

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

**APPLICATIONS NO. A/YL-LFS/488 and 489**

- Applicants** : Mr. Tang, Henry Ka Chun (Application No. A/YL-LFS/488)  
Mr. Tang, Chu Ting (Application No. A/YL-LFS/489)  
Both represented by Mr. Lee Wai Leung
- Sites** : Lot 1396 RP (Application No. A/YL-LFS/488)  
Lot 1396 S.A (Application No. A/YL-LFS/489)  
Both in D.D. 129, Mong Tseng Wai, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long, New Territories
- Site Areas** : About 225.09m<sup>2</sup> (Application No. A/YL-LFS/488)  
About 218.25m<sup>2</sup> (Application No. A/YL-LFS/489)
- 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 Land for Permitted Agricultural Use

**1. The Proposals**

- 1.1 The applicants seek planning permission for proposed filling of land for permitted agricultural use at the application sites (the Sites) zoned “V” on the OZP (**Plan A-1**). According to the Notes for the “V” zone of the OZP, ‘Agricultural Use’ is always permitted, while filling of land requires planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). The Sites also fall 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 Sites are currently overgrown with vegetation (**Plans A-2 and A-4**).
- 1.2 As indicated in the submissions, the applicants propose to fill the entire Sites (about 225.09m<sup>2</sup> and 218.25m<sup>2</sup> respectively) with cultivation soil of about 0.6m in depth. As a result of the proposed land filling works, the formation level of the Sites would be raised from +3.2mPD to +3.8mPD (**Drawings A-1 and A-2**). No ecological impact assessment (EcoIA) is submitted by the applicants in support of the proposed filling of land.
- 1.3 As indicated in the submissions, upon the completion of the land filling works, the Sites would be used for cultivation of grass such as broadleaf carpetgrass and

sportsfield grass, strawberry, as well as permitted agricultural use in general.

- 1.4 As shown on **Drawings A-3 and A-4**, the construction vehicles (24 tonnes dump truck and small-scale tracked dumpers) are proposed to access the Sites via a local track branching off Tin Yuet Road<sup>1</sup>. There would be about two trips of 24 tonnes dump truck and 20 trips of small-scale tracked dumpers generated per day during the works period<sup>2</sup>.
- 1.5 The Sites are the subject of a previous application (No. A/YL-LFS/270) for the same development proposal submitted by a different applicant, which was approved with conditions by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board on 13.3.2015 (details at paragraph 6 below). Nevertheless, the proposed land filling works had not been implemented, and the planning permission lapsed on 14.3.2019.
- 1.6 In support of the application, the applicants have submitted the following documents:
  - (a) Application Form of Application No. A/YL-LFS/488 with (Appendix I) attachments received on 23.8.2023
  - (b) Application Form of Application No. A/YL-LFS/489 with (Appendix Ia) attachments received on 23.8.2023
  - (c) Supplementary Information (SI) for both applications (Appendix Ib) received on 28.8.2023
  - (d) Further Information (FI) for both applications received on (Appendix Ic) 18.9.2023\*
  - (e) FI for both applications received on 26.9.2023\* (Appendix Id)

*\* accepted and exempted from publication requirements*

## **2. Justifications from the Applicants**

The justifications put forth by the applicants in support of the applications are detailed in the Application Forms and the SI at **Appendices I to Ib**. They can be summarised as follows:

- (a) the Site are situated in a low-lying area where crops could not be grown due to inundation. Filling of land is therefore required for cultivation; and
- (b) the proposed land filling works would not affect the surroundings.

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup> As shown on Photo 1 of **Plan A-4**, part of the proposed construction vehicle access is currently overgrown with vegetation. However, the applicants have not applied for filling of land thereat.

<sup>2</sup> As indicated in the submissions, no construction vehicle trip would be generated on Saturdays and Sundays. The land filling works is expected to be completed in 18 working days by 1.7.2024.

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

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

- (a) 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
- (b) 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 Sites are not subject to any active planning enforcement action.

