

REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/TP/628
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

**Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House)
in “Green Belt” zone
Lots 362 S.A ss.1 and 362 S.A ss.2 in D.D. 22, Lai Chi Shan Village, Tai Po**

1. Background

- 1.1 On 9.6.2017, the applicant, Mr. LI Chun Hau, represented by Mr. CHAN Kam Biu, sought planning permission to build a house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) - Small House) at the application site (the Site) under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Site falls within an area zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) on the draft Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TP/27 (**Plan R-1**).
- 1.2 On 22.9.2017, 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 for the “GB” zone for the area which is to define 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 this planning intention;
 - (b) the proposed development does 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 involve clearance of existing natural vegetation affecting the existing natural landscape;
 - (c) the proposed development does 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 areas;
 - (d) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Lai Chi Shan which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services; and

- (e) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications within “GB” zone. The cumulative impacts of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the natural environment and landscape quality in the area.”

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

- (a) RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/628 (Annex A)
- (b) Extract of minutes of the RNTPC meeting held on 22.9.2017 (Annex B)
- (c) Secretary of Town Planning Board’s letter dated 13.10.2017 (Annex C)

2. **Application for Review**

On 16.10.2017, the applicant applied under section 17(1) of the Ordinance, for review of the RNTPC’s decision to reject the application (**Annex D**). The applicant has 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-4**)

- 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 8.1 and 8.2 of **Annex A**. There has been no material change of the situation since then.
- 3.2 The Site is:
 - (a) located on a gently sloping ground, fenced off and mainly covered by herbs and weeds;
 - (b) located to the south of the “V” zone of Lai Chi Shan Village; and
 - (c) accessible only by an informal footpath.
- 3.3 The surrounding area is predominantly rural in character with clusters of village houses and temporary structures. Sunshine Garden and three approved Small House sites (applications No. A/TP/574 to 576) are located to the northwest. To the southeast is an area zoned “Residential (Group B) 8” which is intended primarily for medium-density residential development.

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.

Assessment Criteria

- 3.5 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 **Annex A**.

Previous Application

- 3.6 The Site is the subject of a previous application (No. A/TP/420) (submitted by a different applicant) for a Small House. The application was approved with conditions by the RNTPC on 13.3.2009 mainly for the reasons that the proposed Small House was generally in compliance with the Interim Criteria in that more than 50% of the Small House footprint fell within the village ‘environs’ (‘VE’) and there was a general shortage of land within the “V” zone for Small House development at the time of consideration. Details of the previous application are shown at Appendix III of **Annex A**.
- 3.7 The planning permission for Application No. A/TP/420 had extended once and valid until 13.3.2017. The planning permission lapsed on 14.3.2017.

Similar Applications

- 3.8 When the s.16 application was considered by the RNTPC on 22.9.2017, there were nine similar applications for Small House development in the vicinity of the Site and within the same “GB” zone since the first promulgation of the Interim Criteria on 24.11.2000 (**Plan R-1**). There is no additional similar application since then.
- 3.9 Six applications (No. A/TP/305, 307, 574 to 576 and 606) were approved by the RNTPC/the Board on review between 2002 and 2016. Application No. A/TP/305 for a Small House was approved by the RNTPC on 8.11.2002 as it was generally in line with TPB PG-No. 10 and the Interim Criteria. Application No. A/TP/307 for five Small Houses was approved by the RNTPC on 13.12.2002 mainly for reasons that the proposed Small Houses were generally in compliance with the Interim Criteria in that more than 50% of the Small House footprint was within ‘VE’ and there was a general shortage of land within “V” zone for Small House development, and no tree felling was involved. Applications No. A/TP/574 to 576, each applied for a Small House, were approved by the Board upon review on 24.4.2015. The three proposed Small Houses fell within the application site of Application No. A/TP/307 but were submitted by different applicants. The three applications were approved mainly for reasons that they were in compliance with the Interim Criteria and there was a shortage of land within “V” zone for Small House developments; sympathetic consideration was given as the application sites were located close to the existing village cluster and the scope of further proliferation of NTEHs/Small Houses within the subject “GB” zone would be limited. Application No. A/TP/606 was approved by the RNTPC on 27.5.2016 mainly for reasons that it was in compliance with the Interim Criteria in that more than 50% of the Small House footprint was within ‘VE’ and there was a shortage of land within “V” zone for Small House developments; and it was an infill development among existing village houses.

