

TPB Paper No. 10901

**For Consideration by
the Town Planning Board on 1.6.2023**

REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/YL-LFS/450
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

**Proposed Holiday Camp in “Coastal Protection Area” zone,
Lot 256 RP in D.D. 129, Tsim Bei Tsui, Yuen Long, New Territories**

REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/YL-LFS/450
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

Proposed Holiday Camp in “Coastal Protection Area” zone,
Lot 256 RP in D.D. 129, Tsim Bei Tsui, Yuen Long, New Territories

1. Background

- 1.1 On 12.12.2022, the applicant, Mr. Huang Jianjun, sought planning permission for proposed holiday camp at the application site (the Site) under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Site falls within an area zoned “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) on the approved Lau Fau Shan and Tsim Bei Tsui Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-LFS/11 (**Plan R-1**). According to the Notes of the “CPA” zone of the OZP, ‘Holiday Camp’ is a Column 2 use requiring planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). Moreover, the Site 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’.
- 1.2 On 3.2.2023, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the RNTPC) of the Board decided to reject the application and the reasons were:
- (a) the proposed use was not in line with the planning intention of the “CPA” zone, which was intended to conserve, protect and retain the natural coastlines and the sensitive coastal natural environment, including attractive geological features, physical landform or area of high landscape, scenic or ecological value, with a minimum of built development. There was a general presumption against development in this zone. There was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intention;
 - (b) the proposed use, which fell within the Wetland Buffer Area, was 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 no ecological impact assessment was submitted to demonstrate the ecological impact of the proposed development and propose any mitigation measures; and
 - (c) the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not be susceptible to adverse environmental impact and would not have adverse landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.
- 1.3 Under the section 16 application, the proposed fee-paying holiday camp comprises four structures of one storey (about 3.3m) in height, with a total floor area of about 205m² for leisure room, store rooms for tools and miscellaneous items, and toilet (three portable toilets in total) uses. An open-air area of about 775m² would be designated as tent camping area which could accommodate a maximum of eight tents (Drawing A-1 of **Annex A**) (hereafter ‘the Original Scheme’). Visitors may choose to rent tents

at the Site or bring their own ones. The tents available for renting would not exceed 2m in height. Three parking spaces for private cars would be provided. No filling or excavation of land will be undertaken at the Site.

- 1.4 Moreover, according to the applicant, the proposed development will operate 24 hours a day, including Sundays and public holidays. A maximum of 60 visitors and six staff can be accommodated at the Site. Whilst no barbecue activities would be carried out at the Site, simple catering equipment would be provided on-site for cooking light refreshment. The proposed toilet on-site would be restricted for urination only. Visitors wishing to defecate are required to go to the nearby public toilets (the nearest at about 840m to the west of the Site)¹ (Plan A-5 of **Annex A**). The wastewater holding tanks of the portable toilets would be tanked away off-site regularly. Wastewater from the proposed leisure room would also be discharged to the wastewater holding tanks of the portable toilets. Refuse would be delivered to refuse collection point nearby.
- 1.5 The Site is currently not subject to any active planning enforcement action. Should there be sufficient evidence to form an opinion that there is unauthorized development (UD) on-site under the Town Planning Ordinance, planning enforcement action would be instigated.
- 1.6 For Members' reference, the following documents are attached:
 - (a) RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/450 (**Annex A**)
 - (b) Extract of minutes of the RNTPC Meeting held on 3.2.2023 (**Annex B**)
 - (c) Secretary of the Board's letter dated 17.2.2023 (**Annex C**)

2. Application for Review

- 2.1 On 9.3.2023, the applicant applied, under Section 17(1) of the Ordinance, for a review of the RNTPC's decision to reject the application (**Annex D-1**). On 15.3.2023, the applicant submitted written representation (**Annex D-2**) proposing amendments to the Original Scheme and providing justifications in support of the review.
- 2.2 In the section 17 review application, the applicant proposes the following amendments to the Original Scheme:
 - (a) reduction of maximum tent camping places from eight to four (-50%);
 - (b) reduction of maximum visitors accommodated from 60 to 30 (-50%);
 - (c) both urination and defecation would be allowed at the proposed toilet within the Site (only urination was allowed previously);
 - (d) refuse generated by the proposed development would be handled at the applicant's own means (rather than delivering to refuse collection points nearby); and

