

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

APPLICATION NO. A/YL-NTM/377

- Applicants** : East Star International Holdings Limited, Golden Swallow Holdings Limited and Sino Plastic Enterprise Limited represented by Aikon Development Consultancy Limited
- Site** : Lots 2572 RP, 2573, 2578 in D.D. 104 and Adjoining Government Land (GL), Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long
- Site Area** : About 1,544.7m² (including GL of about 38.2 m² (2.47%))
- Lease** : Block Government Lease (demised for agricultural use)
- Plan** : Approved Ngau Tam Mei Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-NTM/12
- Zoning** : “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”)
 [maximum plot ratio: 0.2, maximum building height: 2 storeys (6m); filling of pond or excavation of land requires permission from the Town Planning Board]
- Application** : Proposed House

1. The Proposal

- 1.1 The applicants seek planning permission for a proposed house with a plot ratio (PR) of 0.2 at the application site (the Site) (**Plan A-1**). According to the Notes for “R(D)” zone on the OZP, ‘House (not elsewhere specified)’ is a Column 2 use which requires planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). The Site is currently vacant and covered with vegetation (**Plans A-2 to A-4b**).
- 1.2 According to the applicants, the proposed house comprises 2 structures connected by a 4.5m-high shelter in between, with a single-storey structure at the northwestern part of the Site, and a 2-storey structure with a lift tower at the southeastern part of the Site. The Site is accessible via Chun Shin Road with its proposed ingress/egress at the northern boundary of the Site (**Plan A-3**). Since the existing level of the Site (i.e. ranging from about +4.3mPD to +4.5mPD) is lower than that of the Chun Shin Road (i.e. about +5.6mPD), the proposed development would require filling of land (of not more than 1.45m) to facilitate

construction of a proper emergency vehicular access (EVA) with a lower gradient to serve the proposed development.

- 1.3 According to the application, the uncovered area of the Site will be used for driveway, parking area, landscape pool, swimming pool, and landscape planting. The applicants confirm no filling of pond/excavation of land will be involved. The site plan, elevations, sections and 3D illustration plans submitted by the applicants are at **Drawings A-1 to A-5**. The major development parameters of the proposed development are summarized as follows:

Site Area	1544.7 m ²
No. of House	1
Domestic GFA	about 308.9 m ² #
PR	0.2
Site Coverage	21.9%
No. of Storeys	1-2
BH	3m to 6m
Car Parking Spaces	2
Expected Completion Year	2023

The submission has assumed the area to be covered by the shelter between the two house structures (about 53 m²) can be exempted from GFA calculation (see section S1 on **Drawing A4**).

- 1.4 In support of the application, the applicants have submitted the following documents :
- (a) Application Form received on 29.10.2018 **(Appendix I)**
 - (b) Planning Statement with site plans, elevations and sections of the proposed house **(Appendix Ia)**
 - (c) Further information (FI) dated 6.11.2018 providing revised extract of Lot Index Plan **(Appendix Ib)**
 - (d) FI dated 19.2.2019 providing swept path analysis, Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR) and responses to departmental comments **(Appendix Ic)**
(accepted but not exempted from publication and recounting requirements)
 - (e) FI dated 15.3.2019 providing responses to departmental comments **(Appendix Id)**
 - (f) FI dated 29.3.2019 enclosing revised drawings, and clarifying minor relaxation is not required and no filling of pond and excavation of land is involved **(Appendix Ie)**
 - (g) FI dated 4.4.2019 enclosing replacement pages of application form and planning statement, and clarifying that the covered area of the EVA has not been included in **(Appendix If)**

GFA calculation.

- 1.5 On 21.12.2018, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) decided to defer decision on the application for two months as requested by the applicants pending submission of FI to address departmental comments. On 19.2.2019, the applicants submitted FI on swept path analysis and GPRR, and the application is scheduled for consideration by the Committee at this meeting.

2. Justifications from the Applicant

The justifications put forth by the applicants in support of the application are detailed in **Appendices Ia** and **If**. They can be summarized as follows:

