

REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS NO. A/NE-TT/9 and A/NE-TT/10
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

Proposed Houses (New Territories Exempted Houses - Small Houses) in “Green Belt” Zone
Government land in D.D. 289, Ko Tong, Tai Po, New Territories

1. Background

- 1.1 On 17.1.2019, the following applicants sought planning permission to build a house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House) at each of the application sites (the Sites) under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Sites fall entirely within an area zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) on the Approved Tai Tan, Uk Tau, Ko Tong and Ko Tong Ha Yeung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-TT/2.

Application No.	Applicant	Site Area
A/NE-TT/9	Mr. WONG Fung Mu, Thomas	65.03m ²
A/NE-TT/10	Mr. WONG Ken-liang	65.03m ²

- 1.2 On 8.3.2019, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to reject the applications and the reasons were:
- (a) the proposed developments are not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone, which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submissions for a departure from the planning intention of the “GB” zone;
 - (b) the proposed developments do not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that the proposed developments would cause adverse landscape impact on the surrounding area;
 - (c) the proposed developments do not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for ‘Application for Development within “GB” zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ in that the proposed developments would affect the existing natural landscape; and
 - (d) the approval of the applications would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such

applications would result in adverse impacts on the natural environment and landscape character of the area.

1.3 For Members' reference, the following documents are attached:

- (a) RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TT/9 (Annex A1)
- (b) RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TT/10 (Annex A2)
- (c) Extract of minutes of the RNTPC meeting held on 8.3.2019 (Annex B)
- (d) Secretary of the Board's letter on Application No. A/NE-TT/9 dated 22.3.2019 (Annex C1)
- (e) Secretary of the Board's letter on Application No. A/NE-TT/10 dated 22.3.2019 (Annex C2)

2. Applications for Review

On 11.4.2019, the applicants, both represented by Philip So & Associates Limited, applied under section 17(1) of the Ordinance for review of the RNTPC's decisions to reject the applications (Annex D). Subsequently, at the requests of the applicants' representative, the Board agreed on 28.6.2019 and 13.9.2019 to defer decisions on the applications to allow time for them to consult relevant Government departments and prepare further information in support of the applications. Since then, the applicants have not submitted any written representation in support of the review applications and the applications are scheduled for consideration by the Board at this meeting.

3. The Section 16 Applications

The Sites and Their Surrounding Areas (Plans R-1, R-2a, and photos on Plans R-3 and R-4)

3.1 The situation of the Sites and their surrounding areas at the time of consideration of the s.16 applications by the RNTPC were described in paragraphs 8.1 and 8.2 of Annexes A1 and A2. There has been no material change of the situation since then.

3.2 The Sites are:

- (a) situated on a hillslope and are about 20m to the west of the existing village cluster of Ko Tong;
- (b) currently vacant. There is a tree in a fair condition on each of the Sites. On the Site of Application No. A/NE-TT/10, a group of tree seedlings is also found;
- (c) only accessible by an unauthorized track; and
- (d) adjacent to a Small House (approved under similar application No. A/NE-TT/8).

- 3.3 The surrounding areas are natural and rural in character comprising the woodland hillslope in the immediate environs of the Site and the existing village cluster of Ko Tong is located to the east.

Planning Intention

- 3.4 The planning intention of the “GB” zone is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone.

Town Planning Board Guidelines

- 3.5 The Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 (TPB PG-No. 10) for ‘Application for Development within “GB” zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ relevant to the consideration of the applications is still effective. The relevant assessment criteria of the Guidelines are mentioned in paragraph 4 of **Annexes A1** and **A2**.

Assessment Criteria

- 3.6 The set of Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories (the Interim Criteria) was first promulgated on 24.11.2000 and had been amended four times on 30.3.2001, 23.8.2002, 21.3.2003 and 7.9.2007. The latest set of Interim Criteria promulgated on 7.9.2007 is at Appendix II of **Annexes A1** and **A2**.

Previous Applications

- 3.7 The Sites are the subjects of two previous planning applications (No. A/DPA/NE-TT/66 and 64) for the same use submitted on 5.6.2015 by other applicants. Both were rejected by the RNTPC on 17.7.2015 and also by the Board upon review on 15.1.2016, on the same grounds that the proposed development would cause adverse landscape impacts on the surrounding area, and approving the application would set undesirable precedents for similar applications in the area and pre-determine the land use zonings of the OZP under preparation.
- 3.8 Details of these previous applications are summarized at Appendix IIIa of **Annexes A1** and **A2** and their locations are shown on **Plans R-1** and **R-2a**.

