

**REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/NE-TK/611**  
**UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Proposed Temporary Toilet for a Period of 3 Years and Excavation of Land in  
“Conservation Area” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’  
Government Land in D.D. 28, Tai Mei Tuk, Tai Po**

**1. Background**

- 1.1 On 24.4.2017, the applicants, Messrs. WONG Wong Po Stanley and WONG Pak Sing, represented by Goldrich Planners & Surveyors Ltd., sought planning permission to use the application site (the Site) for a proposed temporary toilet for a period of three years with ancillary excavation works under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Site falls within an area mainly zoned “Conservation Area” (“CA”) (about 93.6 m<sup>2</sup> or 71% of the Site) and partly shown as ‘Road’ (about 38.3 m<sup>2</sup> or 29% of the Site) on the approved Ting Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-TK/19 (**Plan R-1**).
- 1.2 On 13.10.2017, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to reject the application and the reasons were:
- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “CA” zone which is intended to protect and retain the existing natural character or ecological features of the area for conservation, educational and research purposes and to separate sensitive natural environment such as Site of Special Scientific Interest or Country Park from the adverse effects of development. There is a general presumption against development in this zone. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
  - (b) there is no information in the submission to justify the proposed development and to demonstrate that the proposed temporary toilet is needed to support the conservation of the existing natural landscape or scenic quality of the area or it is an essential infrastructure project with overriding public interest; and
  - (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within “CA” zone resulting in disturbance to the existing natural character of the area and the surrounding areas.”
- 1.3 For Members’ reference, the following documents are attached:
- (a) RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/611A (Annex A)
  - (b) Extract of minutes of the RNTPC meeting held on (Annex B)

13.10.2017  
(c) Secretary of the Board's letter dated 27.10.2017

(Annex C)

## 2. Application for Review

On 3.11.2017, the applicants applied under section 17(1) of the Ordinance, for review of the RNTPC's decision to reject the application (**Annex D**). The applicant have not submitted any written representation in support of the review application.

## 3. The Section 16 Application

### The Site and its Surrounding Areas (Plans R-1 to R-4b)

- 3.1 The situation of the Site and the surrounding areas at the time of the consideration of the s.16 application by the RNTPC were described in paragraphs 6.1 to 6.3 of **Annex A**. There has been no material change of the situation since then.
- 3.2 The Site is:
  - (a) located at the embankment of two ponds;
  - (b) covered with grass; and
  - (c) accessible via Ting Kok Road (**Plan R-2a**).
- 3.3 The surrounding areas are predominantly rural in character with cluster of village houses within "V" zone of Tai Mei Tuk on the opposite side of Ting Kok Road and tree groups. To the south of the Site is the fish pond covered by Government Land Licence ('GLL') No. T20153 (**Plans R-2b** and **R-3**) and further west and southwest along Tai Mei Tuk Road are public car park, public transport terminus, public toilet (which is about 30m from the south-western part of the fish pond and about 330m from the gate of the fish pond adjacent to the Site at Ting Kok Road) and barbecue area (**Plan R-2b**).
- 3.4 There was an application (No. A/NE-TK/605), submitted by the same applicants, for temporary depositing of two containers for selling of refreshment, and hiring of fishing-related accessories and storage for a period of three years at the southern portion of the same "CA" zone (**Plan R-1**). The application was approved with conditions by the RNTPC on 3.3.2017 on a temporary basis for a period of three years mainly on considerations of being small in scale and no pond filling involved, no environmental nuisance and no adverse traffic, drainage, sewage disposal and fire safety impacts on the surrounding areas; no objection or adverse comments from concerned Government departments and the public, and was the subject of a previously approved application (No. A/NE-TK/174) for the same use. The application site is situated on a piece of Government land which is covered by a valid Short Term Tenancy (i.e. STT No. 1296) granted with a term of two years certain commenced from 1.2.2002 and thereafter quarterly permitting the selling of refreshment, hiring of fishing-related accessories and storage while the permitted structures include two containers with a total built-over area of not exceeding 44.654m<sup>2</sup> and a height of not exceeding 2.44m (**Plan R-3**).

### Planning Intention

- 3.5 The planning intention of the “CA” zone is to protect and retain the existing natural character or ecological features of the area for conservation, educational and research purposes and to separate sensitive natural environment such as Site of Special Scientific Interest or Country Park from the adverse effects of development. There is a general presumption against development in this zone. In general, only developments that are needed to support the conservation of the existing natural landscape or scenic quality of the area or are essential infrastructure projects with overriding public interest may be permitted.
- 3.6 According to paragraph 9.10.2 of the Explanatory Statement of the approved Ting Kok OZP No. S/NE-TK/19, the pond at the southern side of Ting Kok Road near Tai Mei Tuk is designated “CA”. This pond should be retained due to Fung Shui reason. Therefore, any type of intensive development would not be allowed in this zone. In fact, apart from being a Fung Shui pond, it also provides a nice view for the villages of Tai Mei Tuk and Lung Mei.