- 3.10 For the three rejected cases, Application No. A/TP/418 for three Small Houses was rejected by the RNTPC on 27.2.2009 mainly for the reasons of being not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone, non-compliance with the Interim Criteria in that the proposed houses were entirely outside the “V” zone/‘VE’ and having adverse impact on the existing landscape character. Application No. A/TP/578 was rejected by the RNTPC on 6.2.2015 in view of the adverse geotechnical and landscape impacts. Application No. A/TP/607 was rejected by the RNTPC on 24.6.2016 mainly for the reasons of being not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone, non-compliance with TPB PG-No. 10 in that the proposed development had involved clearance of existing natural vegetation, non-compliance with the Interim Criteria in that the proposed development would cause adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas, setting of undesirable precedent and land was still available within the “V” zone of Lai Chi Shan for Small House development.
- 3.11 Details of the above similar applications are summarized in Appendix IV of **Annex A** and their locations are shown on **Plan R-1**.

4. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

- 4.1 Comments on the s.16 application made by relevant Government departments are stated in paragraph 10 and Appendix V 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 1 of the Appendix V in **Annex A**, except that the number of outstanding Small House applications has been increased from 17 to 18, and recapitulated below:
- (a) no objection to the application;
 - (b) the Site is not covered by any Modification of Tenancy or building licence;
 - (c) the applicant is an indigenous villager of Chung Pui of Luk Heung of Tai Po, as confirmed by the respective Indigenous Inhabitant Representative (IIR);
 - (d) the Site partially falls within the ‘VE’ of Lai Chi Shan;
 - (e) the number of outstanding Small House applications and the number of 10-year Small House demand for Lai Chi Shan are 18 and 68 respectively (the figure of 10-year Small House demand was provided by the IIR concerned and the information so obtained is not verified in any way by DLO/TP); and

- (f) if and after planning approval has been given by the Board, DLO/TP will process the Small House application. If the Small House application is approved by LandsD acting in the capacity as landlord at its sole discretion, such approval will be subject to such items and conditions as may be imposed by LandsD. There is no guarantee to the grant of a right of way to the Small House concerned or approval of the emergency vehicular access thereto.

Traffic

4.2.2 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 2 of the Appendix V in **Annex A** and recapitulated below:

- (a) in general, he has reservation on the application. Such type of development should be confined within the “V” zone as far as possible. Although additional traffic generated by the proposed development is not expected to be significant, such type of development 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;
- (b) notwithstanding the above, the application only involves development of a Small House. He considers that this application could be tolerated unless it is rejected on other grounds; and
- (c) the existing village access near the Site is not under Transport Department’s management. The land status, management and maintenance responsibilities of the village access should be clarified with the relevant lands and maintenance authorities accordingly in order to avoid land disputes.

Environment

4.2.3 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 3 of the Appendix V in **Annex A** and recapitulated below:

- (a) no objection to the application;
- (b) in view of the small scale of the proposed development, the proposed Small House is unlikely to cause major environmental pollution; and
- (c) the applicant should note the DEP’s advice that 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 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.

Landscape

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 4 of the Appendix V in **Annex A** and recapitulated below:

- (a) the Site is located at the southern edge of Lai Chi Shan Village. The Site is the subject of a previous case (A/TP/420) on which he had some reservations from the landscape planning perspective. The surrounding areas are predominantly rural in character consisting of fallow agricultural land, farm squatters and tree groups;
- (b) according to site inspection, the Site has been enclosed by hoarding. Existing trees in good condition are found adjoining the Site. Moreover, the Site is on a sloping ground. Vegetation clearance for the proposed Small House and due to the site/access formation is anticipated;
- (c) nevertheless, although existing village houses in Lai Chi Shan Village can be found in the proximity of the Site, approval of the proposed Small House may set an undesirable precedent for similar applications. The cumulative impact of approving such applications would result in more “GB” being disturbed and thus defeating the purpose of “GB” zoning and leading to the degradation of existing landscape quality of the surrounding area. In view of the above, he has some reservations on the application from the landscape planning perspective; and
- (d) should the application be approved by the Board, an approval condition on submission and implementation of landscape and tree preservation proposals is recommended.

