

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

**APPLICATION NO. A/YL-LFS/448**

- Applicant** : 鄧君正 (Mr.)
- Site** : Lot 1 S.L RP (Part) in D.D. 126, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long, New Territories
- Site Area** : About 17,045m<sup>2</sup>
- 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** : “Conservation Area” (“CA”)
- Application** : Proposed Filling of Pond for Permitted Agricultural Use (Fish Pond Culture)

**1. The Proposal**

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for proposed filling of pond for permitted agricultural use (fish pond culture) at the application site (the Site) (**Plan A-1**). The Site falls within an area zoned “CA” on the approved Lau Fau Shan and Tsim Bei Tsui OZP No. S/YL-LFS/11. According to the Notes for the “CA” zone of the OZP, ‘Agricultural Use (Fish Pond Culture only)’ is always permitted, but filling of pond requires planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). Moreover, the Site falls within the Wetland Conservation Area (WCA) according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C for ‘Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’. The Site is currently a pond (**Plans A-2 to A-4**).
- 1.2 As shown on the pond filling plan at **Drawing A-1** and indicated in the submission, an area of about 10,045m<sup>2</sup> (or 59%) of the Site would be filled with soil of about 2.5m in depth to level with the adjoining land for formation of twelve smaller ponds. In addition, an area of about 1,000m<sup>2</sup> (or 6%) (i.e. one of the smaller ponds formed) would be filled with soil of about 1.5m in depth. To sum up, a total of about 11,045m<sup>2</sup> (or 65%) would be filled with soil of about 1.5m to 2.5m in depth.
- 1.3 As shown on the aquaculture layout plan at **Drawing A-2** and indicated in the submission, the proposed pond filling is to facilitate pond culture of a fish species named Jade Perch. Amongst the twelve smaller ponds formed, nine of them (each of about 500m<sup>2</sup> and 2.5m in depth) would be used for fish farming with various fish stock management functions (including fry monitoring, grading, sick fish isolation and disinfection); two of them (each of about 750m<sup>2</sup> and 2.5m in depth) would be

used for fresh water storage and wastewater treatment respectively; and the remaining one (about 1,000m<sup>2</sup> and 1m in depth) would be used for pre-market cleansing (吊水). No structure is proposed at the Site. Loading/unloading activities would be undertaken at the track to the southeast of the Site (**Drawing A-4**). The proposed pond filling plan, aquaculture layout plan, vehicular access plan and loading/unloading space plan are at **Drawings A-1 to A-4** respectively.

- 1.4 The Site is accessible from Tin Wah Road via a local track (**Drawing A-3**). As indicated in the submission, there would be about 80 to 150 trips of dump truck generated per day during the three-month period of pond filling.
- 1.5 No ecological impact assessment (EcoIA) is submitted in support of the proposed filling of pond. Also, no wetland compensation and mitigation measure is proposed.
- 1.6 The Site is involved in a previous application (No. A/YL-LFS/48) for proposed pond filling, which was rejected by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board in 2000 (**Plan A-1**) (details at paragraph 6 below).
- 1.7 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:
  - (a) Application Form received on 2.11.2022 (**Appendix I**)
  - (b) Supplementary Information (SI) received on 10.11.2022 (**Appendix Ia**)
  - (c) Further Information (FI) received on 14.11.2022\* (**Appendix Ib**)

*\* accepted and exempted from publication requirements*

## **2. Justifications from the Applicant**

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application are detailed in the Application Form at **Appendix I**. They can be summarised as follows:

- (a) the size of the existing pond is excessive for modern fish farming practice emphasising cost and energy efficiency;
- (b) nine ponds would be formed for various fish stock management functions, such as fry monitoring, grading, sick fish isolation and disinfection. Together with the application of a management system and water treatment techniques, they can ensure stable and sustainable supply of fish stocks;
- (c) a pond would be designated for treatment and filtration of culture water before disposal so as to protect the surrounding environment. Some of the culture water would be reused upon biological filtration and disinfection in order to save water and minimise pollution;
- (d) replenishing the fish farming ponds with fresh water can increase the amount of dissolved oxygen, whilst lower the amount of pollutants including ammonia and nitrates, all of which are essential for good fish pond culture. As such, a pond would be designated as fresh water storage;
- (e) as fish stocks reach marketable size, they have to be transferred to a pond filled with saline water and equipped with water purifier for excretion of pollutants and harmful

substances, as well as to remove the earthy taste commonly found in freshwater fish stocks. A pond is therefore designated for this purpose; and

- (f) after years of abandonment, the bunds of the existing pond have collapsed and become dangerous.

