

**APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

APPLICATION NO. A/YL-LFS/585

Applicants : Mr. 蘇樹源 and Ms. 鄧麗霞

Site : Lot 1236 S.B in D.D. 129, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long, New Territories

Site Area : About 3,800m²

Lease : Block Government Lease (demised for agricultural use)

Plan : Approved Lau Fau Shan and Tsim Bei Tsui Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-LFS/11

Zoning : “Green Belt” (“GB”)

Application : Filling and Excavation of Land for Permitted Agricultural Use

1. The Proposal

- 1.1 The applicants seek planning permission for filling and excavation of land for permitted agricultural use at the application site (the Site) (**Plan A-1**) zoned “GB” on the OZP. According to the Notes for “GB” zone, ‘agricultural use’ is a Column 1 use which is always permitted. Nonetheless, any filling of land or excavation of land, including that to effect a change of use to any of those specified in Columns 1 and 2 require permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). The eastern part of the Site is currently partly hard-paved and partly excavated without obtaining planning permission while the western part of the Site is mainly vegetated land. Some temporary structures and converted containers used for dwelling and storage purposes are also found in the eastern part of the Site (details at paragraph 8 below) (**Plans A-2 and A-4a**).

- 1.2 According to the applicants, the Site is accessible via a local track leading from Deep Bay Road (**Drawing A-1 and Plans A-2, A-3a to 3d**). The vehicular ingress/egress point is located at the northeastern part of the Site while two pedestrian access points are located at the northeastern and southeastern parts of the Site respectively (**Drawing A-1 and Plan A-2**). The current application seeks to regularise the filling and excavation of land which have already been undertaken at the eastern part of the Site (**Drawing A-1**), involving about 400m² (10.5%) and 55m² (1.5%) in area, and about 0.1m and 1.7m in depth respectively. According to the applicants, the hard-paved area is for a footpath while the excavated area is to accommodate a water tank to facilitate agricultural use within the Site. The paved footpath under application comprises three sections (i.e. entrance section, middle section and end section) and their dimensions are 20m x 11m, 13m x 8m and 25m x 3m (length x width) respectively. The applicants indicated that the applied land filling does not include

areas underneath the structures (**Appendix Ia**).

- 1.3 According to the applicants' layout plan (**Drawing A-1**), there are ten structures (with a total floor area of about 315.8m² and building height of about 2.3m – 5.18m) along the applied filling of land area for farm house, storage, toilet, lookout, sheep shed, electric room and resting place uses at the eastern part. Furthermore, 30 solar panels with a total size of about 60m² are installed atop a metal frame near the vehicular ingress/egress at the northeastern part of the Site to collect solar energy for their own use. The western part of the Site (about 3,040m² or 80% of the Site) would be used for agricultural use (for growing of grass and fruits, and rearing of sheep).
- 1.4 The Site is the subject of two previous applications (No. A/YL-LFS/359 and 540) for the same applied development, i.e. filling and excavation of land for permitted agricultural use submitted by the applicants. The former was rejected by the Board upon review on 17.7.2020 and the applicants lodged an appeal against the Board's decision which was dismissed by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) ("the Appeal Board Panel") on 6.12.2023. The latter was rejected by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board on 11.4.2025 (details at paragraph 6 below). Compared with the last previous application (No. A/YL-LFS/540), the current application involves a reduced land filling area while the area of land excavation remains the same.
- 1.5 A comparison of the major development parameters between the last previous application No. A/YL-LFS/540 and the current application is as follows:

	Previous Application No. A/YL-LFS/540 (a)	Current Application No. A/YL-LFS/585 (b)	Difference (b) - (a)
Site Area	about 3,800m ²	about 3,800m ²	No Change
Applied development	Filling and Excavation of Land for Permitted Agricultural Use	Filling and Excavation of Land for Permitted Agricultural Use	No Change
Area of filling	about 700m ²	about 400m ²	-300m ² (-42.9%)
Depth of filling	about 0.1m	about 0.1m	No Change
Area of excavation	about 55m ²	about 55m ²	No Change
Depth of excavation	about 1.7m	about 1.7m	No Change
No. of structures	11 • for farm house, storage, toilet, lookout, sheep shed, electric room and resting place uses	10 • for farm house, storage, toilet, lookout, sheep shed, electric room and resting place uses	-1 (-9.1%)
Total Floor Area	about 375.8m ²	about 315.8m ²	-60m ² (-16%)
Height of structures	1 - 2 storeys (about 2.3m to 5.18m)	1 - 2 storeys (about 2.3m to 5.18m)	No Change

- 1.6 In support of the application, the applicants have submitted the following documents:

- (a) Application Form with attachments received on 1.12.2025 (**Appendix I**)
- (b) Further Information (FI) received on 14.1.2026* (**Appendix Ia**)

**accepted and exempted from publication requirements*

2. Justifications from the Applicants

The justifications put forth by the applicants in support of the application are detailed in the Application Form and FI at **Appendices I and Ia**. They can be summarised as follows:

- (a) The applied filling of land is reduced to around 10% of the Site and is for provision of a footpath within the Site.
- (b) To minimise the impact on the environment, the existing trees at the Site, including six large lychee trees, would be preserved.
- (c) Around 80% of the Site is proposed for growing of fruits and rearing of sheep. Steel wire mesh would be placed around the trees to protect them from disturbance by the sheep.

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

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

4. Town Planning Board Guidelines

- 4.1 Town Planning Board Guidelines for “Application for Development within the Green Belt Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance” (TPB PG-No. 10) are relevant to the application. The relevant assessment criteria are detailed at **Appendix II**.
- 4.2 According to Town Planning Board Guidelines for “Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance” (TPB PG-No. 12C), the Site falls within the Wetland Buffer Area (WBA). The relevant assessment criteria are detailed at **Appendix III**.

5. Background

- 5.1 The Site was subject to two previous planning enforcement actions (No. E/YL-LFS/381 and 433).
- 5.2 For case No. E/YL-LFS/381, Enforcement Notice (EN) was issued against unauthorized development (UD) involving storage use (including deposit of containers) at majority of the Site on 24.11.2015 requiring the UD to be discontinued by 24.2.2016. Subsequently, Compliance Notice (CN) was issued on 5.8.2016.
- 5.3 For case No. E/YL-LFS/433, EN was issued against UD involving filling of land at majority of the Site on 23.10.2017 requiring the UD to be discontinued by 6.11.2017. Reinstatement Notice (RN) was issued on 8.2.2018 requiring the concerned parties to remove the leftover, debris and all fill materials on the land and to grass the land

by 8.5.2018. As the Planning Authority was satisfied that the concerned UD had been discontinued as required by the EN and the land had been reinstated as required by the RN, CN for the EN and RN were issued on 10.7.2018 and 13.7.2018 respectively.

5.4 The Site is currently also subject to an active planning enforcement case (No. E/YL-LFS/490) (**Plan A-2**) against UD involving filling of land. The EN was issued to the registered land owners (i.e. applicants of the current application) on 12.7.2019 requiring the UD to be discontinued by 26.7.2019. RN was issued on 29.8.2019 requiring the concerned parties to remove the leftover, debris and fill materials (including hard-paving) on the land and to grass the land by 29.11.2019. As the Site has not been reinstated upon expiry of the RN, two rounds of prosecution action were taken and the concerned parties were convicted and fined in June 2022 and 2025 respectively. As the Site has still not been fully reinstated, further prosecution action may be considered.

6. Previous Applications

6.1 The Site was involved in two previous applications (No. A/YL-LFS/359 and 540) submitted by the same applicants for the same development (i.e. filling and excavation of land for permitted agricultural use) at the same site. The applications were dismissed by the Appeal Board Panel / rejected by the Committee in 2023 and 2025 respectively. Details of the previous applications are summarised at **Appendix III** and their locations are shown on **Plan A-1**.

6.2 Application No. A/YL-LFS/359 was rejected by the Board upon review on 17.7.2020 mainly on the grounds that the application was not in line with the planning intention and TPB PG-No. 10 due to incompatibility with the surrounding areas and adverse landscape impact in that the applied filling and excavation of land had involved vegetation clearance. Also, the applicants failed to justify the need for land filling and excavation for agricultural activities. Subsequently, the applicants lodged an appeal against the Board's decision which was dismissed by the Appeal Board Panel on 6.12.2023 on the grounds that the appellants failed to provide strong justifications to justify the need for the applied land filling and excavation.

6.3 Application No. A/YL-LFS/540, with a reduced land filling area, was rejected by the Committee on 11.4.2025 mainly on similar grounds that the application was not in line with the planning intention and TPB PG-No. 10 due to incompatibility with the surrounding areas and the applicants failed to demonstrate the applied filling and excavation of land would not have adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas. Also, the applicants failed to justify the need for the applied land filling and excavation.

7. Similar Applications

7.1 Within the same “GB” zone, there are two similar applications (No. A/YL-LFS/382 and 434) for land filling for permitted agricultural use in the past five years. The former was approved while the latter was rejected by the Committee. Details of the similar applications are summarised at **Appendix IV** and their locations are shown on **Plan A-1**.