Drainage and Sewerage

4.2.5 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 5 of the Appendix V in **Annex A** and recapitulated below:

- (a) no in-principle objection to the application from public drainage viewpoint;
- (b) if the application is approved, a condition should be included to request the applicant to submit and implement a drainage proposal for the Site to the satisfaction of Director of Drainage Services to ensure that the proposed development will not cause adverse drainage impact to the adjacent area. The proposed development should have its own stormwater collection and discharge system to cater for the runoff generated within the site and overland flow from surrounding of the Site. The Site is located on unpaved ground. The catchment area for drainage design should include the runoff from nearby slope/unpaved area. It should be noted that the proposed development 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 in the area. The applicant should take the above into account when preparing the drainage proposal. The applicant is also required to maintain such system properly and rectify the system if it is found to be inadequate or ineffective during operation. The applicant shall also be liable for and shall indemnify claims and demands arising out of damage or nuisance caused by failure of the system;

- (c) the applicant should design the drainage proposal based on the actual site conditions for DSD's comment/agreement. DSD would not assist the lot owner/developer to the drainage proposal. In the design, the applicant should consider the workability, the impact to the surrounding environment and seek comments from other concerned parties/departments if necessary. He should make sure no adverse impact will be caused to the area due to the proposed works. 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 development and the nearest existing streamcourse/pond/river/the top of embankment should be maintained;
- (d) public drain and public sewers are available in the vicinity of the proposed development but connection to them might not be feasible. View and comments from DEP should be sought regarding the sewage disposal arrangement of the proposed development;
- (e) the proposed drainage works, whether within or outside the lot boundaries, should be constructed and maintained by the lot owner at his expense. For works to be undertaken outside the lot boundaries, prior consent and agreement from LandsD and/or relevant private lot owners should be sought; and
- (f) the lot owner/developer should take all precautionary measures to prevent any disturbance, damage and pollution from the development 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 owner/developer would be held responsible for the cost of all necessary repair works, compensation and any other consequences arising therefrom.

Nature Conservation

- 4.2.6 The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries & Conservation (DAFC) has no further comment on the review application and maintains his previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 6 of the Appendix V in **Annex A** and recapitulated below:

the Site is overgrown with herbs and weeds and some tree saplings of common species may be affected. He has no strong view on the application.

Fire Safety

4.2.7 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 7 of the Appendix V in **Annex A** and recapitulated below:

- (a) no in-principle objection to the application; and
- (b) the applicant is reminded to observe ‘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

4.2.8 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 of the Appendix V in **Annex A** and recapitulated below:

- (a) no objection to the application; and
- (b) for provision of water supply to the proposed development, the applicant may need to extend the inside services to the nearest suitable Government water mains for connection. The applicant 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 and Safety

4.2.9 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 9 of the Appendix V in **Annex A** and recapitulated below:

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, organizing and supervising any activity near the underground cable or overhead line under the 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 in the vicinity of the Site. They should also be reminded to observe the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation (the 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.

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

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

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

On 27.10.2017, the review application was published for public inspection. During the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, which ended on 17.11.2017, no public comment was received.

6. **Planning Considerations and Assessments**

- 6.1 The subject application was rejected by the RNTPC on 22.9.2017 mainly on the grounds of being not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone; non-compliance with TPB PG-No. 10 due to adverse landscape impact; availability of land within the “V” zone; and setting of undesirable precedent. The applicant has not provided any written representation in support of the review application.
- 6.2 The Site falls entirely within an area zoned “GB”. The proposed development is 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 this zone. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission for a departure from this planning intention.
- 6.3 This is a cross-village Small House application. According to DLO/TP, LandsD’s record, the total number of outstanding Small House applications for Lai Chi Shan is 18 while the 10-year Small House demand forecast for this village is 68. Based on the latest estimate of Planning Department, about 0.52 ha (or equivalent to about 21 Small House sites) of land is available within the “V” zone of Lai Chi Shan (**Plan R-2b**). Since the Site partially falls within the ‘VE’ of Lai Chi Shan Village, DLO/TP, LandsD has no objection to the application.
- 6.4 The Site is located at the fringe of Lai Chi Shan village (**Plan R-2a**). The proposed Small House is not incompatible with the surrounding environment which is predominantly rural in character consisting of fallow agricultural land, temporary structures and tree groups. DAFC maintains his previous view of having no strong view on the application as the Site is overgrown with herbs and weeds, though some tree saplings of common species may be affected, while CTP/UD&L, PlanD also maintains his previous view of having some reservations on the application from the landscape planning perspective as the proposed development would require vegetation clearance due to the site/access formation and set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the “GB” zone leading to the degradation of existing landscape quality of the surrounding area. Besides, the application does not comply with TPB PG-No. 10 as the proposed development would involve clearance of existing natural vegetation affecting the existing natural landscape. Other Government departments consulted including C for T, CE/MN of DSD, CE/C of WSD, PM/NTE and H(GEO)

of CEDD, D of FS, CHE/NTE, HyD and DEMS have no objection to/adverse comment on the application.