- (a) The proposed development is fully in line with the planning intention of “R(D)” zone which is primarily for improvement and upgrading of existing temporary structures within the rural areas through redevelopment of existing temporary structures into permanent buildings. The applicants intend to develop low-rise and low-density residential development with a PR of 0.2 and BH ranging from 3m to 6m which tally with the permitted PR and BH stipulated on the OZP.
- (b) The applicants intend to undertake extensive landscape garden work throughout the Site, providing the proposed house development with a green ratio of 58.2%. By allowing the application, the current physical state of the Site can be converted and upgraded to a permanent verdant and natural environment, and is ideal to attain utmost land use maximization without giving rise to detrimental impacts on the environment.
- (c) The proposed development is fully compatible with the surrounding environs which are predominantly characterized by vacant land, village houses and private residential settlement. It is also compatible with the surrounding built environment with PR ranging from 0.2 to 0.4 and BH of 2 to 3 storeys.
- (d) The Site is directly accessible to Chun Shin Road and San Tam Road and is considered highly suitable for residential development.
- (e) Sewage treatment will be designed and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Practice Note for Professional Person (ProPECC) PN 5/93 “Drainage Plans subject to Comment by the Environmental Protection Department” at the detailed design stage and will be duly certified by an Authorized Person (AP).
- (f) No adverse environmental impact is anticipated since there is no non-conforming industrial or open storage uses in close vicinity. Despite the Site is about 40m away from San Tin Highway, a fencing wall along the site boundary is proposed to serve as noise barrier to screen off possible traffic noise from San Tin Highway and to serve as a visual barrier. A landscape strip along the periphery of the Site will be provided. The Site is of low traffic volume given the relatively small scale with 2 parking spaces. Adverse drainage, sewerage, visual and traffic impacts due to the proposed development are not anticipated.

- (g) There are similar approved applications in “R(D)” zone on Mai Po and San Tin OZPs. The current application should enjoy the same land use planning treatment as those approved applications.

3. Compliance with the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” Requirements

The applicants are the sole “current land owner”. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection.

4. Background

The Site is not subject to planning enforcement action.

5. Previous Application

The Site is not the subject of any previous application.

6. Similar Application

- 6.1 There are 4 similar applications (Application Nos. A/YL-NTM/47, 58 and 69 on the same site, and Application No. A/YL-NTM/225 on another site) for proposed New Territories Exempted Houses (NTEHs) and houses in the same “R(D)” zone.
- 6.2 Application No. A/YL-NTM/47 for four proposed NTEHs was rejected by the Committee on 11.12.1998 as its proposed PR was considered excessive (from 0.2 to 0.53) and would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications within the “R(D)” zone. Application Nos. A/YL-NTM/58 and 69, both for three proposed houses and relaxation of PR restriction from 0.2 to 0.3 and 0.25 respectively were rejected by the Committee on 30.4.1999 and by the Board upon review on 10.3.2000 on grounds that the proposed relaxation of PR was not considered minor; there was no strong justification to merit a relaxation of PR restriction; and the approvals would set undesirable precedents.
- 6.3 Application No. A/YL-NTM/225 for proposed NTEH (Small House) on a site partly zoned “R(D)” (45%) and partly zoned “Village Type Development” (“V”) (55%) was approved with conditions on 4.7.2008, mainly on the grounds that favourable consideration was given to the application with reference to the Interim Criteria taking into account that at least 50% of the site was within “V” zone encircling a recognised village; the development was not incompatible with the surrounding areas; was in line with the planning intention of “R(D)” zone for low-rise, low-density residential developments; and no technical problems were envisaged.

6.4 Details of the applications are summarised at **Appendix II** and their locations are shown on **Plan A-1**.

6.5 Application No. A/YL-NTM/372 for proposed houses development at the east of the Site (**Plan A-1**) is scheduled for consideration by the Committee at this meeting.

7. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1, A-2 to A-4b)

7.1 The Site is:

- (a) accessible via Chun Shin Road which branches off from San Tam Road (**Plan A-2**); and
- (b) currently vacant and covered with vegetation.

7.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:

- (a) rural in character and predominated by ponds, vegetated/vacant/unused land;
- (b) to the east are mainly ponds and vacant/unused land, and the site for proposed houses development under Application No. A/YL-NTM/372 to be considered by the Committee at this meeting;
- (c) to the south are ponds, some vacant/unused land and an open storage of construction machinery;
- (d) to the west are vegetated slope, San Tam Road and San Tin Highway; and
- (e) to the north across Chun Shin Road are a nullah, vacant/unused land, village houses of Yau Tam Mei San Tsuen, a temporary real estate office and transportation office with parking of vehicles and storage approved by the Committee on 22.3.2019 under Application No. A/YL-NTM/386, and scattered temporary structures for storage and residential dwelling. To the further northeast are the residential development, La Maison Vineyard, and the Wai Tsai Tsuen within “V” zone.

8. Planning Intention

The planning intention of the “R(D)” zone is intended primarily for improvement and upgrading of existing temporary structures within the rural areas through redevelopment of existing temporary structures into permanent buildings. It is also intended for low-rise, low-density residential developments subject to planning permission from the Board.

9. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

9.1 The following Government departments have been consulted and their views on the application received are summarized as follows:

Land Administration

9.1.1 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department (DLO/YL, LandsD):

- (a) The Site comprises Lot Nos. 2572 RP, 2573 and 2578 all in D.D. 104 and adjoining GL. Those private lots are old schedule agricultural lots held under Block Government Lease and no structure is allowed to be erected without the prior approval of the Government.
- (b) The private lots within the Site are currently owned by different owners. The ownership particulars of the lots forming the Site have to be examined in details at the land exchange application stage, if applied.
- (c) The Site has an area of about 1,544.7m², of which site area, site boundaries, lease details, etc. are subject to verification upon application received by his office at land exchange stage.
- (d) If planning approval is given, the applicants have to apply to the LandsD for a land exchange to effect the proposed development. Such application will be considered by LandsD acting in its capacity as a landlord at its sole discretion and there is no guarantee that the land exchange for the proposed development, including the grant of any additional GL, will be approved. In the event that the land exchange application is approved, it would be subject to such terms and conditions, including, among other things, the payment of premium and administrative fee as may be imposed by LandsD at its sole discretion.

Traffic

9.1.2 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

- (a) He has no comment on the ingress and egress point, proposed parking provisions, and the manoeuvring of vehicles within the Site.
- (b) No vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from the Site at any time.
- (c) Should the application be approved, the following condition should be incorporated:

- (i) the design and provision of vehicular access and parking arrangement for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (ii) the submission and implementation of run-in/run-out proposal to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and Director of Highways.

9.1.3 Comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (CHE/NTW, HyD):

- (a) If the access arrangement is agreed by C for T, the applicants should construct a run-in/out at the access point at Chun Shin Road in accordance with the latest version of Highways Standard Drawing No. H1113 and H1114, or H5133, H5134 and H5135, whichever set is appropriate to match with the existing adjacent pavement.
- (b) His department does not and will not maintain any access connecting the Site and Chun Shin Road. The applicants should be responsible for his own access arrangement.
- (c) Adequate drainage measures should be provided to prevent surface water running from the Site to the nearby public roads and drains.

9.1.4 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Railway Development 2-2, Railway Development Office, Highways Department (CE/RD 2-2, RDO, HyD):

He has no comment from railway development viewpoint. The Site neither falls within any administrative route protection boundary, gazetted railway schemes, nor railway protection boundary of heavy rail systems.

Environment

9.1.5 Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) In view of the small scale of the proposed development, the application is unlikely to cause major pollution.
- (b) In view of the scale and nature of the proposed development, septic tank and soakaway system is considered a suitable sewage treatment system provided that its design, construction and operation follows the requirements of the Practice Note for Professional Person (ProPECC) PN 5/93 'Drainage Plans subject to Comment by the Environmental Protection Department' and are duly certified by an Authorized Person. He has no comment

on the sewage treatment arrangement as the Applicants confirmed that they would implement the most suitable solution to the requirement of ProPECC PN 5/93 and be duly certified by an Authorized Person.

- (c) Regarding the public comments related to water quality impact and sewage disposal, the Applicants are reminded to minimize water quality impact by observing good design and practices such as ProPECC PN 1/94 and PN 5/93 during construction and operation, with special attention in setting up perimeter drainage channels at site boundaries.
- (d) It is noted that the distance to San Tin Highways is about 50m and that the proposed house is 2-storey high. It is recommended to impose the following approval condition should the application be approved:

the submission of a Noise Impact Assessment and implementation of mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the DEP or of the TPB.

Landscape

9.1.6 Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD):

- (a) He has no comment on the application from the landscape planning perspective. It is noted that the Site falls within a landscape non-sensitive zone and significant landscape impact due to the proposed development is not anticipated.
- (b) In consideration that the Site is not located at landscape sensitive areas and the proposed development is unlikely to cause adverse visual and landscape impacts, landscape condition is not recommended, should the application be approved by the Board.
- (c) The applicants are reminded that any proposed tree works/tree felling shall be submitted to the relevant authority for approval prior to commencement of works.

Drainage

9.1.7 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (CE/MN, DSD):

- (a) It is noted that there is an existing DSD's 450mm channel located at the northern part of the Site.

- (b) Should the application be approved, the following conditions should be incorporated:
 - (i) submission of a drainage proposal including preservation and protection of the part of public drainage system that fall within the Site; and
 - (ii) implementation of the drainage proposal for the development to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Board.