¹ There are three public toilets in the vicinity of the Site, namely Lau Fau Shan Sha Kiu Tsuen Sheung Wan Toilet (about 840m away), Sha Kiu Ha Wan Public Toilet (about 850m away), and Sha Kiu Sheung Wan Public Toilet (about 1,065m away) (Plan A-5 of **Annex A**).

- (e) a notice would be posted on the Site indicating that the Site would be susceptible to odour nuisance from the pig farm to the west.

2.3 Apart from the above, the other proposals of the proposed development remain unchanged in the review application.

3. **Justifications from the Applicant**

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the review application are detailed in his written representation at **Annex D-2** as summarised below:

- (a) no filling and excavation of land would be undertaken at the Site;
- (b) no workshop activity would be carried out at the Site; and
- (c) the proposed building height of not more than 3.3m are lower than that of the developments in the vicinity. Hence, no landscape and environmental impacts would be caused.

4. **The Section 16 Application**

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

4.1 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.

4.2 The Site is:

- (a) formed and fenced off, with the northern portion being used for cultivation, whilst the remaining portion being largely vacant; and
- (b) accessible from Deep Bay Road to its south via a local track.

4.3 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics. Some of the uses/developments are suspected UD's subject to planning enforcement action:

- (a) to the immediate north are ponds, a tract of fallow agricultural land, and the mangroves along the Deep Bay coastline. To the further north off the coast of Deep Bay is the Wetland of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention (the Ramsar Site);
- (b) to the east is a tract of shrubland. To the further east are the Tsim Bei Tsui Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), as well as the Inner Deep Bay SSSI which falls within the Wetland Conservation Area (WCA);
- (c) to the south across Deep Bay Road are a private garden, a temporary animal shelter covered by valid planning permission under application No. A/YL-

LFS/423, a parcel of cultivated land, and a woodland knoll where the Tsim Bei Tsui Lookout is located; and

- (d) to the immediate west is a site with works in progress. To the further west is a pig farm and shrubland.

Planning Intention

- 4.4 There has been no change to the planning intention of the “CPA” zone as mentioned in paragraph 9 of **Annex A**, which is intended to conserve, protect and retain the natural coastlines and the sensitive coastal natural environment, including attractive geological features, physical landform or area of high landscape, scenic or ecological value, with a minimum of built development. It may also cover areas which serve as natural protection areas sheltering nearby developments against the effects of coastal erosion. There is a general presumption against development in this zone. In general, only developments that are needed to support the conservation of the existing natural landscape or scenic quality of the area or are essential infrastructure projects with overriding public interest may be permitted.

Town Planning Board Guidelines

- 4.5 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 WBA. The relevant assessment criteria are detailed at Appendix II of **Annex A** 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 ecological impact assessment (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.

Previous Application

- 4.6 The Site is not involved in any previous planning application.

Similar Application

- 4.7 There is no similar application within the same “CPA” zone of the OZP.

5. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

- 5.1 Comments on the section 16 application made by relevant government departments are stated in paragraph 10 of **Annex A**.
- 5.2 For the review application, the following government departments have been further consulted and their new/updated comments are summarised as follows:

Nature Conservation and Licencing

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

As the proposed changes to the Original Scheme have not addressed his concerns, his previous comments as stated in paragraph 10.1.2 of **Annex A** are still valid with major comments recapitulated below:

- (a) Based on his staff's inspection and the aerial photos, the Site is currently a piece of wasteland with some agricultural activities near the northern edge of the Site. The Site and the adjacent area to the west, south and the east are developed and disturbed. However, there are shrubland/marsh to the north of the Site, and mangroves to the further north are at about 50m away from the Site. The applicant is required to provide information on how to avoid disturbing the natural habitats including the coastal fauna and flora to the north of the Site during the construction and operation of the proposed holiday camp.
- (b) Regarding the licensed pig farm² to the west of the Site, although he has no specific comment on the application from livestock keeping license perspective, the pig farm is in close proximity to the Site (i.e. about 25m away) which may attract complaints from the future visitors of the proposed holiday camp.

