

TPB Paper No. 10891

**For Consideration by
the Town Planning Board on 28.4.2023**

REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/YL-LFS/448
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

**Proposed Filling of Pond for Permitted Agricultural Use (Fish Pond Culture)
in “Conservation Area” zone,
Lot 1 S.L RP (Part) in D.D. 126, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long, New Territories**

REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/YL-LFS/448
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

Proposed Filling of Pond for Permitted Agricultural Use (Fish Pond Culture)
in “Conservation Area” zone,
Lot 1 S.L RP (Part) in D.D. 126, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long, New Territories

1. Background

- 1.1 On 2.11.2022, the applicant, 鄧君正 (Mr.), sought planning permission for proposed filling of pond for permitted agricultural use (fish pond culture) at the application site (the Site) under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Site falls within an area zoned “Conservation Area” (“CA”) on the approved Lau Fau Shan and Tsim Bei Tsui Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-LFS/11 (**Plan R-1**).
- 1.2 On 23.12.2022, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to reject the application and the reasons were:
- (a) the proposed pond filling was not in line with the planning intention of the “CA” zone which was to conserve the ecological value of wetland and fish ponds which formed an integral part of the wetland ecosystem, and any change in use within this zone had to adopt the “no-net-loss in wetland” principle. The applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed pond filling was required to support the conservation of the ecological integrity of the wetland ecosystem or the development was an essential infrastructure project with overriding public interest;
 - (b) the proposed pond filling, which fell within the Wetland Conservation Area, was not in line with the Town Planning Board (TPB) 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 was not complied with, and no ecological impact assessment (EcoIA) had 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 failed 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.

- 1.3 There is no change to the development parameters in the review application. To recapitulate, the site area is about 17,045m². As shown on the pond filling plan at Drawing A-1 of **Annex A** and indicated in the submission at section 16 stage, an area of about 10,045m² (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 12 smaller ponds. In addition, an area of about 1,000m² (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 11,045m² (or 65%) would be filled with soil of about 1.5m to 2.5m in depth.
- 1.4 As shown on the aquaculture layout plan at Drawing A-2 of **Annex A** and indicated in the submission at section 16 stage, the proposed pond filling is to facilitate pond culture of a fish species named Jade Perch. Amongst the 12 smaller ponds formed, nine of them (each of about 500m² 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 750m² and 2.5m in depth) would be used for fresh water storage and wastewater treatment respectively; and the remaining one (about 1,000m² 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 of **Annex A**). During the three-month period of pond filling, about 80 to 150 trips of dump truck would be generated daily.
- 1.5 The Site is currently not subject to any active planning enforcement action.
- 1.6 For Members' reference, the following documents are attached:
- (a) RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/448 (Annex A)
 - (b) Extract of minutes of the RNTPC Meeting held on 23.12.2022 (Annex B)
 - (c) Secretary of the Board's letter dated 13.1.2023 (Annex C)

2. **Application for Review**

On 1.2.2023, the applicant applied, under Section 17(1) of the Ordinance, for a review of the RNTPC's decision to reject the application (**Annex D**). The applicant has not submitted any written representation in support of the review application.

3. **The Section 16 Application**

The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (**Plans R-1, R-2**, aerial photo on **Plan R-3** and site photos on **Plans R-4a and R-4b**)

- 3.1 The situation of the Site and its surrounding areas at the time of the consideration of the section 16 application by the RNTPC was described in paragraphs 8.1 and 8.2 of **Annex A**. There has not been any major change in the planning circumstances of the Site and the surrounding areas since then.
- 3.2 The Site is:
- (a) currently a pond; and

- (b) accessible from Tin Wah Road to its southwest via a local track.

3.3 The surrounding areas 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.

Planning Intention

- 3.4 There has been no change to the planning intention of the “CA” zone as mentioned in paragraph 9 of **Annex A**, which 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” principle¹ 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.

- 3.5 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.

Town Planning Board Guidelines

- 3.6 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

¹ According to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, “No-net-loss in wetland” can refer to both loss in area and function.

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.

Previous Application

- 3.7 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 RNTPC 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. 12B² in that the proposal was not to conserve the ecological value of the area, and no information submitted to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in, or be able to fully compensate for the loss in wetland function and negative disturbance impact; 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 **Annex E** and its location is shown on **Plan R-1**.
- 3.8 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 (-69,319m² or -80% in area).

Similar Application

- 3.9 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 RNTPC on 6.7.2001 mainly on grounds of not in compliance of the then TPB PG-No. 12B in that no information was provided to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in, or be able to fully compensate for the loss in wetland function and negative disturbance impact on the ecological integrity and ecological value of the fish ponds within the Deep Bay Area; no information submitted to demonstrate no adverse ecological, drainage, environmental, visual and landscape impacts; and setting of undesirable precedent. Details of the similar application are summarised at **Annex E** and its location is shown on **Plan R-1**.

4. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

- 4.1 Comments on the section 16 application made by relevant government departments are stated in paragraph 10 of **Annex A**.
- 4.2 For the review application, the following government departments maintain their previous objection to/adverse views on the section 16 application in paragraph 10.1 of **Annex A**, which are recapitulated below:

² 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.

Nature Conservation and Fisheries

4.2.1 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 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

4.2.2 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

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

- (a) He 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 **Annex G**.