#### **6. Previous Application**

6.1 The Sites are the subject of a previous application (No. A/YL-LFS/270) for proposed filling of land (by about 0.6m) for permitted agricultural use, which was approved by the Committee on 13.3.2015 mainly on considerations that the proposed land filling to facilitate always-permitted agricultural use is not incompatible with the planning intention; there was no objection to/no adverse comment on the application from concerned government departments including the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) and the Chief Engineer/Mainland North of the Drainage Services Department (CE/MN, DSD); and the technical concerns could be addressed by approval conditions. In particular, while DAFC considered that the proposed land filling was for ground levelling purpose which could not be regarded as a supporting activity to agricultural uses, DAFC noted that the site and its vicinity was involved in an unauthorized land filling works subject to planning enforcement actions<sup>3</sup>, and considered that the Site was fragmented from the fish ponds/wetland in the WCA by the said unauthorized works and therefore had limited ecological value at that time (**Plan A-3b**).

6.2 Details of the previous application are summarised in **Appendix III** and its location is shown on **Plan A-1**.

---

<sup>3</sup> The concerned lots where the unauthorized land filling (UD) was undertaken were Lots 1396, 1403, 1404 S.A, 1404 S.B, 1404 RP and 1414 (Enforcement Case No. E/YL-LFS/353); and Lots 1390 S.A RP, 1397 RP, 1398 S.A, 1398 S.C, 1398 S.D, 1398 S.F, 1398 S.G, 1398 S.I, 1398 S.J, 1398 S.L and 1398 RP (Enforcement Case No. E/YL-LFS/359), all in D.D.129 (**Plan A-2**). Enforcement Notice (EN) requiring the discontinuance of the UD were issued in July and October 2014 respectively; whilst Reinstatement Notice (RN) requiring the reinstatement of the concerned lots (i.e. removal of leftovers, debris and fill materials, as well as grassing) were issued in October 2014 and January 2015 respectively. As the concerned lots were subsequently reinstated, Compliance Notices were issued in November and September 2015 respectively.

## 7. **Similar Applications**

- 7.1 Within/straddling the same “V” zone, there are six similar applications for filling of land (with or without filling of pond) for agricultural use or New Territories Exempted Houses (NTEH) development. Four of them were approved whilst two were rejected by the Committee. Details of the similar applications are summarised at **Appendix III** and their locations are shown on **Plan A-1**.

### *Approved applications*

- 7.2 Application No. A/YL-LFS/271 for proposed filling of land for permitted agricultural use to the east of the Site was approved with conditions by the Committee on 13.3.2015 mainly on similar considerations as mentioned in paragraph 6.1 above. Meanwhile, DAFC considered that the proposed land filling was not necessary for farming purpose and thereby could not be regarded as a supporting activity to agricultural use.
- 7.3 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.
- 7.4 Applications No. A/YL-LFS/387 and 413 for proposed NTEH and filling and excavation of land straddling the northern part of “V” zone and the “Green Belt” zone to the north 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.

### *Rejected applications*

- 7.5 Application No. A/YL-LFS/463 for proposed filling of pond and filling of land for permitted houses (NTEH - Small Houses) was rejected by the Committee on 5.5.2023 mainly on grounds of being not in line with TPB PG-No. 12C (viz. no EcoIA to demonstrate no net-loss in wetland and negative off-site indirect impact on the ecological value of the WCA); and failure to demonstrate no adverse drainage impact.
- 7.6 Application No. A/YL-LFS/472 (at the same site as application No. A/YL-LFS/271) for proposed filling of land for permitted agricultural use was rejected by the Committee on 14.7.2023 mainly on grounds of being not in line with TPB PG-No. 12C (viz. no EcoIA to demonstrate no negative off-site disturbance impact on the ecological value of the WCA); failure to demonstrate the need for the proposed filling of land; and failure to demonstrate no adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas.

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

### **8.1 The Sites are:**

- (a) currently overgrown with vegetation; and
- (b) situated between the village houses of Mong Tseng Wai to the north and the ponds within the “Conservation Area” (“CA”) zone and the WCA to the south. They are inaccessible as the immediate vicinity of the Sites is also overgrown with vegetation. The nearest vehicular access to the northeast of application No. A/YL-LFS/488 (at about 50m) is accessible from a local track branching off Deep Bay Road (**Plans A-2 and A-3a**).