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

The applicant is not a “current land owner” but has complied with the requirements as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Satisfying the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” Requirements under Sections 12A and 16 of the Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 31A) by obtaining consent of the current land owner. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection.

### **4. Town Planning Board Guidelines**

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 Conservation Area (WCA). The relevant assessment criteria are summarised as follows.

- (a) The planning intention of the WCA is to conserve the ecological value of the fish ponds which form an integral part of the wetland ecosystem in the Deep Bay Area. It comprises the existing and contiguous, active or abandoned fishponds in the Deep Bay Area, which should all be conserved.
- (b) New development within the WCA would not be allowed unless it is required to support the conservation of the ecological value of the area or the development is an essential infrastructural project with overriding public interest.
- (c) Any development within the WCA which requires planning permission from the Board should be supported by an EcoIA to demonstrate that the development would not result in a net loss in wetland function and negative disturbance impact. Moreover, wetland compensation is required for development involving pond filling and mitigation measures against disturbance would be necessary.
- (d) Subject to submission of EcoIA, the type of activities which may be considered within the WCA must be related to conservation, environmental education or essential infrastructure projects needed for public purpose.

### **5. Background**

The Site is currently not subject to any active planning enforcement action.

### **6. Previous Application**

- 6.1 The Site is involved in a previous application (No. A/YL-LFS/48) for proposed pond filling (for prevention of mosquitoes and insects breeding, and drowning hazard for

children), which was rejected by the Committee of the Board on 28.1.2000 mainly on grounds of not in line with the planning intention of the “CA” zone and the then TPB PG-No. 12B<sup>1</sup>; no information submitted to demonstrate no adverse ecological, drainage and environmental impacts; and setting of undesirable precedent. Details of the above previous application are summarised at **Appendix II** and its location is shown on **Plan A-1**.

- 6.2 Compared with the previous application, the current application is submitted by a different applicant for the same development (i.e. pond filling) at a smaller site (-69,319m<sup>2</sup> or -80.1% in area).

## **7. Similar Application**

Within the same “CA” zone, there is a similar application (No. A/YL-LFS/69) for proposed pond filling (raising of pond to level with adjoining land, with above-ground pond bunds) was rejected by the Committee on 6.7.2001 mainly on grounds of not in compliance of the then TPB PG-No. 12B; no information submitted to demonstrate no adverse ecological, drainage, environmental, visual and landscape impacts; and setting undesirable precedent. Details of the similar application are summarised at **Appendix II** and its location is shown on **Plan A-1**.

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

8.1 The Site is:

- (a) currently a pond; and
- (b) accessible from Tin Wah Road to its southwest via a local track on Government land and private land.

8.2 The surrounding areas of the Site have the following characteristics:

- (a) to its north is the Hong Kong Wetland Park Special Area designated under the Country Park Ordinance (Cap. 208);
- (b) to its east are the contiguous fish ponds of the Deep Bay Area, including those within the Wetland of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention;
- (c) to its south are a local track parked with vehicles and grassland; and
- (d) to its southwest is the Yuen Long Community Green Station. To its further west across Wetland Park Road is the Tin Shui Wai New Town.

---

<sup>1</sup> Promulgated in April 1999, TPB PG-No. 12B is the version immediately preceding the current TPB PG-No. 12C. The major difference between TPB PG-No. 12B and 12C is that the latter covers the wetland complex in Hoo Hok Wai. TPB PG-No. 12C was promulgated on 16.5.2014.

## **9. Planning Intention**

- 9.1 The planning intention of “CA” zone is to conserve the ecological value of wetland and fish ponds which form an integral part of the wetland ecosystem. The “no-net-loss in wetland” principle<sup>2</sup> is adopted for any change in use within this zone. The primary intention is to discourage new development unless it is required to support the conservation of the ecological integrity of the wetland ecosystem or the development is an essential infrastructure project with overriding public interest.
- 9.2 As filling of land/pond or 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, Lands Department (DLO/YL, LandsD):

- (a) He has no objection to the proposed filling of pond from lease perspective.
- (b) The Site comprises an Old Schedule Agricultural Lot 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. It is noted that no structure is proposed at the Site.