- 6.5 Regarding the Interim Criteria (Appendix II of **Annex A**), more than 50% of the proposed Small House footprint is located within the 'VE' of Lai Chi Shan Village. Whilst land available within the "V" zone for Small House development (about 0.52 ha or equivalent to 21 Small House sites) (**Plan R-2b**) is insufficient to fully meet the future Small House demand, it is capable to meet the outstanding 18 Small House applications. It should be noted that the Board has adopted a more cautious approach in approving applications for Small House development in recent years. Amongst others, in considering whether there is a general shortage of land in meeting Small House demand, more weighting has been put on the number of outstanding Small House applications provided by LandsD. As such, it is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the "V" zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.
- 6.6 According to the Interim Criteria, application with previous permission lapsed will be considered on its own merits. Although the Site is the subject of a previous application (No. A/TP/420) for Small House development approved by the RNTPC in 2009, that application is submitted by a different applicant. Moreover, as the Site is relatively far from the village cluster and not an infill site, and adverse landscape impact arising from vegetation clearance due to the site/access formation is anticipated, sympathetic consideration may not be given to the application.
- 6.7 Regarding the six similar applications (No. A/TP/305, 307, 574, 575, 576 and 606) (**Plan R-1**) approved by the RNTPC, the main reasons were generally in compliance with the Interim Criteria in that the entire/majority of the proposed Small House footprints fell within the 'VE'; there was a general shortage of land within the "V" zone in meeting the Small House demand at the times of consideration; the proposed Small House developments would unlikely have significant adverse impacts on the surrounding areas, and/or it was an infill development among existing village houses. However, the subject application does not warrant the same planning considerations of these approved applications because it would cause adverse landscape impact and land is still available within the "V" zone for Small House development.
- 6.8 For the three rejected cases, Application No. A/TP/418 was rejected mainly for the reasons of non-compliance with the Interim Criteria in that the proposed houses were entirely outside the "V" zone/'VE' and having adverse impact on the existing landscape character. Application No. A/TP/578 was rejected in view of the adverse geotechnical and landscape impacts. Application No. A/TP/607 was rejected mainly for the reasons of being not in line with the planning intention of "GB" zone, non-compliance with TPB PG-No. 10 in that the proposed development has involved clearance of existing natural vegetation, non-compliance with the Interim Criteria in that the proposed development would cause adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas, setting of undesirable precedent and land was still available within the "V" zone of Lai Chi Shan for Small House development. The planning circumstances of the subject application are similar to those of Application No. A/TP/607. As there has been no major change in planning circumstances since the rejection of the application, the previous assessments as stated in paragraph 12 of **Annex A** are still valid and there is no strong planning justification to warrant a departure from RNTPC's rejection of the application.

6.9 There is no public comment received in respect of the review application.

7. **Planning Department's Views**

7.1 Based on the assessment made in paragraph 6 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 “GB” zone for the area which is to define 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 this planning intention;
- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for ‘Application for Development within “Green Belt” zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ in that the proposed development would involve clearance of existing natural vegetation affecting the existing natural landscape;
- (c) the proposed development does 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 areas;
- (d) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Lai Chi Shan which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services; and
- (e) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications within “GB” zone. The cumulative impacts of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the natural environment and landscape quality in the area.

7.2 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the review application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until **5.1.2022**, 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 provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the Town Planning Board;

- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of landscape and tree preservation proposals 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 E**.

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
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 photo
Annex A	RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/628
Annex B	Extract of minutes of the RNTPC meeting held on 22.9.2017
Annex C	Secretary of the Town Planning Board's letters dated 13.10.2017
Annex D	Letter dated 16.10.2017 from the applicant applying for a review of the RNTPC's decision
Annex E	Recommended advisory clauses

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
JANUARY 2018**

TPB Paper No. 10372

**For Consideration by
the Town Planning Board on 5.1.2018**

**REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/TP/628
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House – Small House)
in “Green Belt” zone**

Lots 362 S.A ss.1 and 362 S.A ss.2 in D.D. 22, Lai Chi Shan Village, Tai Po