

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

APPLICATION NO. A/YL-LFS/463

- Applicants** : Mr. Tang Sing Young and Mr. Tang Tim Fuk represented by Mr. Wong Sun Wo William
- Site** : Lots 1435, 1439, 1442 and 1446 in D.D. 129, Mong Tseng Tsuen, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long, New Territories
- Site Area** : About 2,317m²
- 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** : “Village Type Development” (“V”)
- Application** : Proposed Filling of Pond and Filling of Land for Permitted Houses (New Territories Exempted Houses (NTEH) - Small Houses)

1. The Proposal

- 1.1 The applicants seek planning permission for proposed filling of pond and filling of land for permitted houses (New Territories Exempted Houses - Small Houses) at the application site (the Site) (**Plan A-1**). The Site falls within an area zoned “V” on the approved Lau Fau Shan and Tsim Bei Tsui OZP No. S/YL-LFS/11. According to the Notes for the “V” zone of the OZP, ‘House (NTEH only)’ development is always permitted, but filling of pond and filling of land require planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). The Site also falls within the Wetland Buffer Area (WBA) 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’ (TPB PG-No. 12C). The Site partly forms part of a larger pond overgrown with vegetation (hereafter ‘pond portion’), whilst the remaining part is land covered with vegetation (hereafter ‘land portion’) (**Plans A-2 and A-4**).
- 1.2 As shown on the proposed pond and land filling plan at **Drawing A-1**, the pond portion (about 1,173m² or 50.6%) would be filled with soil of about 2m in depth, whilst the land portion (about 1,144m² or 49.4%) would be filled with soil of about 1m in depth. As a result of the proposed pond and land filling works, the formation level of the Site would be raised from about +2.3mPD (the pond portion) and +3.3mPD (the land portion) to about +4.3mPD (both the pond and land portions).

- 1.3 As shown on the NTEH block plan at **Drawing A-2**, the proposed pond and land filling is to facilitate the erection of eight NTEHs on the Site. Drainage facilities and peripheral landscape plantings would be provided upon completion of the proposed pond and land filling works (**Drawings A-4 and A-5**). No ecological impact assessment (EcoIA) or drainage impact assessment (DIA) is submitted in support of the proposed filling of pond and land.
- 1.4 As indicated in the submission, the construction vehicles would access the Site from the south via a local track branching off an unnamed road connecting Deep Bay Road and Tin Yuet Road (**Drawing A-3**, and **Plans A-1 and A-2**). There would be about 14 dump trucks trips generated per day¹ during the three-month construction period.
- 1.5 In support of the application, the applicants have submitted the following documents:
 - (a) Application Form received on 10.3.2023 (Appendix I)
 - (b) Supplementary Information (SI) received on 17.3.2023 (Appendix Ia)
 - (c) SI received on 22.3.2023 (Appendix Ib)

2. Justifications from the Applicants

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

- (a) to minimise the impact on migratory birds, construction works would be suspended from Decembers to Februarys, i.e. the high seasons of migratory birds coming to Hong Kong;
- (b) no construction waste but soil from excavated land and slopes would be used for the proposed pond and land filling works;
- (c) should the application be approved, EcoIA with proposed mitigation measures would be submitted to the satisfaction of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department or the Board before commencement of the pond and land filling works; and
- (d) should the application be approved, professional surveyors would be appointed to confirm the lot boundaries to the satisfaction of the Lands Department (LandsD) or the Board before commencement of the pond and land filling works.

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

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

4. Town Planning Board Guidelines

According to TPB PG-No. 12C, the Site falls within the WBA. The relevant assessment criteria are detailed at **Appendix II** and summarised as follows:

¹ Except Sundays and public holidays.

- (a) in considering development proposals in the Deep Bay Area, the Board adopts the principle of “no-net-loss in wetland” which provides for the conservation of continuous and adjoining fishponds. The “no-net-loss” can refer to both loss in “area” and “function”. No decline in wetland or ecological functions served by the existing fish ponds should occur. As the fish ponds form an integral part of the Deep Bay Area wetland ecosystem, alternative uses could be considered suitable only if it could be demonstrated that they would not result in the loss of ecological function of the original ponds and if they complement the ecological functions of the wetlands and fishponds in and/or around the Deep Bay Area;
- (b) the intention of the WBA is to protect the ecological integrity of the fish ponds and wetland within the Wetland Conservation Area (WCA) and prevent development that would have a negative off-site disturbance impact on the ecological value of fish ponds; and
- (c) within the WBA, for development or redevelopment which requires planning permission from the Board, an EcoIA would also need to be submitted. Development/redevelopment which may have negative impacts on the ecological value of the WCA would not be supported by the Board, unless the EcoIA can demonstrate that the negative impacts could be mitigated through positive measures. The assessment study should also demonstrate that the development will not cause net increase in pollution load to Deep Bay. Some local and minor uses are however exempted from the requirement of EcoIA.