Similar Applications

- 3.9 When the s.16 applications were considered by the RNTPC on 8.3.2019, there were three similar applications for Small House development in the vicinity of the Sites and within the same “GB” zone in the Ko Tong area since the first promulgation of the Interim Criteria on 24.11.2000. There has been no change in the number of similar applications since then.

- 3.10 Applications No. A/NE-TT/1 and 7 were rejected by the RNTPC on 8.9.2017 and 18.1.2019 respectively on the grounds that the proposed developments were not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone; the proposed developments did not comply with the TPB PG-No. 10 for development within “GB” zone; the proposed developments did not meet the Interim Criteria and they would cause adverse landscape impact on the surrounding area; and setting of undesirable precedent.
- 3.11 Application No. A/NE-TT/8 was approved by the RNTPC on 1.2.2019 on sympathetic consideration that the subject Small House grant was approved and executed by LandsD and the excavation permit for commencement of construction was also granted, all of which had occurred before the first statutory plan for the area was gazetted.
- 3.12 Details of the above similar applications are summarized at Appendix IIIb of **Annexes A1** and **A2** with the location shown on **Plans R-1** and **R-2a**.

4. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

- 4.1 Comments on the s.16 applications made by relevant Government departments are stated in paragraph 10 and Appendix IV of **Annexes A1** and **A2**.
- 4.2 For the review applications, relevant Government departments have been further consulted and their views are summarized as follows:

Land Administration

4.2.1 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Tai Po, Lands Department (DLO/TP, LandsD):

- (i) he has reservation on the applications;
- (ii) the applicants are indigenous villagers of Ko Tong Village of Sai Kung North Heung, as confirmed by the respective Indigenous Inhabitant Representative;
- (iii) the Sites under application are on Government land and are not covered by Modification of Tenancy or Building Licence;
- (iv) the applicants' Small House grant applications were first made to his office on 23.10.1994 (for Application No. A/NE-TT/9) and 9.9.1997 (for Application No. A/NE-TT/10) on locations different from the Sites. No Small House grant applications were received on the sites;
- (v) the proposed house sites fall wholly within the village 'environs' of Ko Tong Village;

- (vi) the proposed house sites are on sloping land and are covered by vegetation. An unauthorized track in the vicinity is under land control action by his Office and approval will not be given to the applicant to form or disturb Government land for the formation of new access road to facilitate the applicants' Small House developments. His office has reservation on the applications since there is ongoing complaint against the unauthorized track and the applicants could not demonstrate how they can make proper access to the Sites. If the planning applications are not acceptable to the Board, the applicants should be advised to identify alternative sites for their Small House development;
- (vii) the number of outstanding Small House applications and the number of 10-year Small House demand forecast for Ko Tong Village are 31 and 100 respectively, which remain unchanged compared to the s.16 application stage. The figures of 10-year Small House demand is estimated and provided by the Indigenous Inhabitant Representative of Ko Tong and the information so obtained is not verified in any way by DLO/TP, LandsD; and
- (viii) the Court of First Instance of High Court on 8.4.2019 handed down a judgment on a judicial review of the Small House Policy, ruling that the Private Treaty Grant (PTG) arrangement under the Policy is unconstitutional. As the applicants' Small House applications are of PTG in nature, his office has suspended processing of the applications. Even though the applicants could obtain permissions from the Board, his office would continue to suspend their PTG applications.

4.3 The following Government departments have no further comments on the review applications and maintain their previous views on the s.16 applications in Appendix IV of **Annex A**, which are recapitulated as follows:

Landscape

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

- (a) based on the aerial photo taken on 13.3.2018, the Sites are situated in an area of rural landscape character comprising extensive hillside woodland which links up the Sai Kung West Country Park to its west. The main village cluster is to their east at a further distance. The proposed use is considered incompatible with the surrounding environment;

- (b) according to site inspection dated 13.2.2019, the Sites are vacant and located on a sloping ground. One existing *Aporosa dioica* (銀柴) in fair condition is recorded within each of the Sites and a group of tree seedlings are also found within the Site of Application No. A/NE-TT/10. Comparing the aerial photos taken on 21.3.2014 and 2.1.2015, it is noted that vegetation clearance had been carried out gradually within the Sites and their immediate surroundings since 2014. The proposed developments, if approved, would encourage similar site modification prior to approval, and would also set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications within the “GB” zone, the cumulative effect would result in general degradation of the surrounding environment and cause significant adverse impact on the landscape character of the area, as well as undermine its function to conserve the natural landscape of the area. In view of the above, she objects to the applications from the landscape planning perspective; and
- (c) should the Town Planning Board approve the applications, no landscape condition is recommended as the proposed building footprint covers the entire application site area leaving no space for landscaping.