Traffic

4.2.4 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

- (a) The applicant stated in the submission at the section 16 application stage 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 **Annex**

G.

Drainage

4.2.5 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.

4.3 The following government departments maintain their previous views on the section 16 application as stated in paragraphs 10.1 of **Annex A**:

- (a) District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department (DLO/YL, LandsD);
- (b) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (CHE/NTW, HyD); and
- (c) District Officer/Yuen Long, Home Affairs Department (DO/YL, HAD).

4.4 The following government departments maintain their previous views of having no objection to/no comment on the application as stated in paragraph 10.2 of **Annex A**:

- (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 (H(GEO), CEDD);
- (e) Project Manager (West) (PM(W)), CEDD;
- (f) Commissioner of Police (C of P); and
- (g) Director of Fire Services (D of FS).

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

5.1 On 10.2.2023, the review application was published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection period, three public comments from Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and an individual (**Annexes F-1 to F-3**) were received objecting to the review application mainly on the following grounds:

- (a) the fact that the Site was found utilised by Tufted Duck, a wild duck species which are common winter visitors to the Hong Kong Wetland Park Special Area adjoining the Site, in late February 2023 reveals that the Site has some ecological linkages with and/or possess similar ecological functions with the habitats of the Hong Kong Wetland Park Special Area;
- (b) the proposed pond filling within the “CA” zone and the WCA without any assessment on the environmental and ecological impacts would lead to direct and permanent loss of wetland, and is not in line with the planning intention of the “CA” zone and the WCA;

- (c) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the WCA; and
- (d) the adverse comments of the concerned government departments at the section 16 application stage are still valid. There is no justification for the review application.

5.2 A total of five public comments, all objecting to the application, were received at the section 16 application stage as set out in paragraph 11 of **Annex A**.

6. Planning Considerations and Assessments

- 6.1 The application is for a review of the RNTPC's decision on 23.12.2022 to reject the subject application for proposed filling of pond for permitted agricultural use (fish pond culture) at the Site zoned "CA" on the OZP (**Plan R-1**). The application was rejected for the reasons that (1) the proposed pond filling was not in line with the planning intention of the "CA" zone; (2) the proposed pond filling within the WCA was not in line with TPB PG-No. 12C in that the "no-net-loss in wetland" principle was not complied with, and no ecological impact assessment had 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; (3) the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed pond filling would not have significant adverse drainage, landscape and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas; and (4) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the "CA" zone.
- 6.2 The applicant has not provided any written representation in support of the review application. Moreover, there has been no major change in the planning circumstances regarding the Site and its surrounding areas since the consideration of the subject application by the RNTPC on 23.12.2022. Hence, there is no strong justification to warrant a departure from the RNTPC's decision of rejecting the application. The planning considerations and assessments as set out in paragraph 12 of **Annex A** remain valid and are recapitulated as follows.

Not in line with the planning intention of the "CA" zone

- 6.3 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 11,045m² or 65% of the Site) for permitted agricultural use (fish pond culture) at the Site within the "CA" zone (**Plan R-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 areas. In view of the above, the proposed pond filling is considered not in line with the planning intention of the "CA" zone.

Not in line with TPB PG-No. 12C

- 6.4 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.

Insufficient justification for the proposed pond filling

- 6.5 According to the applicant at the section 16 application stage, the size of the existing pond is excessive for modern fish farming practice emphasising cost and energy efficiency. The applicant therefore proposed to carry out pond filling works to partition the existing pond into 12 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.

Adverse landscape impact

- 6.6 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.

Adverse traffic impact

- 6.7 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 regarding 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.

Setting undesirable precedent

- 6.8 The Site is involved in a previous application for proposed pond filling (No. A/YL-LFS/48), which was rejected by the RNTPC 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 of undesirable precedent. The RNTPC 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 RNTPC.

Public comments

- 6.9 Regarding the public comments objecting to the review application on the grounds as summarised in paragraph 5 above, the planning considerations and assessments in paragraphs 6.1 to 6.8 above are relevant.

7. Planning Department's Views

- 7.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 6, having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 5 and given that there has been no major change in the planning circumstances since the consideration of the subject application by the RNTPC on 23.12.2022, the Planning Department maintains its previous view of not supporting the review 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.

7.2 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the review application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until **28.4.2027**, 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) 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 **Annex G**.

8. Decision Sought

- 8.1 The Board is invited to consider the application for a review of the RNTPC’s decision and decide whether to accede to the application.
- 8.2 Should the Board decide to reject the review application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicant.

- 8.3 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the review 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.

9. Attachments

Plan R-1	Location Plan
Plan R-2	Site Plan
Plan R-3	Aerial Photo
Plans R-4a and R-4b	Site Photos
Annex A	RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/448
Annex B	Extract of Minutes of the RNTPC Meeting Held on 23.12.2022
Annex C	Secretary of the Board's letter dated 13.1.2023
Annex D	E-mail Dated 1.2.2023 from the Applicant Applying for a Review of the RNTPC's Decision
Annex E	Previous and Similar Applications
Annexes F-1 to F-3	Public Comments Received During the Statutory Publication Period of the Review Application
Annex G	Recommended Advisory Clauses

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
APRIL 2023**