Approved application

7.2 Application No. A/YL-LFS/382 involving filling of soil for planting of fruit trees was approved with conditions by the Committee on 8.1.2021 mainly on considerations that the applicant had demonstrated the need for the land filling works; being not incompatible with the surrounding areas; there was no adverse comment from concerned government departments in general and the applicant had proposed to replace the leftover soil on-site with soil suitable for cultivation.

Rejected application

7.3 Application No. A/YL-LFS/434 involving concrete-paving for erection of four structures for agricultural storage, plant nursery, farm tools storage and toilet uses was rejected by the Committee on 26.8.2022 mainly on the grounds that the applicant failed to justify the need for the proposed filling of land and the application was not in line with TPB PG-No. 10 in that the applicant failed to demonstrate the applied filling of land would not have adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas.

8. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1 to A-4e)

8.1 The Site is:

- (a) accessible via a local track leading from Deep Bay Road;
- (b) partly hard-paved for a footpath, partly covered with soil and vegetation, and occupied by several temporary structures, converted containers and a water tank in the eastern part (**Plans A-3a and A-4a to A-4d**). Concrete paving, not forming part of the application, is found underneath some of the structures (**Plans A-4a, A-4c and A-4e**). The two structures at the southeast indicated for resting room uses (i.e. TS 1 and TS 2) in the applicants' submission (**Drawing A-1**) are currently covered by a much larger temporary structure with blue metal roof mainly used for dwelling/storage purpose (**Plans A-4b and A-4e**). Storage of used furniture is also observed at some of the structures and underneath the solar panels (**Plans A-4b and A-4c**); and
- (c) mainly vegetated in the western part.

8.2 The surrounding areas are predominated by shrubland, woodland and fallow agricultural land. To the north and east is a permitted burial ground No. YL/62. To the further south are residential dwellings (about 60m away) in the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone of Mong Tseng Wai.

9. Planning Intention

9.1 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.

9.2 According to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, as filling of land and excavation of land may cause adverse drainage impacts on the adjacent areas and adverse impacts on the natural environment, permission from the Board is required for such activities.

10. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

10.1 The following government departments have been consulted and their views on the application are summarised as follows:

Land Administration

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

- (a) The Site comprises Old Schedule Agricultural Lot (OSAL) held under the Block Government Lease which contains the restriction that no structures are allowed to be erected without the prior approval of the Government.
- (b) He has reservation on the application since there are unauthorized structures and/or uses on Lot 1236 S.B in D.D. 129 which are already subject to lease enforcement actions according to case priority. The lot owner(s) should rectify and/or apply for regularisation of the lease breaches as demanded by LandsD.
- (c) The applicants should note his advisory comments in **Appendix V**.

Agriculture and Nature Conservation

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

- (a) The Site falls within the “GB” zone and is generally abandoned with some structures. As there is no agricultural activity on the Site, he has no comment on the application from agricultural perspective.
- (b) Although the Site falls within the WBA under TPB PG-No. 12C, the Site is partly paved and partly covered with vegetation of common species. He has no comment on the application from nature conservation perspective.

Environment

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

- (a) There is no substantiated environmental complaints pertaining to the Site in the past three years.
- (b) In view of the small scale and nature of works of the filling and excavation of land, he considers that the application alone is unlikely

to cause major pollution. The applicants are reminded that the filling and excavation of land for permitted agricultural use is subject to statutory control of relevant pollution control ordinances. Moreover, the applicants should make reference to "Recommended Pollution Control Clauses" (RPCC) that is available at https://www.epd.gov.hk/epd/english/environmentinhk/eia_planning/guide_ref/rpc.html to implement suitable mitigation measures and good site practice to minimise the potential environmental impact during construction.

Landscaping

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

- (a) She has no adverse comment on the application from landscape planning perspective.
- (b) According to the aerial photo of 2025 (**Plan A-3a**) and the site photos taken in 2025 (**Plans A-4c to A-4e**), the Site is situated in area of rural landscape characterised by graveyards to the north, scattered tree clusters to the south and east and woodland to the west. The eastern portion of the Site is partly paved with concrete and occupied by temporary structures. Existing trees and vegetation are observed at the western portion of the Site. Noting that the area of filling of land under current application has been reduced from about 700m² to 400m² and the mature trees in the site would not be affected and no tree felling would be involved as proposed by the applicants, no significant adverse landscape impact arising from the applied filling of land is anticipated.

Drainage

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

- (a) He has no objection in principle to the application from public drainage point of view.
- (b) Should the Board consider the application acceptable from the planning point of view, an approval condition should be stipulated requiring the applicants to submit a drainage proposal, to implement and maintain the proposed drainage facilities to his satisfaction.
- (c) The applicants should note his advisory comments at **Appendix V**.