### Previous Application

- 3.7 There is no previous application at the Site.

### Similar Application

- 3.8 There is no similar application within the same “CA” zone.

## **4. Comments from Relevant Government Departments**

- 4.1 Comments on the s.16 application made by relevant Government departments are stated in paragraph 8 and Appendix III of **Annex A**.
- 4.2 For the review application, the relevant Government departments have been further consulted and their views on the review application are summarized as follows:

### Land Administration

- 4.2.1 The District Lands Officer/Tai Po, Lands Department (DLO/TP, LandsD) has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 8.1.1 in **Annex A**, and recapitulated below:
- (a) no objection to the application;
  - (b) the Site partly falls within the licence area (of about 32,700m<sup>2</sup>) of GLL No. T20153 and partly on unallocated Government land. GLL No. T20153 was issued for fish pond and temporary structures use. Permitted structures under the GLL are for storage and watchman shed on the northern side of the licence area and no other structures are permitted without his consent in writing;

- (c) since the proposed toilet is not intended for public use, the planning intention of the “CA” zone is an important factor. FEHD should be consulted whether the existing toilet is able to meet the public needs and additional facilities are required;
- (d) for the GLL No. T20153 portion, if the planning application is approved, the licensee is required to apply to LandsD for permission. Such application will be considered by LandsD acting in the capacity of landlord at his sole discretion and there is no guarantee that such application will be approved. If such application is approved, it will be subject to such form, terms and conditions, including payment of any fees, as may be imposed by him; and
- (e) for the unallocated Government land portion, if the planning application is approved, the applicants are required to apply to LandsD and HyD for excavation permit.

#### Environmental Hygiene

4.2.2 The Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH) has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 8.1.2 in **Annex A**, and recapitulated below:

- (a) the existing public toilet at Tai Mei Tuk next to the Tai Mei Tuk Bus Terminus (**Plan R-1**), with a building footprint of about 119.6m<sup>2</sup>, provides a male toilet (with four cubicles and five urinals), a female toilet (with 12 cubicles) and one disabled person toilet. The public toilet opens 24 hours a day and can sufficiently meet the public needs. Additional toilet facilities for the public are not required;
- (b) he has no objection regarding any private toilet to be built in Tai Mei Tuk area subject to clearance from other concerned Government departments. So far, no complaint on the lack of toilet facilities at Tai Mei Tuk has been received; and
- (c) the proposed temporary toilet is within a leased government land and no facilities of Food and Environmental Hygiene Department would be affected.

#### Nature Conservation

4.2.3 The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 8.1.3 in **Annex A**, and recapitulated below:

- (a) the “CA” zone covering the Site was designated due to ‘Fung Shui’ and visual reasons according to the Explanatory Statement of the Ting Kok OZP; and

- (b) no objection to the application as long as there is no pond filling, no net loss of aquaculture area, and proper connection of sewage system to prevent leaching of waste to the fish pond.

#### Urban Design and Visual

4.2.4 The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 8.1.4 in **Annex A**, and recapitulated below:

- considering the temporary nature and small scale of the proposed toilet, he has no strong view on the application from urban design and visual impact perspectives.

#### Landscape

4.2.5 The CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 8.1.5 in **Annex A**, and recapitulated below:

- (a) no objection to the application from the landscape planning perspective;
- (b) according to the aerial photo taken in 2015, the Site is situated in an area of rural landscape character comprising village houses and tree groups in its vicinity. The Site is sandwiched by ponds to its north and south. In the recent site visit, it is revealed that the Site is vacant and partly covered by wild grass while some young trees are outside the Site. The proposed use is not incompatible with the surrounding environment and unlikely causes significant adverse landscape impact on existing rural area. Subject to the applicants' confirmation that the excavation works are to be kept outside the dripline area (i.e. the area is defined by the outermost circumference of the tree branches, from which water drops onto the ground) of the trees near the site boundary, he has no objection to the application from the landscape planning perspective; and
- (c) since the proposed toilet's footprint covers the entire site area, there is no scope for additional landscaping within the Site. Thus, approval condition on landscape proposal is not recommended.