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

- (a) to the north of the Site are village houses, cultivated and fallow agricultural land, a car park and grassland. To the further north across a local track are village houses, a temple, a shrine, and a car park covered by valid planning permission under application No. A/YL-LFS/367;
- (b) to the east are fallow agricultural land and village houses;
- (c) to the south are fallow agricultural land and a stream (at about 14m to the south of application No. A/YL-LFS/489). To the further south across the stream are ponds falling within the “CA” zone on the OZP and the WCA (about 16m to the south of application No. A/YL-LFS/489); and
- (d) to the west are fallow agricultural land and village houses.

## **9. Planning Intention**

9.1 The planning intention of the “V” zone is to designate both existing recognized 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) He has no adverse comment on the proposed filling of land.
- (b) The Sites comprise Old Schedule Agricultural Lots 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.
- (c) Two Small House applications on Lot 1396 S.A and 1396 RP in D.D.129 (i.e. the Sites) are under processing by his office.

### **Nature Conservation and Agriculture**

10.1.2 Comments of DAFC:

#### **Nature Conservation**

- (a) The Sites are an abandoned wet field covered by dense vegetation of common species. Also, the Sites are close to the fish ponds/wetland within the WCA and the “CA” zone to the south with dense vegetation in between. Moreover, the proposed construction vehicular access (**Drawing A-4, and Plans A-2 and A-3a**) falls within the WCA, the “CA” zone and the Priority Site for Enhanced Conservation (viz. Deep Bay Wetland outside Ramsar Site). No EcoIA or other information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed filling of land would not cause negative impacts on the ecological value of the WCA.

#### **Agriculture**

- (b) Local farmers may occasionally carry out replenishment of lost top soil or levelling of ground to prevent excessive surface run-off. The thickness of replenished soil or the amount of earth that need to be redistribute in ground levelling is dependent on many factors such as topography of the land and the extent of erosion. Generally speaking, the amount of top soil needed for vegetable farming is about 30-45cm.
- (c) Nevertheless, the Sites are covered with dense vegetation. He cannot identify any major physical factors that may affect the suitability of the soil at the Site for cultivation in general.

### **Landscaping**

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

- (a) The Sites are situated in area of rural landscape predominated by village houses, ponds, marshland and woodland. The Sites are

covered with dense vegetation in a wet environment. A water ditch is also found traversing the Sites.

- (b) The applicants stated in the submissions that the proposed filling of land is for the cultivation of strawberry, grass and/or for agricultural uses. Significant landscape impact on the existing wetland species/vegetation and water ditch within the Sites arising from the proposed filling of land is envisaged. However, no information is provided in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed filling of land would not have adverse landscape impact on the Sites and their surrounding areas.
- (c) As there is a large area of existing ponds within the “CA” zone just to the south, she has grave concern that the proposed filling of land would further degrade the landscape resources and quality of the WBA and adjoining “CA” zone. As such, the proposed filling of land is considered incompatible with the surrounding areas.

### **Drainage**

#### 10.1.4 Comments of CE/MN, DSD:

- (a) He has no objection in principle to the application from drainage point of view.
- (b) Should the Board consider that the application be acceptable from planning point of view, an approval condition should be stipulated requiring the applicant to submit a drainage proposal, implement and maintain the proposed drainage facilities to the satisfaction of his department.
- (c) The Sites are not subject to any record of flooding. Based on his preliminary assessment, it is believed that there would be overland flow from the north passing through the Sites. However, the existing land characteristics of the Sites and their vicinity are generally grassland/vegetated land, where infiltration or rainfall absorption by soil is expected. Besides, the stream to the south of the Sites may well be the discharge path conveying the surface runoff (generated by saturation of soil due to heavy rainstorm event) from upland catchment.
- (d) Impact to overland flow from the adjacent area after the proposed land filling works is envisaged. The applicants are requested to provide topographic survey of existing ground level in the vicinity, as well as a cross-sectional drawing to demonstrate the proposed land filling works in the drainage proposal. Any alteration of existing drainage system shall also be indicated.

## **Environment**

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

- (a) He has no adverse comment on the proposed filling of land.
- (b) No medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, as defined under the Road Traffic Ordinance, shall be allowed to enter/exit the local track (i.e. the section as shown on **Drawing A-4**) at any time during the planning approval period.
- (c) Although the applicants have confirmed that no works will be carried out within the “CA” zone adjacent to the Site, since the access to the Sites will make use of the field bund located within the “CA” zone, the applicants are reminded to take note of any Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance implications that may arise.
- (d) There is no substantiated environmental complaint pertaining the Sites in the past three years.
- (e) The applicants should note his advisory comments in **Appendix VI**.