Building Matters

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

- (a) As there is no record of approval granted by the Building Authority for the existing structures at the Site, he is not in a position to offer

comments on its suitability for use proposed in the application.

- (b) It is noted that 10 structures and filling and excavation of land are proposed in the application. Before any new building works (including containers / open sheds as temporary building, demolition and land filling etc.) are to be carried out on the Site, prior approval and consent of the BA should be obtained, otherwise they are unauthorised building works (UBW) under the Buildings Ordinance (BO). An Authorised Person should be appointed at the coordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the BO.
- (c) If agricultural structure(s) to be erected on the Site fall within the ambit of the Part 2 of the Schedule of Buildings Ordinance (Application to the New Territories) Ordinance (Cap. 121), DLO/YL, LandsD should be in a better position to comment on the application. Otherwise, such structure(s) will require prior approval and consent under the BO.
- (d) The applicants should note his advisory comments in **Appendix V**.

District Officer's Comments

10.1.7 Comments of the District Officer/Yuen Long, Home Affairs Department (DO/YL, HAD):

His office has not received any feedback from locals.

10.2 The following government departments have no objection to/no comment on the application:

- (a) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD);
- (b) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO), CEDD);
- (c) Chief Engineer/Land Works, CEDD;
- (d) Project Manager (West), CEDD (PM(W), CEDD);
- (e) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (CHE/NTW, HyD);
- (f) Director of Fire Services (D of FS);
- (g) Commissioner for Transport (C for T); and
- (h) Commissioner of Police (C of P).

11. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period

On 9.12.2025, the application was published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection period, three public comments from the Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation, an individual and a group of villagers (**Appendix VI**) were received objecting to the application mainly on grounds that the proposal is not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone and the TPB PG-No. 10; the previous applications for the same development were rejected; and the applied filling and excavation of land would cause potential adverse drainage, geotechnical, traffic, environmental, health and fung shui impacts.

12. Planning Considerations and Assessments

12.1 The application is for regularisation of filling and excavation of land (involving a total area of about 455m² or 12% of the Site) at the eastern part of the Site that had been undertaken to facilitate the permitted agricultural use at the Site zoned “GB” (**Plan A-1**). According to the applicants, the Site will be used for permitted agricultural use, and the filled area under application (about 400m² or 10.5% of the Site) would serve as a footpath while the excavated area is mainly to accommodate a water tank (about 55m² or 1.5% of the Site). According to the layout plan submitted by the applicants (**Drawing A-1**), ten structures at the eastern part of the Site along the filled area under application would be used for farm house, storage, toilet, lookout, sheep shed, electric room and resting place uses while the western part would be used for growing of grass and fruits and rearing of sheep. The planning intention of the “GB” zone (**Plan A-1**) is primarily intended 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 and there is a general presumption against development within this zone. Whilst ‘Agricultural Use’ is always permitted within the “GB” zone, filling and excavation of land within the “GB” zone is subject to planning permission as it may cause adverse drainage impacts on the adjacent areas and adverse impacts on the natural environment. In this regard, no strong justifications have been provided in the submission to demonstrate the necessity of the land filling and excavation works to facilitate the permitted agricultural use at the Site. The applied works are hence considered not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone.

12.2 With regard to the applied filling and excavation of land, the applicants claim that the works are to provide a footpath and a water tank for agricultural purpose respectively. However, the applicants have not provided justifications to substantiate why about 10.5% of the Site is required to be paved with cement of about 0.1m in depth to provide a footpath with a width ranging from 3m to 11m to facilitate the agricultural use (i.e. growing of grass and fruits and rearing of sheep). While some sections of the footpath with a width of 8 to 11m is considered excessively wide, there are also insufficient details provided on the agricultural activities and operation at the Site and no explanation given in the submission regarding the necessity of a hard-paved footpath for the agricultural use. Besides, no justifications have been provided in the submission regarding the need for the applied excavation of land for provision of a water tank. According to the site photos taken on 19.12.2025 and 14.1.2026 (**Plans A-4a to A-4e**), a lorry truck is observed at the eastern part of the Site and some structures are mainly occupied by furniture and miscellaneous items unrelated to agricultural use. Thus, it cannot be ascertained whether the applied filling and excavation of land is genuinely intended to facilitate agricultural use. Hence, there is insufficient information in the submission to justify that the applied filling and excavation of land is necessary for the permitted agricultural use. Furthermore, despite the land underneath some of the structures had already been paved, the applicants have not applied for planning permission for filling of land for other filled areas within the Site in the current application.