Building Matters

9.1.8 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department (CBS/NTW, BD):

- (a) He has no in-principle objection to the application under the Buildings Ordinance.
- (b) The Site shall be provided with means of obtaining access thereto from a street under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) 5 and emergency vehicular access shall be provided for all the buildings to be erected on the site in accordance with the requirements under the B(P)R 41D.
- (c) Detailed checking of plans will be carried out upon formal submission of building plans, including whether the proposed covered area can be disregarded from GFA calculation under B(P)R.
- (d) In accordance with the Government's committed policy to implement building design to foster a quality and sustainable built environment, the applicants should observe the sustainable building design requirements (including building separation, building setback and greenery coverage).

Nature Conservation

9.1.9 Comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC):

- (a) He has no strong view against the application from the nature conservation perspective noting that the Site has been zoned as "R(D)" and the development scale and height of the proposed development is low and within the parameters set in the OZP.
- (b) However, there are some abandoned ponds in the vicinity of the Site and a drainage channel to the north. Should the application be approved, the applicants should be advised to adopt necessary measures to avoid causing pollution to the surrounding ponds and

the drainage channel during both construction and operation of the development.

Fire Safety

9.1.10 Comments of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS):

- (a) He has no in-principle objection to the application subject to the provision of water supplies for fire-fighting and fire service installations (FSIs) to his satisfaction.
- (b) Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans or referral from relevant licensing authority.
- (c) The EVA provision in the Site shall comply with the standard as stipulated in Section 6 Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 under the B(P)R 41D which is administered by BD.

Others

9.1.11 Comments of Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO), CEDD):

He has no in-principle objection to the application from geotechnical point of view and no comment on the submitted GPRR in **Appendix Ic**.

9.1.12 Comments of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS):

- (a) According to his office record, there may be some amenity area with trees near the proposed ingress/egress. The Applicants shall provide a tree survey indicating the trees nearby and the exact location of the proposed ingress/egress in the subsequent land exchange stage.
- (b) From tree preservation point of view, every possible effort should be made to preserve existing trees on Site as far as possible and minimise the adverse impact to them. Should any trees be inevitably affected, the project proponent should submit a Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal (TPRP) with strong justifications to relevant government departments for consideration and approval in accordance with DEVB Technical Circular (Works) No. 7/2015. The Applicants should submit the TPRP to LandsD for processing and DLCS will provide comment upon request from LandsD.

9.1.13 Comments of the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS):

Electricity Safety

- (a) He has no particular comment on the application from electricity supply safety aspect. However, in the interests of public safety and ensuring the continuity of electricity supply, the parties concerned with planning, designing, organising and supervising any activity near the underground cable or overhead line under application should approach the electricity supplier (i.e. CLP Power) for the requisition of cable plans (and overhead line alignment drawings, where applicable) to find out whether there is any underground cable and/or overhead line within and/or within the vicinity of the Site. They should also be reminded to observe the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation and the “Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines” established under the Regulation when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines.

Town Gas Safety

- (b) There is a high pressure town gas transmission pipeline running along San Tam Road which is in the vicinity of the Site. The project proponent/consultant/works contractor shall liaise with the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited in respect of the exact location of existing or planned gas pipe routes/gas installations in the vicinity of the Site and any required minimum set back distance away from them during the design and construction stages of the proposed development. The project proponent/consultant/works contractor is required to observe the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department’s requirements on the “Avoidance of Damage to Gas Pipes 2nd Edition” for reference.

District Officer’s Comments

9.1.14 Comment of the District Officer (Yuen Long), Home Affairs Department (DO(YL), HAD):

His office conducted a local consultation from 6.3.2019 to 22.3.2019 consulting Village Representatives of Wai Tsai, Yau Tam Mei (I) and Yau Tam Mei (II) and did not receive any comments from the locals. Local comments should be submitted to the Board directly, if any.

9.2 The following Government departments have no comment on the application:

- (a) Commissioner of Police (C of P);
- (b) Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department (PM/W, CEDD); and
- (c) Chief Engineer/Development (2), Water Supplies Department (CE/Dev(2), WSD).

10. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period

On 9.11.2018 and 1.3.2019, the application and the FI were published for public inspection. During the first 3 weeks of the statutory public inspection periods, 65 public comments were received from a Yuen Long District Council member and 64 members of the public (of which 62 are in two formats of standard letters) objecting to the application. They were concerned that the proposed development had failed to provide information on sewerage arrangement, noise impact and impacts on the nearby ponds and drainage channels; and there was no strong justification submitted for the case, which would set a precedent if approved (**Appendix III**).

