and urging the Government to improve the plan to protect the CPEs • the area of “V” zone on the OZP is unreasonable, the ecological environment is not protected and would have adverse impacts to the country park in the vicinity • District Lands Office has not received any Small House applications in the past 10 years, and the information on Small House demand forecasts over the years are not sufficient and the mechanism is not transparent • news and investigations carried out by local bodies reviewed that land within Pak Lap is mostly sold to a developer and there is also operation of holiday inn • the Board has undermined the adverse impact to the ecology of Pak Lap, large piece of wetland has turned to be grassland and the existing stream has been modified in Pak Lap