### **Nature Conservation and Fisheries**

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

#### **Nature Conservation**

- (a) He objects to the application from nature conservation point of view.
- (b) The subject pond forms an integral part of the Deep Bay Area wetland ecosystem. The proposed pond filling will result in net loss in wetland both in terms of area and function, which will cause adverse ecological impacts to the wetland habitats. Also, the high volume of construction traffic which generates noise, dust and visual disturbance would result in negative disturbance impact to waterbirds and other wildlife of the wetland habitats. Meanwhile, no EcoIA is submitted in support of the application which is considered necessary from nature conservation point of view. The proposed pond filling

---

<sup>2</sup> According to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, “No-net-loss in wetland” can refer to both loss in area and function.

fundamentally violates the principles set out in TPB PG-No. 12C.

### Fisheries

- (c) He does not support the application from a fisheries viewpoint.
- (d) Generally speaking, pond filling is not recommended from a fisheries viewpoint, for it may hinder the potential of the existing pond to be used for fish culture operations in the future.
- (e) The proposed fish farming operation is not a commonly observed fish farming practice. In fact, partitioning of pond(s) is not essential for operating the various functions mentioned in the submission. For example, nets with appropriate mesh sizes may be placed in ponds to separate adult fish from fry/fingerlings, and tanks may be used to isolate/quarantine sick fish from healthy fish stock.
- (f) Profitability, cost-effectiveness and suitability of fish farming operations depends on multitude of factors. They include quality and source of fish fry, type of fish feed, stocking density, number of fish species (i.e. mono- versus poly-culture) farmed, condition of and monitoring frequency of farm environment (e.g. hygiene, water quality and nutrient loading) and health of cultured fish, etc. There is no strong justification that profitability, cost-effectiveness and suitability can be maximised with the implementation of the applicant's fish farming proposal.

### Landscaping

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

- (a) She has reservation on the application from landscape planning perspective.
- (b) The Site is situated in area of miscellaneous rural fringe predominated by contiguous fish ponds, wetlands, scattered tree groups and woodland. The Site is a pond and existing vegetation along the periphery of the Site are observed. The proposed pond filling is considered incompatible with the surrounding landscape setting from landscape planning perspective.
- (c) With reference to the proposal, more than half of the pond (about 65%) is proposed to be filled with soil. Significant impact on the landscape resources (i.e. pond with existing vegetation) arising from the proposed development is anticipated.
- (d) There are existing ponds located in close proximity to the Site. Moreover, there is no similar application for filling of pond for permitted agricultural use previously approved in the same "CA" zone. There is concern that approval of the application would alter the landscape character of the area and degrade the landscape quality

of surrounding environment.

### **Environment**

#### 10.1.4 Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) She does not support the application.
- (b) The Site falls within the “CA” zone and the WCA of Deep Bay Area. However, the applicant has not provided sufficient information (e.g. EcoIA) to demonstrate the acceptability of the proposed pond filling. No wetland compensation proposal was provided by the applicant for the loss of wetland area and function. The proposed pond filling may cause significant impact to the environment.
- (c) The applicant should be reminded of the detailed comments at **Appendix IV**.

### **Traffic**

#### 10.1.5 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

- (a) The applicant stated in the submission that there would be a maximum of around 150 daily trips of construction vehicles during the proposed pond filling works. The applicant is required to review and advise the traffic pattern of the construction vehicles (e.g. whether arrival and departure of construction vehicles would avoid traffic peak hours) and assess the associated impact on road network, particularly on whether construction vehicles queuing along the local unnamed access road for pond filling operation would tail back to the junction of Tin Wah Road/Tin Tsz Road/Wetland Park Road.
- (b) The applicant should be reminded of the detailed comments at **Appendix IV**.

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

He has no adverse comment on the application. The applicant should be reminded of the detailed comments at **Appendix IV**.

### **Drainage**

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

The applicant is required to submit a drainage impact assessment in support of the proposed pond filling, in order to demonstrate that there will be no adverse drainage impact to the surrounding area.