#### Environment

4.2.6 The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 8.1.6 in **Annex A**, and recapitulated below:

- (a) no in-principle objection to the application;
- (b) the Site falls within “CA” zone. The proposed works may constitute a designated project (DP) under Item Q.1 of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO), i.e. ‘All projects including new access roads, railways, sewers, sewage treatment facilities, earthworks, dredging works and other building works partly or wholly in an existing or gazetted proposed country park or special area, a conservation area, an existing or gazetted proposed marine park or marine reserve, a site of cultural heritage, and a site of special scientific interest’, unless it falls within one of the exceptions (a) to (j) under Item Q.1 (Appendix II of **Annex A**) . If this project is confirmed to be a DP, then an environmental permit (EP) would be required prior to start of its construction and operation. It is noted that the applicants have employed an environmental consultant to apply for the EP;
- (c) the applicants propose to divert the sewage and foul water from the proposed toilet to the existing public sewerage pipe under Ting Kok Road. The proposed temporary toilet is about 45m away from the existing sewer. The proposed sewer connection is considered feasible and capacity is available; and
- (d) in view of the project may constitute a DP and shall undergo EIAO process to apply for an EP before its construction, he reserves his comment on the technical details regarding environmental impact assessment in the applicant’s submission (Appendix Ic of **Annex A**).

### Traffic

4.2.7 The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 8.1.7 in **Annex A**, and recapitulated below:

- (a) no in-principle objection to the application as the proposed sewer alignment will run along the verge and cross the carriageway at the shortest distance to minimize disruption to the traffic; and
- (b) for any works to be undertaken outside the lot boundary, in particular along Ting Kok Road, prior consent and agreement from relevant Government departments should be sought. The existing traffic along Ting Kok Road should be maintained during construction or maintenance of the sewer.

4.2.8 The Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department (CHE/NTE, HyD) has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 8.1.8 in **Annex A**, and recapitulated below:

- (a) no comment on the application; and

- (b) if the application is approved, the applicants are required to seek land grant from LandsD and obtain excavation permit from LandsD and HyD for private sewer installation in Government land.

#### Drainage and Sewerage

4.2.9 The Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (CE/MN, DSD) has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 8.1.9 in **Annex A**, and recapitulated below:

- (a) no in-principle objection to the application from the public drainage viewpoint;
- (b) there is existing DSD maintained public drain in the vicinity of the Site;
- (c) for works to be undertaken outside the site boundary, prior consent and agreement from LandsD and/or relevant private lot owners should be sought;
- (d) existing public sewerage is available in the vicinity of the Site for connection. DEP should be consulted regarding the sewage treatment/disposal aspects of the proposed development;
- (e) the applicants should follow the established procedures and requirements for connecting sewers from the Site to the public sewerage system. A connection proposal should be submitted to DSD via LandsD for approval beforehand. Moreover, the sewerage connection will be subject to DSD's technical audit for which an audit fee will be charged; and
- (f) his detailed comments on the drainage proposal enclosed in the applicant's submission on 25.8.2017 are at Appendix III of **Annex A**.

#### Building Matters

4.2.10 The Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department (CBS/NTW, BD) has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 8.1.10 in **Annex A**, and recapitulated below:

- (a) there is no record of submission of the proposed temporary building to the Building Authority for approval;
- (b) the proposed temporary toilet building and the associated drainage works are subject to the control of Part VII of the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R);

- (c) the applicants should make formal submission to the Building Authority for approval regarding the proposed temporary toilet building. Detailed comments will be given at the building plans submission stage; and
- (d) the applicants should note the followings :
  - (i) if the existing structures are erected on leased land without approval of BD (not being a New Territories Exempted House), they are unauthorized under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) and should not be designated for any approved use under the subject application;
  - (ii) before any new building works (including containers/open sheds as temporary buildings) are to be carried out on the Site, the prior approval and consent of the BD should be obtained, otherwise they are Unauthorized Building Works (UBW). An Authorized Person (AP) should be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the BO;
  - (iii) for UBW erected on leased land, enforcement action may be taken by the BD to effect their removal in accordance with BD's enforcement policy against UBW as and when necessary. The granting of any planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of any existing building works or UBW on the Site under the BO;
  - (iv) if the proposed use under application is subject to the issue of a licence, please be reminded that any existing structures on the Site intended to be used for such purposes are required to comply with the building safety and other relevant requirements as may be imposed by the licensing authority;
  - (v) in connection with (ii) above, the Site shall be provided with means of obtaining access thereto from a street and emergency vehicular access in accordance with Regulations 5 and 41D of the B(P)R respectively; and
  - (vi) if the Site does not abut on a specified street of not less than 4.5m wide, its permitted development intensity shall be determined under Regulation 19(3) of the B(P)R at the building plan submission stage.