Nature Conservation

4.3.2 Comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries & Conservation (DAFC) :

the Sites have been mostly cleared of vegetation and is only accessible via unauthorized access tracks. Some trees on Government land may be affected by the proposed housing development and the ancillary site formation. Hence, he has reservation on the applications from the tree preservation and nature conservation perspective.

Traffic

4.3.3 Comments of Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

- (a) in general, he has reservation on the applications;
- (b) such type of developments should be confined within the “V” zone as far as possible. Although additional traffic generated by the proposed developments are not expected to be significant, such type of developments outside the “V” zone, if permitted, will set an undesirable precedent case for similar applications in the future. The resulting cumulative adverse traffic impact could be substantial;

- (c) notwithstanding the above, the applications only involve development of a Small House on each of the Sites. He considers that the applications can be tolerated unless they are rejected on other grounds; and
- (d) the existing village access on and near the Site is not under TD's management. The applicants should clarify with the relevant lands and maintenance authorities accordingly regarding the land status, management and maintenance responsibilities of the village access in order to avoid potential land disputes.

Drainage

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

- (a) from public drainage viewpoint, she has no strong view on the proposed Small House developments. There is no public drain maintained by DSD in the vicinity of the Sites. If the applications are approved, a condition should be included to request the applicants to submit and implement a drainage proposal for the Sites to the satisfaction of Director of Drainage Services to ensure that they will not cause adverse drainage impact to the surrounding area and the residential premises located at their downhill area. The proposed developments should have their own stormwater collection and discharge systems to cater for the runoff generated within the Sites and their uphill overland flow. The applicants/owners are also required to maintain such systems properly and rectify the systems if they are found to be inadequate or ineffective during operation. The applicants/owners shall also be liable for and shall indemnify claims and demands arising out of damage or nuisance caused by failure of the systems;
- (b) the applicants should note that they should design the drainage proposal based on the actual site condition for DSD's comment/agreement. In the design, the applicants should consider the workability, the drainage impact to the surrounding environment and seek comments from all concerned parties/departments if necessary. They should make sure no adverse drainage and geotechnical impact will be caused to the area due to the proposed Small Houses. The Sites are located on the unpaved ground and slope area. The proposed developments will increase the impervious area, resulting in a change of the flow pattern and an increase of the surface runoff and thus the flooding risk to surrounding area and the residential premises located at its downhill side. The applicants should take this into account when preparing the drainage proposal. The existing

natural stream, village drains, ditches and the adjacent areas should not be adversely affected. In particular, a minimum clearance of 3m between the proposed developments and the nearest extremity of the existing streamcourse/pond/river/the top of embankment should be maintained;

- (c) there is no existing public sewerage in the vicinity of the Sites. EPD should be consulted regarding the sewage treatment/disposal aspects of the development and the provision of septic tank;
- (d) the proposed drainage works, whether within or outside the lot boundary, should be constructed and maintained by the lot owners at their expense;
- (e) for works to be undertaken outside the lot boundary, prior consent and agreement from DLO/TP and/or relevant private lot owners should be sought;
- (f) the proposed houses are located on the slope. The stability of the existing slope may be affected if the proposal are approved. The Geotechnical Engineering Office should be consulted on this aspect; and
- (g) the lot owners/developers should take all precautionary measures to prevent any disturbance, damage and pollution from the developments to any parts of the existing drainage facilities in the vicinity of the lots. In the event of any damage to the existing drainage facilities, the lot owners/developers would be held responsible for the cost of all necessary repair works, compensation and any other consequences arising therefrom.

Sewerage and Environment

4.3.5 Comments of Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) given the small scale of the proposed developments, they are unlikely to cause major pollution; and
- (b) the septic tank and soakaway system is an acceptable means for collection, treatment and disposal of the sewage provided that its design and construction follow the requirements of the ProPECC PN 5/93 "Drainage Plans subject to Comment by the Environmental Protection Department" and are duly certified by an Authorized Person.

Fire Safety

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

- (a) he has no in-principle objection to the applications; and
- (b) the applicants are reminded to observe the 'New Territories Exempted Houses – A Guide to Fire Safety Requirements' published by LandsD. Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal application referred by LandsD.