12.3 The Site falls within the WBA designated under TPB PG-No. 12C, and is situated in an area of rural landscape character comprising fallow agricultural land, burial ground and residential dwellings (**Plans A-2 and A-3a**). While DAFC has no adverse comment on the application from both agricultural and nature conservation perspectives, the applied excavation and filling of land, with their necessity yet to be

justified, are considered not compatible with the surrounding areas.

- 12.4 According to TPB PG-No. 10, an application for new development within “GB” zone will only be considered in exceptional circumstances and must be justified with very strong planning grounds. The development should not involve extensive clearance of existing natural vegetation and affect the existing natural landscape. The design and layout of any proposed development within “GB” zone should also be compatible with the surrounding areas. The issue on land use compatibility has been discussed in paragraph 12.3 above. Regarding the impact on existing natural vegetation and landscape, by comparing the aerial photos between 2015 and 2025 (**Plans A-3a to A-3d**), it is noted that extensive vegetation clearance and filling and excavation of land had been undertaken at the eastern part of the Site. Although CTP/UD&L of PlanD has no adverse comment on the application from landscape planning perspective as the applied land filling area has been reduced and no tree felling would be involved, given the circumstances and assessment detailed in paragraph 12.2 above, the application is considered not in line with TPB PG-No. 10 as there are no exceptional circumstances or very strong planning grounds in the submission that warrant approval of the application.
- 12.5 Other concerned departments including DEP, C for T and CE/MN of DSD have no objection to or no comment on the applied filling and excavation of land from environmental, traffic and drainage perspectives respectively. Regarding DLO/YL’s concern on the unauthorised structures erected within the Site, the applicants will be advised to liaise with LandsD on these land administration matters should the Committee approve the application.
- 12.6 The Site was involved in two rejected previous applications (No. A/YL-LFS/359 and 540) for filling and excavation of land for permitted agricultural use submitted by the same applicants as detailed in paragraph 6 above. Compared with the last application (No. A/YL-LFS/540), despite the extent of land filling has been reduced by 300m² in the current application, the application is considered not in line with TPB PG-No. 10 as explained in paragraph 12.4 above.
- 12.7 While there is an approved similar application (No. A/YL-LFS/382) for land filling for permitted agricultural use, it was approved by the Committee in 2021 mainly on the considerations that the applicant had demonstrated the need for the land filling works; being not incompatible with the surrounding areas; there was no adverse comment from concerned government departments in general and the applicant had proposed to replace the leftover soil on-site with soil suitable for cultivation. The current application does not warrant the same planning considerations as the applicants have not demonstrated the need for the applied land filling and excavation works and the application is considered not in line with TPB PG-No. 10. In fact, the Board rejected a similar application (No. A/YL-LFS/434) in 2022 on ground of failure to justify the need for the applied land filling works involving concrete-paving. Rejecting the current application is generally in line with the previous decisions of the Committee.
- 12.8 Regarding the public comments objecting to the application as stated in paragraph 11 above, the planning considerations and assessments in paragraphs 12.1 to 12.7 above are relevant.

13. Planning Department's Views

13.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 12 above and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 11, the Planning Department does not support the application for the following reason:

the applied filling and excavation of land is not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone and the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Development within the Green Belt zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ (TPB PG-No. 10) in that there are no exceptional circumstances or very strong planning grounds in the submission to justify the need for the filling and excavation of land and a departure from the planning intention.

13.2 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to approve the application, no time clause for commencement of development is proposed as the land filling and excavation works under application have already been completed. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members’ reference:

Approval Conditions

- (a) the submission and implementation of a 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 **23.10.2026**; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with by the above specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice.

Advisory Clauses

The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Appendix V**.

14. Decision Sought

14.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant planning permission.

14.2 Should the Committee decide to reject the application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicants.

14.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to approve the application, Members are invited to consider the approval condition(s) and advisory clause(s), if any, to be attached to the permission.

15. Attachments

Appendix I	Application Form with attachments received on 1.12.2025
Appendix Ia	FI received on 14.1.2026
Appendix II	Extracts of Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Development within Green Belt Zone (TPB PG-No. 10)

Appendix III	Extracts of Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Development within Deep Bay Area (TPB PG-No. 12C)
Appendix IV	Previous and Similar Applications
Appendix V	Recommended Advisory Clauses
Appendix VI	Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period
Drawing A-1	Layout Plan
Plan A-1	Location Plan with Previous and Similar Applications
Plan A-2	Site Plan
Plans A-3a to A-3d	Aerial Photos taken in 2025, 2019, 2018 and 2015
Plans A-4a to A-4e	Site Photos

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
JANUARY 2026