## **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. A total of 12 local comments (six for each of the two applications) from villagers of Mong Tseng Wai and Mong Tseng Tsuen in the form of standard letters (Samples at **Appendices IV-1 and IV-2**) were received objecting to the applications mainly on grounds that the proposed filling of land would impede stormwater discharge and bring serious flooding problem to the villages, and would adversely affect the roosting ground of birds and the natural environment in general.

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

- (a) Executive Secretary (Antiquities & Monuments), Antiquities and Monuments Office, Development Bureau (ES(A&M), AMO, DEVB);
- (b) Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department (CBS/NTW, BD);
- (c) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD);
- (d) Chief Engineer/Land Works, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CE/LW, CEDD);
- (e) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD (H(GEO)), CEDD;
- (f) Project Manager (West), CEDD (PM(W), CEDD);
- (g) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (CHE/NTW, HyD);
- (h) Commissioner for Transport (C for T);
- (i) Commissioner of Police (C of P); and



(j) Director of Fire Services (D of FS).

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

On 1.9.2023, the applications were published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection period, two public comments were received from the Conservancy Association (one for each of the two applications) (**Appendices V-1 and V-2**) objecting to the application mainly on grounds that the proposed development, which is very close to the WCA, is not in line with the planning intention of the WBA; the construction vehicular access falls within the WCA and is very close to the ponds which may incentivise unauthorized pond filling; there is no information on the treatment of tree(s) on-site; and there is concern on environmental pollution caused by the use of pesticide or other chemicals during the operational phase.

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

- 12.1 The applications are for proposed filling of land (cultivation soil of about 0.6m in depth) for permitted agricultural use at the Sites within the “V” zone (**Plan A-1**). Whilst ‘Agricultural Use’ is always permitted within the “V” zone, filling of 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 (including the ecology). In this regard, CE/MN of DSD has no objection in principle to the applications from drainage point of view.
- 12.2 Regarding the ecological aspect, the Site falls within the WBA under TPB PG-No. 12C, and is located at about 16m to the north of the ponds within the WCA and the “CA” zone of the OZP. According to TPB PG-No. 12C, the intention of the WBA is to protect the ecological integrity of the fish ponds and wetland within the WCA and prevent development that would have a negative off-site disturbance impact on the ecological value of fish ponds. Development/redevelopment which may have negative impacts on the ecological value of the WCA would not be supported by the Board, unless an EcoIA is submitted to demonstrate that the negative impacts could be mitigated through positive measures. In these regards, DAFC considers that the Sites are close to the fish ponds/wetland within the WCA and the “CA” zone to the south with dense vegetation in between. Moreover, the proposed construction vehicular access (**Drawing A-4, and Plans A-2 and A-3a**) falls within the WCA, the “CA” zone and the Priority Site for Enhanced Conservation (viz. Deep Bay Wetland outside Ramsar Site). However, no EcoIA or other information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed filling of land would not cause negative impacts on the ecological value of the WCA.
- 12.3 In view of the above, the applicants fail to demonstrate that the proposed filling of land would not have adverse ecological impact on the surrounding areas. Also, the proposed filling of land is considered not in line with TPB PG-No. 12C.
- 12.4 According to the applicants, the Sites would be used for cultivation of strawberry, grass, as well as permitted agricultural use in general. In support of their proposal, the applicants claim that the Site is inundated and crops could not be grown thereon. In this regard, CE/MN of DSD advises that the Sites are not subject to any record of flooding. Moreover, based on his preliminary observation, overland flow from

upland catchment to the north of the Sites would be absorbed by the soil on-site. Even in the event of heavy rainfall, surface run-off generated by saturation of soil would also be conveyed by the stream to the south of the Site. Meanwhile, DAFC advises that the Sites are currently covered by dense vegetation. He cannot identify any major physical factors that may affect the suitability of the soil at the Sites for cultivation. As such, there is insufficient information in the submission to justify that the proposed land filling is necessary for the permitted agricultural use.