### **District Officer's Comments**

10.1.8 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 Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department (CBS/NTW, BD);
- (b) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD);
- (c) Chief Engineer/Land Works, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CE/LW, CEDD);
- (d) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD (H(GEO), CEDD);
- (e) Project Manager (West), CEDD (PM(W), CEDD);
- (f) Commissioner of Police (C of P); and
- (g) Director of Fire Services (D of FS).

## **11. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period**

On 11.11.2022, the application was published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection period, five public comments from Conservancy Association, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong and an individual (**Appendices IV-1 to IV-5**) were received objecting to the application mainly on the following grounds:

- (a) the proposed pond filling will lead to direct and permanent loss in wetland, which is not in line with the planning intentions of the “CA” zone and the WCA, particularly the “no-net-loss in wetland” principle;
- (b) no detail is provided in the submission regarding the fill materials to be used and the proposed energy-efficient and environmentally-friendly practice for assessing the necessity of the proposal, as well as the potential land contamination and other disturbance impact during the construction and operation phases. Also, no detail is provided regarding the proposed wastewater treatment pond, particularly on how the wastewater would be treated and discharged which may deteriorate the water in the adjacent fish ponds. No drainage impact assessment is submitted to assess whether there would be change in hydrology in the adjoining fish ponds within the WCA;
- (c) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the “CA” zone and the WCA, which may affect the overall Deep Bay fish pond system of international conservation importance; and
- (d) the proposed pond filling is a ‘destroy to build’ proposal in disguise.

## **12. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

12.1 The application is for proposed filling of pond (i.e. soil of about 1.5m to 2.5m in



depth covering an area of about 11,045m<sup>2</sup> or 65% of the Site) for permitted agricultural use (fish pond culture) at the Site within the “CA” zone (**Plan A-1**). The “no-net-loss in wetland” principle is adopted for any change in use within this zone. The primary intention is to discourage new development unless it is required to support the conservation of the ecological integrity of the wetland ecosystem or the development is an essential infrastructure project with overriding public interest. Whilst ‘Agricultural Use (Fish Pond Culture only)’ is always permitted within the “CA” zone, filling of pond within the “CA” 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 these regards, DAFC objects to the application from nature conservation point of view as the proposed pond filling will result in net loss in wetland both in terms of area and function. Moreover, the applicant has not submitted any drainage impact assessment to address the potential drainage concerns despite CE/MN of DSD’s requirement. There is insufficient information to assess whether the proposed pond filling would have adverse drainage impact on the surrounding area. In view of the above, the proposed pond filling is considered not in line with the planning intention of the “CA” zone.

- 12.2 According to TPB PG-No. 12C, the Site falls within the WCA wherein the existing and contiguous, active or abandoned fishponds should all be conserved. Developments requiring planning permission from the Board should be supported by an EcoIA to demonstrate that the development would not result in a net loss in wetland function and negative disturbance impact. Wetland compensation is required for development involving pond filling, whilst mitigation measures against disturbance would be necessary. In this regard, no EcoIA is submitted; and no wetland compensation and mitigation measures against the disturbance impact are proposed in the current application to address DAFC’s concerns on the net loss in wetland, as well as the negative disturbance impact on the wildlife caused by the high volume of construction traffic. Also, DEP considers that there is insufficient information to demonstrate the environmental acceptability of the proposal, and does not support the application. In view of the above, the proposed pond filling is considered not in line with TPB PG-No. 12C.
- 12.3 According to the applicant, the size of the existing pond is excessive for modern fish farming practice emphasising cost and energy efficiency. The existing pond is therefore partitioned vide the proposed pond filling into twelve smaller ponds for various fish stock management functions, so as to maintain good fish pond culture environment and ensure sustainable supply of fish stock. In this regard, DAFC does not support the application from fisheries point of view as the proposed pond filling may hinder the use of the existing pond for fish farming in the future. He also advised that the applicant’s proposal is not a common fish farming practice. Profitability and cost-effectiveness of fish farming hinge on various factors, and there is no strong justification that the applicant’s proposal could maximise these attributes. More importantly, there are alternative ways for fish stock management without the need for pond filling, such as placing of nets in ponds and use of tanks. In view of the above, there is insufficient information in the submission to justify that the proposed pond filling is essential for the permitted pond fish culture use. There is also no information to justify that the proposed pond filling is required to support the conservation of the ecological integrity of the wetland ecosystem or the development is an essential infrastructure project with overriding public interest.