11. Planning Considerations and Assessments

- 11.1 The application is for proposed house development in the “R(D)” zone. The planning intention of the “R(D)” zone is primarily for improving and upgrading of existing temporary structures within the rural areas through redevelopment of existing temporary structures into permanent buildings. It is also intended for low-rise, low density residential developments subject to planning permission from the Board. The proposed house development is in line with the planning intention of the “R(D)” zone, and the proposed development parameters of PR of 0.2 and BH of 1 to 2 storeys (3m to 6m) also conform to the development restrictions as stipulated in the “R(D)” zone under OZP.
- 11.2 The proposed low-rise development is considered not incompatible with the surrounding environment which is predominated by ponds, vacant/unused land with scattered open storage/storage use, and some residential dwellings/structures. Approval of the house development could serve as a catalyst to phase out the non-conforming and undesirable rural industrial-related uses in the vicinity of the Site and help achieve an early implementation of the planning intention of the “R(D)” zone. The proposed filling of land is to facilitate the provision of a proper EVA with a lower gradient to serve the proposed development.
- 11.3 DAFC, DEP and CTP/UD&L of PlanD have no adverse comments on the application from ecological, environmental and landscape planning points of view. H(GEO) of CEDD has no objection to the application from geotechnical point of view and no comment on the submitted GPRR. Other departments including C for T, CHE/NTW of HyD, CE/MN of DSD and D of FS have no adverse comment on the proposed development. Their technical requirements could be addressed by imposing approval conditions as recommended in paragraphs 12.2 (a) to (f). In view of the above, the proposed development is not anticipated to generate adverse impacts on traffic, environmental, sewerage, drainage and infrastructural aspects on the surrounding area.
- 11.4 The applicants have proposed a shelter of about 53 m² connecting the 2 house structures, and an EVA will run underneath the shelter (**Drawings A1 and A2**).

Regarding whether the concerned covered area is acceptable for disregarding its area from GFA calculation under B(P)R, CBS/NTW of BD advised that detailed checking of plans shall be carried out upon formal submission of building plans. In this regard, an advisory clause is suggested in **Appendix IV** to advise the applicants that if concessions are not granted by the Building Authority for the concerned covered area with the resultant PR exceeding the PR applied for, a fresh application to the Board would be required.

- 11.5 While two similar applications within the same “R(D)” zone (Application Nos. A/YL-NTM/58 and 69) were rejected by the Committee/Board between 1999 and 2000, they were for house developments involving relaxation of PR restriction, and the proposed PR relaxation was considered not minor and with no strong justification to merit a relaxation. The planning circumstance of the current application is different in that it is for house development with proposed PR and BH in compliance with the OZP restrictions.
- 11.6 65 objecting public comments were received raising concerns on sewerage arrangement, noise impact and impacts on the nearby ponds and drainage channels, and setting of precedence. The planning assessment above and comments of relevant departments are of relevance.

12. Planning Department’s Views

- 12.1 Based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 and having taken into account the public comment in paragraph 10, the Planning Department has no objection to the application.
- 12.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 12.4.2023, and after the said date, the permission shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted is commenced or the permission is renewed. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members’ reference:

Approval conditions

- (a) the design and provision of vehicular access and parking arrangement for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission and implementation of run-in/run-out proposal to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the submission of a Noise Impact Assessment and implementation of mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the submission of a drainage proposal including preservation and

protection of the part of public drainage system that fall within the Site to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;

- (e) in relation to (d) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (f) the submission and implementation of water supplies for fire-fighting and fire service installations proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board.

Advisory Clauses

The recommended advisory clauses are in **Appendix IV**.

12.3 There is no strong reason to recommend rejection of the application.

13. Decision Sought

- 13.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant permission.
- 13.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, Members are invited to consider the approval condition(s) and advisory clause(s), if any, to be attached to the permission, and the date when the validity of the permission should expire.
- 13.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, Members are invited to advise what reasons for rejection should be given to the applicants.

14. Attachments

Appendix I	Application form received on 29.10.2018
Appendix Ia	Planning Statement with MLP, floor plans, elevations and sections of the proposed house
Appendix Ib	FI dated 6.11.2018
Appendix Ic	FI dated 19.2.2019
Appendix Id	FI dated 15.3.2019
Appendix Ie	FI dated 29.3.2019
Appendix If	FI dated 4.4.2019

Appendix II	Similar applications within the same “R(D)” zone of the Ngau Tam Mei OZP
Appendix III	Public comment received during the statutory publication period
Appendix IV	Recommended Advisory Clauses
Drawing A-1	Master Layout Plan
Drawing A-2	First Floor Site Plan
Drawing A-3	Elevation Plan
Drawing A-4	Section Plan
Drawing A-5	3D Illustration of the Proposed Development
Plan A-1	Location Plan with Similar Application
Plan A-2	Site Plan
Plan A-3	Aerial Photo
Plan A-4a to 4b	Site Photos