5. **Background**

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

6. **Previous Application**

The Site is not involved in any previous planning application.

7. **Similar Applications**

- 7.1 Within/straddling the same “V” zone, there were seven similar applications for filling of pond/land for permitted NTEH development and/or agricultural use. Six of them were approved whilst one was rejected by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee)/the Board on review. Details of the similar applications are summarised at **Appendix III** and their locations are shown on **Plan A-1**.

Applications involving filling of pond

Approved applications

- 7.2 Applications No. A/YL-LFS/58 and 72 for proposed filling of pond for permitted NTEH and/or agricultural use were approved with conditions by the Committee in 2000 and 2001 respectively mainly on consideration that the technical concerns on drainage aspect could be addressed by approval conditions.

- 7.3 Application No. A/YL-LFS/216 for proposed filling of pond for permitted NTEH was approved with conditions by the Board on review in 2013 on considerations that the revised ecological appraisal had demonstrated no significant adverse ecological impact on the WCA; the drainage proposal was considered acceptable; and technical concerns on ecological, drainage and landscape aspects could be addressed by approval conditions.

Rejected application

- 7.4 Application No. A/YL-LFS/447 for proposed filling of pond for permitted agricultural use was rejected by the Committee on 3.2.2023 mainly on grounds of being not in line with TPB PG-No. 12C (viz. no EcoIA submitted; resulting in loss in wetland; and potential adverse impact to the wetland habitats in the vicinity); deficiency of the submitted DIA in demonstrating no adverse drainage impact; and failure to demonstrate no adverse landscape impact.

Applications not involving filling of pond but filling/excavation of land only

Approved applications

- 7.5 Applications No. A/YL-LFS/371 for proposed filling and excavation of land for permitted NTEH at the north of the “V” zone was approved with conditions by the Committee in 2020 mainly on considerations of no adverse comments from concerned government departments; not in contravention with TPB PG-No. 12C; and the technical concerns could be addressed by approval conditions.
- 7.6 Applications No. A/YL-LFS/387 and 413 for proposed NTEH and filling and excavation of land straddling the “V” and “Green Belt” zones were approved with conditions by the Committee in 2021 mainly on considerations of being generally in line with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories and TPB PG-No. 10 on ‘Application for Development within the Green Belt Zone’; concerned government departments generally have no objection to/adverse comment on the application; and the technical concerns could be addressed by approval conditions.

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

8.1 The Site:

- (a) partly forms part of a larger pond overgrown with vegetation, and partly land covered with vegetation; and
- (b) is currently accessible from Deep Bay road via a local track and footpath connected to the north of the Site².

² The applicant proposed that the construction vehicles would access the Site from the south (**Drawing A-3**). However, there is a stream to the immediate south of the Site which is not included in the site boundary (**Plan A-2**). Moreover, by comparing the aerial photos taken between January and March 2022 (**Plans A-3a and A-3b**), a road vide which the construction vehicles are proposed to access the Site was formed within the “CA” zone and the WCA without any valid planning permission, which would be subject to planning enforcement action.

8.2 The surrounding areas of the Site have the following characteristics. Some of the uses are suspected unauthorized developments (UDs) subject to planning enforcement action:

- (a) to the north are village houses intermixed with parking of vehicles, vacant land and unused land;
- (b) to the east are cultivated and fallow agricultural land, residential dwellings, parking of vehicles, sites under works in progress and vacant land;
- (c) to the immediate south is a stream. To the south are ponds falling within the “Conservation Area” (“CA”) zone and the WCA; and
- (d) to the west are ponds overgrown with vegetation; fallow agricultural land, shrubland, residential dwellings and parking of vehicles.

9. Planning Intention

9.1 The planning intention of the “V” zone is to designate both existing recognised villages and areas of land considered suitable for village expansion. Land within this zone is primarily intended for development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers. It is also intended to concentrate village type development within this zone for a more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.