- 12.4 The Site is located at the southwestern fringe of the wetland in the Deep Bay Area (**Plan A-1**). Although the Site is located just outside the Tin Shui Wai New Town, the area to the north of the Site is the Hong Kong Wetland Park Special Area, whilst the area to the east is predominated by existing contiguous and continuous fish ponds. The proposed filling of pond is considered not compatible with the character of the surrounding area.
- 12.5 CTP/UD&L of PlanD has reservation on the application from landscape planning perspective, as the proposed pond filling would cause significant impact on the landscape resources (i.e. the pond with existing vegetation), and is incompatible with the surrounding landscape setting. Moreover, there is no similar application approved in the same “CA” zone, and approval of the application would alter the landscape character of the area and result in further degradation of the landscape quality of surrounding environment.
- 12.6 The applicant indicates that about 80 to 150 trips of dump truck would be generated per day during the three-month pond filling period. However, the applicant has not submitted any assessment on the impact of the construction traffic on the surrounding road network, particularly the junction of Tin Wah Road/Tin Tsz Road/Wetland Park Road to address C for T’s requirement. Hence, there is insufficient information to assess whether the proposed pond filling would have adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area.
- 12.7 The Site is involved in a previous application for proposed pond filling (No. A/YL-LFS/48), which was rejected by the Committee in 2000 on grounds of not in line with the planning intention of the “CA” zone and the then TPB PG-No. 12B; no information submitted to demonstrate no adverse ecological, drainage and environmental impacts; and setting undesirable precedent. The Committee also rejected a similar application (No. A/YL-LFS/69) in 2001 on similar grounds. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent and encourage proliferation of similar pond filling within the same “CA” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation of the ecology and natural environment of the area, thereby frustrating the planning intention of the “CA” zone. Rejecting the subject application is in line with the previous decisions of the Committee.
- 12.8 Regarding the five public comments received 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 above, the Planning Department does not support the application for the following reasons:
- (a) the proposed pond filling is not in line with the planning intention of the “CA” zone which is to conserve the ecological value of wetland and fish ponds which form an integral part of the wetland ecosystem, and any change in use within this zone has to adopt the “no-net-loss in wetland” principle. The applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed pond filling is required to support

the conservation of the ecological integrity of the wetland ecosystem or the development is an essential infrastructure project with overriding public interest;

- (b) the proposed pond filling, which falls within the Wetland Conservation Area, is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for 'Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance' (TPB PG-No. 12C) in that the "no-net-loss in wetland" principle is not complied with, and no ecological impact assessment has been submitted to demonstrate that no on-site and/or off-site disturbance impact would be resulted, or that such impacts could be fully mitigated through positive measure;
  - (c) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed pond filling would not have significant adverse drainage, landscape and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas; and
  - (d) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the "CA" zone and the cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation of the ecology and natural environment of the area.
- 13.2 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until **23.12.2026**, 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 submission of an ecological impact assessment for the proposed pond filling, and implementation of the ecological mitigation measures identified therein before commencement of the pond filling works to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission of a drainage impact assessment before commencement of the pond filling works to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) in relation to (b) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal identified in the Drainage Impact Assessment upon completion of the pond filling works to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (d) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b) or (c) is not complied with, 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 IV**.

#### **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 applicant.
- 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, and the date when the validity of the permission should expire.

#### **15. Attachments**

<b>Appendix I</b>	Application Form received on 2.11.2022
<b>Appendix Ia</b>	SI received on 10.11.2022
<b>Appendix Ib</b>	FI received on 14.11.2022
<b>Appendix II</b>	Previous Application and Similar Application
<b>Appendices III-1 to III-5</b>	Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period
<b>Appendix IV</b>	Recommended Advisory Clauses
<b>Drawing A-1</b>	Pond Filling Plan
<b>Drawing A-2</b>	Aquaculture Layout Plan
<b>Drawing A-3</b>	Vehicular Access Plan
<b>Drawing A-4</b>	Loading/Unloading Space Plan
<b>Plan A-1</b>	Location Plan with Previous and Similar Applications
<b>Plan A-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plan A-3</b>	Aerial Photo
<b>Plan A-4</b>	Site Photos

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
DECEMBER 2022**