- 12.5 CTP/UD&L of PlanD considers that significant landscape impact on the existing wetland species/vegetation and water ditch within the Site arising from the proposed filling of land is envisaged. Moreover, as there is a large area of existing ponds within the “CA” zone just to the south, she has grave concern on the proposed filling of land which would further degrade the landscape resources and quality of the WBA and the adjacent “CA” zone. However, no information is provided in the submission to address her concerns in this regard. Hence, the applicants fail to demonstrate that the proposed land filling would not have significant adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas.
- 12.6 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.
- 12.7 The Sites are the subject of a previous application (No. A/YL-LFS/270) for the same development proposal as the current application, which was approved with conditions by the Committee in 2015. The Committee has also approved four similar applications involving filling of land within the subject “V” zone between 2015 and 2021. It should however be noted that three of the similar applications (No. A/YL-LFS/371, 387 and 413) are located at the northern fringe of the subject “V” zone away from the WCA, and relevant departments had no objection to/no adverse comment on these applications. As for the previous and the other similar applications (No. A/YL-LFS/270 and 271 respectively) at or to the east of the Site, they were approved mainly on considerations that the sites were fragmented from the fish ponds/wetland in the WCA by the unauthorized land filling works at that material time and hence had limited ecological value (**Plan A-3b**). Nevertheless, for the current applications, with the reinstatement of the unauthorized land filling works (**Plan A-3a**), dense vegetation has grown between the Sites and the fish ponds/wetland in the WCA. However, no EcoIA or other information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed filling of land would not cause negative impacts on the ecological value of the WCA. In fact, the Committee recently rejected a similar application (No. A/YL-LFS/472) to the east of the Sites in July 2023 taking into account the change in planning and ecological circumstances. As such, rejecting the current applications is not in conflict with the previous decisions of the Committee.
- 12.8 Regarding the local views conveyed by DO/YL of HAD and the public comments received objecting to the applications as summarised in paragraphs 10.1.6 and 11 respectively, 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 local views and public comments mentioned in paragraphs 10.1.6 and 11 respectively, the Planning Department does not support the applications for the following reasons:

- (a) the proposed filling of 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 filling of land would not have negative off-site disturbance impact on the ecological value of the Wetland Conservation Area; and
- (b) the applicant fails to justify the need for the proposed filling of land, and to demonstrate that the proposed filling of land would not have adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas.

13.2 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to approve the applications, it is suggested that the permissions shall be valid until **13.10.2027**, and after the said date, the permissions shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the developments permitted are commenced or the permissions are 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 land, and implementation of the ecological mitigation measures identified therein before commencement of the proposed filling of land to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the submission of a drainage proposal before commencement of the proposed filling of 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 upon completion of the proposed filling of 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 applications and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant planning permissions.
- 14.2 Should the Committee decide to reject the applications, 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 applications, Members are invited to consider the approval condition(s) and advisory clause(s), if any, to be attached to the permissions, and the date when the validity of the permissions should expire.

#### **15. Attachments**

<b>Appendix I</b>	Application Form of Application No. A/YL-LFS/488 with attachments received on 23.8.2023
<b>Appendix Ia</b>	Application Form of Application No. A/YL-LFS/489 with attachments received on 23.8.2023
<b>Appendix Ib</b>	SI received on 28.8.2023
<b>Appendix Ic</b>	FI received on 18.9.2023
<b>Appendix Id</b>	FI received on 26.9.2023
<b>Appendix II</b>	Extracts of Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Development within Deep Bay Area (TPB PG-No. 12C)
<b>Appendix III</b>	Previous and Similar Applications
<b>Appendices IV-1 and IV-2</b>	Sample of Local Views conveyed by District Officer/Yuen Long
<b>Appendices V-1 and V-2</b>	Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period
<b>Appendix VI</b>	Recommended Advisory Clauses
<b>Drawing A-1</b>	Land Filling Plan of Application No. A/YL-LFS/488
<b>Drawing A-2</b>	Land Filling Plan of Application No. A/YL-LFS/489
<b>Drawing A-3</b>	Construction Vehicular Access Plan – 24 tonnes dump trucks
<b>Drawing A-4</b>	Construction Vehicular Access Plan – small-scale tracked dumpers
<b>Plan A-1</b>	Location Plan with Previous and Similar Applications
<b>Plan A-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plans A-3a and A-3b</b>	Aerial Photos in 2022 and 2015
<b>Plan A-4</b>	Site Photos

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
OCTOBER 2023**