9.2 As filling of land/pond and excavation of land may cause adverse drainage impacts on the adjacent areas and adverse impacts on the 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 four Old Schedule Agricultural Lots held under the Block Government Lease.
- (b) According to his records, one Small House application (at Lot 1442 in D.D. 129) is under processing at the Site.
- (c) According to his records, Small House applications at Lot 1442 in D.D.129 (i.e. within the Site) and Lot 1463 in D.D.129 (i.e. outside the Site) are lodged under the name of Tang Sing Young and Tang Tim Fuk respectively.

- (d) The Site falls within “V” zone encircling Mong Tseng Wai, which is a recognized village (RV). That said, consideration may be given to the Small House applications for sites within the “V” zone which encircles the RV.

Nature Conservation and Fisheries

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

- (a) He does not support the application.

Nature Conservation

- (b) The Site is a piece of wetland overgrown with wetland plant forming a marsh habitat, which falls within the WBA, and is to the immediate north of the WCA. Moreover, the proposed construction vehicular access (**Drawing A-3** and **Plan A-2**) cuts across a stream, and falls within the WCA, the “CA zone” and the Priority Site for Enhanced Conservation (viz. Deep Bay Wetland outside Ramsar Site). However, no EcoIA has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed filling of pond and land would not lead to wetland loss and would not cause negative impacts on the ecological value of the WCA.

Fisheries

- (c) Pond filling is generally not recommended from a fisheries viewpoint. Although the fish pond is currently of unknown status, it has the potential to be used for fish culture operations in the future.

Environment

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

- (a) He has no comment on the proposed filling of pond and filling of land.
- (b) Since the Site is within the WBA and is located to the immediate north of “CA” zone and the WCA, he trusts that DAFC would also advise his views from ecological perspective and the need for ecological impact assessment, etc.
- (c) The proposed construction vehicular access falls within the “CA” zone, which may potentially constitute a designated project under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO). Should the application be approved, the applicants should provide more information to confirm the status of the designated project. All the statutory procedures under the EIAO should be strictly followed, and Environmental Permit should be obtained prior to the construction and operation of the proposed vehicular access.

Landscaping

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

- (a) The Site is situated in area of rural landscape predominated by village houses, ponds, marshland and woodland. The Site is covered with vegetation.
- (b) The pond portion of the Site, which takes up about 50.6%, is proposed to be filled. Significant impact of the landscape resources (i.e. ponds and vegetation) arising from the proposed development is anticipated. No mitigation measure regarding the loss of landscape resources, including water features (i.e. pond), is proposed by the applicants.
- (c) As existing ponds are observed in the “CA” zone to the immediate south of the Site, she has grave concern on the proposed filling of pond and land which would further degrade the landscape quality of the WBA.
- (d) When comparing the landscape plan (**Drawing A-5**) and the NTEH block plan (**Drawing A-2**) submitted by the applicants, the proposed tree planting at the northern portion of the Site (viz. at the southwest of Lot 1435) is in conflict with a proposed NTEH.

Drainage

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

- (a) It is noted that currently there are Small House/village drains connected to the subject pond which is proposed to be partially filled. The drainage proposal submitted could not clearly indicate those existing drainage facilities. The applicants are required to submit a DIA for the proposed filling of pond and land to demonstrate whether significant impact to the upstream village drainage system is envisaged.
- (b) Moreover, the subject pond functions as a retention area during rainfall collecting surface runoff from the vicinity. The applicants should assess the drainage impact on the surrounding area arising from the proposed filling of pond.
- (c) Besides, as there is no information provided in the submission on how the filling of pond and land would be confined within the Site, the filling works may encroach onto the lots adjoining the Site, thereby significantly reduces the volume of the pond. The method of filling should also be taken into account when preparing the DIA.
- (d) It is noted that the stream to the immediate south of the Site may be affected or even blocked due to the proposed pond and land filling works, particularly when construction vehicles traffic are proposed to

access the Site from the south that cut across the stream (**Drawing A-3 and Plan A-2**). The applicants are therefore required to demonstrate in the DIA that the capacity of the stream would not be affected. A comprehensive diversion scheme, if any, should also be supplemented in the impact assessment for consideration.