### Fire Safety

4.2.11 The Director of Fire Services (D of FS) has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 8.1.11 in **Annex A**, and recapitulated below:

- (a) no objection to the application; and

- (b) as extensive excavation works would be involved, the applicants should observe the following requirements throughout the works period as far as is reasonably practicable:
  - (i) a thoroughfare of 3.5m wide shall be maintained for passage of fire appliances at all times;
  - (ii) adequate space (6m side minimum) shall be provided in front of the major façade of the building for free aerial rescue and fire fighting operation. If such requirement cannot be achieved, the construction works shall be carried out by sections of not more than 20m in length;
  - (iii) any road opening affecting the emergency vehicular access should be decked over, capable of withstanding 30-tonne loading for emergency traffic;
  - (iv) an inner turning radius of 6.1m and an outer turning radius of 11m shall be maintained; and
  - (v) any excavation/construction works should under no circumstances cause any obstruction to the nearby fire hydrants and ground valves. Should any fire hydrant be affected, comments from Fire Services Department should be sought.

#### Water Supply

4.2.12 The Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD) has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 8.1.12 in **Annex A**, and recapitulated below:

- (a) no objection to the application; and
- (b) for provision of water supply to the development, the applicants may need to extend the inside services to the nearest suitable government water mains for connection. The applicants shall resolve any land matter (such as private lots) associated with the provision of water supply and shall be responsible for the construction, operation and maintenance of the inside services within the private lots to WSD's standards.

#### Electricity Supply

4.2.13 The Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS) has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 8.1.13 in **Annex A**, and recapitulated below:

- (a) no comment on the application from electricity supply safety aspect; and
- (b) however, in the interests of public safety and ensuring the continuity of electricity supply, the parties concerned with planning, designing, organizing and supervising any activity near the underground cable or overhead line shall approach the electricity supplier for the requisition of cable plans (and overhead line alignment drawings, where appropriate) to find out whether there is any underground cable (and/or overhead line) in the vicinity of the Site. They should 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 electricity supply lines.

4.3 The following Government departments have been further consulted and maintain their previous views of having no objection to/no comment on the review application:

- (a) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (b) District Officer/Tai Po, Home Affairs Department;
- (c) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department; and
- (d) Project Manager/New Territories East, Civil Engineering and Development Department.

## 5. **Public Comments on the Review Application Received During Statutory Publication Period**

On 17.11.2017, the review application was published for public inspection. During the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, which ended on 8.12.2017, two public comments from World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong and an individual were received. The commenters object to the review application mainly for the reasons of being not in line with the planning intention of the “CA” zone; setting of undesirable precedent; and there are many restaurants and cafes close by with toilet facilities.

## 6. **Planning Considerations and Assessments**

- 6.1 The subject application was rejected by the RNTPC on 13.10.2017 mainly on the grounds of being not in line with the planning intention of “CA” zone; no information to justify the proposed development and to demonstrate that the proposed temporary toilet is needed to support the conservation of the existing natural landscape or scenic quality of the area or it is an essential infrastructure project with overriding public interest; and setting of undesirable precedent. The applicants have not provided any written representation in support of the review application.
- 6.2 The Site falls within an area mainly zoned “CA” (about 71%) and partly shown as ‘Road’ (29%). The planning intention of “CA” zone is to protect and retain the existing natural character or ecological features of the area for conservation, educational and research purposes and to separate sensitive natural environment such as Site of Special Scientific Interest or Country Park from the adverse effects of

development. There is a general presumption against development in this zone. No information is provided to demonstrate that the proposed temporary private toilet serving the workers/visitors of the fish pond needed to support the conservation of the existing natural landscape or scenic quality of the area or are essential infrastructure projects with overriding public interest. The proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “CA” zone, even on a temporary basis.