Water Supply

4.3.7 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD):

- (a) no objection to the applications; and
- (b) for provision of fresh water supply to the developments, the applicants may need to extend their 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 the WSD's standards.

4.4 The following Government departments maintain their previous views of having no comment on the review applications:

- (a) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department;
- (b) Project Manager/North, Civil Engineering and Development Department;
- (c) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (d) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department; and
- (e) District Officer/Tai Po, Home Affairs Department.

5. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Periods

- 5.1 On 26.4.2019, the review applications were published for public inspection. During the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection periods, 13 public comments were received from the Ko Tong Village Owners and Tenants Society, the Indigenous Inhabitant Representative, Resident Representative and a villager of Ko Tong Village, Designing Hong Kong Limited, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation and five individuals (**Annex E**) objecting to the applications mainly on the grounds of being not in line with

the planning intention of “GB” zone, do not comply with the TPB PG-No. 10 and Interim Criteria, are cases of “destroy first, build later”, and would cause adverse landscape, ecological and drainage impacts, land is still available for Small House development in the “V” zone, it is unfair to approve the applications while rejecting the nearby similar applications, it is not suitable to build a house on the slope which is unstable due to construction of the adjacent house, there is no proper access to the Sites and no ancillary facilities/ infrastructure near the Sites, the applicants are not residents of Ko Tong Village, and the setting of undesirable precedents.

- 5.2 Eight public comments, all objecting to the applications, were received for each application at the s.16 application stage and are set out in paragraph 11 of **Annexes A1 and A2**.

6. Planning Considerations and Assessments

- 6.1 The subject applications for Small House development were rejected by the RNTPC on 8.3.2019 mainly on the grounds that the proposed developments were not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone, the proposed developments do not comply with the Interim Criteria in that the proposed developments would cause adverse landscape impact on the surrounding area, the proposed developments do not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for ‘Application for Development within “GB” zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ in that the proposed development would affect the existing natural landscape, and the approval of the applications would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. As the applicants have not submitted any written representation in support of the review applications, there is no material change in the previous planning considerations and assessments set out in paragraph 12 of **Annexes A1 and A2**.
- 6.2 The Sites falls entirely within the “GB” zone on the OZP. The proposed Small House developments are not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone, which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within the “GB” zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention of the “GB” zone.
- 6.3 The Tai Tan, Uk Tau, Ko Tong and Ko Tong Ha Yeung area (the Area) is a Country Park Enclave surrounded by Sai Kung East and West Country Parks and fronting Ko Tong Hau in the northeast (**Plan R-1**). Given the natural environment, its ecological and landscape values coupled with its potential natural terrain landslide hazards, an incremental approach has been adopted for designation of “V” zones for Small House development with an aim to guiding Small House development at suitable locations around the existing village clusters so as to avoid undesirable disturbances to the natural environment and to achieve a more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.

- 6.4 According to the DLO/TP, LandsD's records for Ko Tong, the total number of outstanding Small House applications is 31 while the 10-year Small House demand forecast is 100. Based on the latest estimate by the PlanD, about 0.78 ha (equivalent to about 31 Small House sites) of land is available within the "V" zone of Ko Tong on the OZP. While land available within the "V" zone of Ko Tong (**Plan R-2b**) is insufficient to fully meet the future Small House demand of 131 Small Houses, such available land (about 0.78 ha or equivalent to 31 Small House sites) is capable to meet the 31 outstanding Small House applications.
- 6.5 The Sites are located on vacant Government land on a densely vegetated hillslope linking with Sai Kung West Country Park (**Plan R-1, R-3 and R-4**). The proposed Small Houses are incompatible with the surrounding environment which is natural and rural in character. Approval of the applications would set an undesirable precedent for similar vegetation removal prior to obtaining planning permission, the cumulative effect of which would result in adverse impact on the surrounding environment and undermine the function of the "GB" zone to conserve the natural landscape of the area. For these reasons, CTP/UD&L, PlanD maintains her view of objecting to the applications from the landscape planning perspective. DAFC also maintains his view of having reservation on the applications from the tree preservation and nature conservation perspectives.
- 6.6 The Sites are located on a hillslope about 20m to the west of the existing village cluster of Ko Tong, and are mainly accessible via an unauthorized track (**Plans R-2a to R-4**). DLO/TP, LandsD advises that there are ongoing complaints against this unauthorized track, and the applicants could not demonstrate how they could make proper access to the Sites. She maintains her view of having reservation on the applications. C for T also has reservation on the applications as the cumulative adverse traffic impact could be substantial but considers that the proposed developments involving one house only on each of the Site can be tolerated. Other relevant Government departments including DEP, CE/MN of DSD, CHE/NTE of HyD, PM/N of CEDD, H(GEO) of CEDD, CE/C of WSD, D of FS and DEMS have no objection to or no adverse comment on the review applications.
- 6.7 Regarding the Interim Criteria, the footprint of both proposed Small Houses fall entirely within the 'VE' of Ko Tong. While land available within the "V" zone of Ko Tong (**Plan R-2b**) is insufficient to fully meet the future Small House demand of 131 Small Houses, such available land (about 0.78 ha or equivalent to 31 Small House sites) is capable to meet the 31 outstanding Small House applications. Furthermore, the applications do not meet the Interim Criteria in that the proposed developments would cause adverse landscape impact on the surrounding area. The applications also do not meet the TPB PG-No. 10 as the proposed Small Houses would affect the existing natural landscape. The approval of the applications would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area, the cumulative effect of which would result in adverse impacts on the natural environment and landscape character of the area. There is no significant change in planning circumstances