District Officer's Comments

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

He has consulted the locals regarding the application. 11 local comments from the Indigenous Inhabitant Representative of Mong Tseng Wai and villagers of Mong Tseng Wai/Tsuen (Samples at **Appendices IV-1 to IV-3**) were received objecting to the application mainly on grounds that the proposed development abuts the WCA and would cause adverse ecological impacts; the Site had long been used for fish culture; the applicants have not submitted DIA and the proposed development would cause adverse drainage impact on the surrounding areas; the Site is not subject to Small House applications and may be susceptible to encroachment of unauthorized uses; and the proposed development would cause traffic congestion at Tin Yuet Road.

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) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (CHE/NTW, HyD);
- (g) Commissioner for Transport (C for T);
- (h) Commissioner of Police (C of P); and
- (i) Director of Fire Services (D of FS).

11. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period

On 24.3.2023, the application was published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection period, five public comments from the Conservancy Association and four individuals (**Appendices V-1 to V-5**) were received objecting to the application mainly on the following grounds:

- (a) the Site falls within the WBA and is in close proximity to the “CA” zone and the WCA. The proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the WBA under TPB PG-No. 12C in that it does not comply with the “no-net-loss in wetland” principle, and the applicants fail to demonstrate that there would not be any negative off-site disturbance impact on the ecological value of the fish ponds and

- wetland. There is no effort demonstrated to avoid or minimise the proposed filling of pond;
- (b) although the applicants propose to suspend construction works from Decembers to Februarys, the suspension period does not cover the entire dry seasons during which migratory birds influx to the Deep Bay area. Construction noise would pose disturbance to migratory birds;
 - (c) the applicants have not provided any details on the collection, treatment and disposal of sewage. The proposed development may pose adverse sewage impacts to the adjacent cultivated land;
 - (d) the proposed construction vehicle access, which had already been formed using construction waste without permission, would pose adverse ecological impact to the fish ponds nearby;
 - (e) the proposed filling of pond would lead to loss of flood detention function of the pond, and may pose adverse drainage impact to the surrounding areas;
 - (f) the proposed development would have adverse impact on the landscape character of the area. The proposed NTEH would exacerbate traffic congestion along the local track serving Mong Tseng Wai/Tsuen; and
 - (g) the proposed development is not in line with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that the Site falls outside of the ‘Village Environ’ wherein land is still available.

12. Planning Considerations and Assessments

- 12.1 The application is for proposed filling of pond (soil of about 2m in depth) and filling of land (soil of about 1m in depth) for eight permitted houses (NTEH - Small Houses) at the Site within the “V” zone (**Plan A-1**). Whilst ‘House (NTEH only)’ is always permitted within the “V” zone, filling of pond and land within the “V” zone is subject to planning permission as it may cause adverse drainage impacts on the adjacent area and adverse impacts on the environment. In these regards, DAFC does not support the application from nature conservation perspective (to be further elaborated in paragraph 12.2 below). Moreover, CE/MN of DSD raises concerns about the impact on the proposed filling of pond and land on the surrounding areas, including the upstream village drainage system connected to the subject pond, the flood retention function of the pond, and the capacity of the stream to the immediate south of the Site which is proposed to be cut across by the access for construction vehicles (**Drawing A-3** and **Plan A-2**). However, no DIA or other information is provided in the applicants’ submission to address CE/MN of DSD’s concerns. As such, the applicants fail to demonstrate that the proposed filling of pond and land would not have adverse drainage impact on the surrounding areas.
- 12.2 The Site falls within the WBA, and is located to the immediate north of the fish ponds within the “CA” zone and the WCA. According to TPB PG-No. 12C, the Board adopts the principle of “no-net-loss in wetland” which provides for the conservation of continuous and adjoining fishponds. No decline in wetland or ecological functions served by the existing fish ponds should occur. Also,

development/ redevelopment which may have negative impacts on the ecological value of the WCA would not be supported by the Board unless an EcoIA can demonstrate that the negative impacts could be mitigated through positive measures. In this regard, DAFC considers that the Site is a piece of wetland and in close proximity to the “CA” zone and the WCA to the immediate south. He also notes that the proposed construction vehicular access (**Drawing A-3 and Plan A-2**) will cut across a stream and falls within the “CA” zone, the WCA and the Priority Site for Enhanced Conservation (viz. Deep Bay Wetland outside Ramsar Site). He does not support the application from nature conservation point of view as no EcoIA has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed filling of pond and land would not lead to wetland loss and would not cause negative impacts on the ecological value of the WCA. Although the applicants claim that an EcoIA would be submitted after the approval of the application, it is necessary to confirm the ecological acceptability of the proposed filling of pond and land before the Committee considers granting a planning permission. In view of the above, the proposed filling of pond and land is considered not in line with TPB PG-No. 12C.