- 6.3 The Site is currently vacant with no significant vegetation (**Plans R-4a and 4b**). The proposed single-storey toilet with a GFA of 78.4m<sup>2</sup> (12.29m (length) x 6.38m (width) x 3m (height)) is not incompatible with the surrounding rural setting with fish pond, cluster of village houses and tree groups. DAFC has no objection to the review application as long as there is no pond filling, no net loss of aquaculture area and proper connection of sewerage system to prevent leaching of waste to the fish pond. The applicants undertake to ensure that the excavation works for the sewerage connection are kept outside the dripline of the trees near the site boundary. CTP/UD&L of PlanD has no objection to the review application from visual and landscape planning perspectives.
- 6.4 The Site falls within an area partly covered by a GLL No. T20153 for fish pond and temporary structures (for storage and watchman shed only) and partly on unallocated Government land where excavation works will be carried out for the laying of sewerage pipeline. According to DFEH, the existing public toilet at Tai Mei Tuk (**Plans R-1 and R-3**), with a building footprint of about 119.6m<sup>2</sup> providing a male toilet (with four cubicles and five urinals), a female toilet (with 12 cubicles) and one disabled person toilet, can sufficiently meet the public needs and additional public toilet facilities are not required. No complaint has been received on the lack of toilet facilities at Tai Mei Tuk. Nonetheless, DFEH has no objection to any private toilet to be built in Tai Mei Tuk area subject to other concerned Government departments’ comments. There is insufficient information to justify the need for the proposed temporary toilet with a building footprint of 78.4m<sup>2</sup> providing a male toilet (with two cubicles and three urinals), a female toilet (with three cubicles), one disabled person toilet and an ancillary store room. There is also no information to demonstrate that there are no other alternatives, such as portable toilet, to cope with the ad hoc and seasonal peak demand. As no information is provided in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed temporary toilet is needed to support the conservation of the existing natural landscape or scenic quality of the area or is an essential infrastructure project with overriding public interest, the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “CA” zone resulting in disturbance to the existing natural character of the area and the surrounding areas.
- 6.5 The construction of the proposed temporary toilet and its sewer connection to the existing public sewer (Drawing A-1 of **Annex A** and **Plan R-2a**) involve land excavation within “CA” zone. DEP has no in-principle objection to the review application and advises that the proposed construction works may constitute a DP and an EP would be required prior to construction and operation. Other Government departments including C for T, CHE/NTE, HyD, CE/MN of DSD and DFEH have no objection to or adverse comment on the review application.
- 6.6 There are two public comments objecting to the review application mainly on the grounds of being not in line with the planning intention of the “CA” zone; setting of undesirable precedent; and there are many restaurants and cafes close by with toilet

facilities. In this regard, the comments of Government departments and the planning assessments above are relevant.

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

7.1 Based on the assessment made in paragraph 6, having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 5 and given that there is no change in the planning circumstances since the consideration of the subject application by the RNTPC, the Planning Department maintains its previous view of not supporting the review application for the following reasons:

- (a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Conservation Area” (“CA”) zone which is intended to protect and retain the existing natural character or ecological features of the area for conservation, educational and research purposes and to separate sensitive natural environment such as Site of Special Scientific Interest or Country Park from the adverse effects of development. There is a general presumption against development in this zone. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) there is no information in the submission to justify the proposed development and to demonstrate that the proposed temporary toilet is needed to support the conservation of the existing natural landscape or scenic quality of the area or it is an essential infrastructure project with overriding public interest; and
- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within “CA” zone resulting in disturbance to the existing natural character of the area and the surrounding areas.

7.2 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the review application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid on a temporary basis for a period of three years until 2.2.2021. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members' reference:

### Approval Conditions

- (a) the submission of drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board by 2.8.2018;
- (b) in relation to (a) above, the implementation of drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board by 2.11.2018;
- (c) the submission of sewerage connection proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board by 2.8.2018;

- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implementation of sewerage connection proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board by 2.11.2018;
- (e) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) or (d) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (f) upon the expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the application site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board.

#### Advisory Clauses

7.3 The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Annex F**.

### **8. Decision Sought**

- 8.1 The Board is invited to consider the application for a review of the RNTPC's decision and decide whether to accede to the application.
- 8.2 Should the Board decide to approve the review application, Members are invited to consider the approval conditions and advisory clauses, if any, to be attached to the permission, and the date when the validity of the permission should expire.
- 8.3 Alternatively, should the Board decide to reject the review application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicant.

### **9. Attachments**

**Plan R-1**                      Location plan  
**Plans R-2a and 2b**      Site plans  
**Plan R-3**                      Aerial photo  
**Plans R-4a and 4b**      Site photos

**Annex A**                      RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/611A  
**Annex B**                      Extract of minutes of the RNTPC meeting held on 13.10.2017  
**Annex C**                      Secretary of the Town Planning Board's letters dated 27.10.2017  
**Annex D**                      Letter dated 3.11.2017 from the applicant applying for a review of the RNTPC's decision  
**Annex E**                      Public comments  
**Annex F**                      Recommended advisory clauses

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**  
**FEBRUARY 2018**