since the applications were rejected by the RNTPC, and there is no strong reason to depart from the RNTPC's decisions.

- 6.8 The Sites are subject of two previous planning applications for Small House (No. A/DPA/NE-TT/64 and 66) which were rejected by the RNTPC in 2015 and by the Board upon review in 2016 on the grounds that the proposed developments would cause adverse landscape impacts and approving the applications would set an undesirable precedent and pre-determine the land use zonings of the OZP under preparation. Furthermore, there were two similar applications for Small Houses (No. A/NE-TT/1 and 7) within the "GB" zone in Ko Tong area, which were rejected by the RNTPC on 8.9.2017 and 18.1.2019 on the grounds that the proposed developments were not in line with the planning intention of "GB" zone, did not comply with the TPB PG-No. 10 for development within "GB" zone and did not meet the Interim Criteria in that they would cause adverse landscape impact on the surrounding area; and approving the applications would set an undesirable precedent. Although there was a similar application approved by the RNTPC on 1.2.2019 (No. A/NE-TT/8), that application was approved on sympathetic consideration that the subject Small House grant was approved and executed before the first statutory plan for the area was gazetted on 8.11.2013. The circumstances of the current review applications are similar to those rejected applications (No. A/NE-TT/1 and 7).
- 6.9 Regarding the public comments objecting to the review applications on the grounds as detailed in paragraph 5 above, Government departments' comments and the planning assessments above are relevant.

7. Planning Department's Views

- 7.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 6, having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 5 and given that there is no major change in the planning circumstances since the consideration of the subject applications by the RNTPC, the Planning Department maintains its previous view of not supporting the review applications for the following reasons:
- (a) the proposed developments are not in line with the planning intention of "GB" zone, which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention of the "GB" zone;
 - (b) the proposed developments do not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that the proposed development would cause adverse landscape impact on the surrounding area;

- (c) the proposed developments do not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for 'Application for Development within "GB" zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance' in that the proposed development would affect the existing natural landscape; and
- (d) the approval of the applications would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in adverse impacts on the natural environment and landscape character of the area.

7.2 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the review applications, it is suggested that the permissions shall be valid until **6.12.2023**, and after the said date, the permissions shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the developments permitted are commenced or the permission are renewed. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members' reference:

Approval Conditions

- (a) the provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicants, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board.

Advisory Clauses

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

8. Decision Sought

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

9. Attachments

- Drawing R-1** Location Plan submitted by the applicant (A/NE-TT/9)
- Drawing R-2** Location Plan submitted by the applicant (A/NE-TT/10)
- Plan R-1** Location plan
- Plan R-2a** Site plan

Plan R-2b	Estimated amount of land available for Small House development within "V" zone
Plan R-3	Aerial photo
Plan R-4	Site photos
Annex A1	RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TT/9
Annex A2	RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TT/10
Annex B	Extract of minutes of the RNTPC meeting held on 8.3.2019
Annex C1	Secretary of the Board's letter on A/NE-TT/9 dated 22.3.2019
Annex C2	Secretary of the Board's letter on A/NE-TT/10 dated 22.3.2019
Annex D	Letter received by the Board on 11.4.2019 from the applicants' representative applying for a review of the RNTPC's decisions
Annex E	Public Comments
Annex F	Recommended Advisory Clauses

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
DECEMBER 2019**