- 12.3 CTP/UD&L of PlanD considers that significant impact on the landscape resources (i.e. ponds and vegetation) arising from the proposed development is anticipated. Moreover, considering there are existing ponds within the “CA” zone to the south of the Site, she has grave concern that the proposed filling of pond would further degrade the landscape quality of the WBA. Although a landscape proposal has been submitted, no mitigation measure regarding the loss of landscape resources including the pond is proposed therein to address CTP/UD&L’s concern. Hence, the applicants fail to demonstrate that the proposed filling of pond and land would not have significant adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas.
- 12.4 Apart from the nature conservation concerns, DAFC does not support the application from the fisheries viewpoint as the pond has the potential to be used for fish culture in the future.
- 12.5 Other concerned departments including DEP and C for T have no objection to or no adverse comment on the application from environmental planning and traffic perspectives.
- 12.6 There is no approved previous planning application covering the Site. Although the Committee/Board has approved six similar applications involving filling of pond or land within the subject “V” zone between 2000 and 2022, three of the applications (No. A/YL-LFS/371, 387 and 413) do not involve filling of pond and are located at the northern fringe of the subject “V” zone away from the WCA, where DAFC and CE/MN of DSD had no objection to/no adverse comment. As for the approved similar applications involving filling of pond, the technical concerns of CE/MN of DSD could be addressed by approval conditions. Also, an ecological appraisal was submitted under application No. A/YL-LFS/216 to demonstrate that no significant ecological impact on the WCA was anticipated, on which DAFC has no adverse comment from nature conservation perspective. For the current application, no EcoIA or other information is submitted to address the concerns of DAFC and CE/MN of DSD on nature conservation and drainage aspects respectively. In fact, the Committee rejected a similar application involving filling of pond (No. A/YL-LFS/447) within the same “V” zone on 3.2.2023 which the applicant failed to address departmental concerns on similar aspects. As such, rejecting the current application is not in conflict with the previous decisions of the Committee.

12.7 Regarding the local views conveyed by DO/YL of HAD and the public comments received objecting to the application as summarised in paragraph 10.1.6 and 11 respectively, the planning considerations and assessments in paragraphs 12.1 to 12.6 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 local views and public comments mentioned in paragraphs 10.1.6 and 11 respectively, the Planning Department does not support the application for the following reasons:

- (a) the proposed filling of pond and land, which falls within the Wetland Buffer 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 there is no ecological impact assessment in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in "net-loss in wetland" and negative off-site indirect impact on the ecological value of the Wetland Conservation Area; and
- (b) the applicants fail to demonstrate that the proposed filling of pond and land would not have adverse drainage impact on the surrounding areas.

13.2 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 5.5.2027, 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) no waste, including construction waste, as defined in the Waste Disposal Ordinance, is allowed to be used to fill the Site;
- (b) the submission of an ecological impact assessment for the proposed filling of pond and land, and implementation of the ecological mitigation measures identified therein before commencement of the filling of pond and land to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the submission of a drainage impact assessment before commencement of the filling of pond and land to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal identified in the drainage impact assessment upon completion of the proposed filling of pond and land to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and

- (e) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c) or (d) 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 VI**.

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

Appendix I	Application Form received on 10.3.2023
Appendix Ia	SI received on 17.3.2023
Appendix Ib	SI received on 22.3.2023
Appendix II	Extracts of Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Development within Deep Bay Area (TPB PG-No. 12C)
Appendix III	Similar Applications within/straddling the same “V” zone
Appendices IV-1 to IV-3	Samples of Local Views conveyed by District Officer/Yuen Long
Appendices V-1 to V-5	Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period
Appendix VI	Recommended Advisory Clauses
Drawing A-1	Pond and Land Filling Plan
Drawing A-2	NTEH Block Plan
Drawing A-3	Vehicular Access Plan
Drawing A-4	Drainage Plan
Drawing A-5	Landscape Plan
Plan A-1	Location Plan with Similar Applications
Plan A-2	Site Plan
Plan A-3a and A-3b	Aerial Photos taken in January 2022 and March 2022
Plan A-4	Site Photo

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
MAY 2023**