Environment

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

Since there is no change to the distance between the proposed holiday camp and the nearby pig farm, he maintains his view of not supporting the application. His previous comments as stated in paragraph 10.1.3 of **Annex A** are still valid with major comments recapitulated below:

- (a) There is a pig farm at about 25m to the west of the Site (**Plan R-2**), and the buffer distance recommended in paragraph 3.3.9, Chapter 9 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards & Guidelines (HKPSG), i.e. "usually a buffer distance of at least 200m from nearby sensitive uses is required" cannot be met. Since the Site is proposed for use as a holiday camp, the future users of the Site may be affected by the odour nuisance from the pig farm.

² According to DAFC, the pig farm to the west of the Site is covered with valid Livestock Keeping Licence issued under the Public Health (Animals and Birds) (Licensing of Livestock Keeping) Regulation (Cap. 139L), which was first issued in 2000.

- (b) The Site falls within Deep Bay Buffer Zone 1 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO). The use as a holiday camp can be considered as “recreation use” and is hence a potential designated project under Item P.1, Part I of Schedule 2 of the EIAO, i.e. “A residential or recreational development, other than New Territories Exempted Houses, within Deep Bay Buffer Zone 1 or 2”. An Environmental Permit issued under the EIAO is required for construction and operation of the proposed development.
- (c) There is no substantiated environmental complaint pertaining to the Site in the past three years.
- (d) The applicant should note his detailed comments at **Annex F**.

Landscaping

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

Landscape

No information regarding landscape planning aspect has been submitted under the review application. She maintains her reservation on the application from landscape planning perspective. Her previous comments as stated in paragraph 10.1.4 of **Annex A** are still valid with major comments recapitulated below:

- (a) The Site is situated in an area of rural coastal plain predominated by wetlands in Deep Bay Area, mangroves, scattered tree groups and woodland. The Site is mainly covered by bare soil, with cultivated area observed at the northern portion of the Site. Having compared the site condition through the aerial photo in 2021 and site photos in April 2023 (**Plans R-3b and R-4a**), tree felling and vegetation clearance had been undertaken at the Site. No landscape proposal was provided in the submission.
- (b) The “CPA” zone is primarily intended to conserve, protect and retain the natural coastlines and the sensitive coastal natural environment, whilst existing wetlands and mangroves are either in close proximity or even right next to the Site. No similar proposed use was approved in the same zone. The proposed development is considered incompatible with the surrounding landscape setting.

Geotechnical

5.2.4 Comments of the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO), CEDD):

The applicant has not submitted a Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR) in support of the review application. His previous comments as stated in paragraph 10.1.5 of **Annex A** are still valid with major comments recapitulated below:

- (a) Some unregistered slopes, which may affect or be affected by the proposed development, are present within the Site. There is insufficient information regarding the configuration of these unregistered man-made slopes. In addition, a steep slope with gradient of more than 50° is present to the northeast of the Site. As such, the applicant is required to submit a GPRR in support of the planning application.
- (b) According to the layout plan, four proposed structures are to be constructed on or above the unregistered slopes at the northwest part of the Site. The applicant should clarify whether there will be any geotechnical works/site formation involved for the proposed development. In addition, the applicant should provide a detailed layout plan showing the relationship between the proposed structures, the lot boundary, the unregistered slopes and the proposed geotechnical works, if any.

Environmental Hygiene

5.2.5 Comments of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH):

She has no adverse comment on the application provided that:-

- (i) toilets for both urination and defecation by the visitors are provided within the proposed holiday camp by the applicant and on his own expenses; and
- (ii) the applicant would handle the waste generated from the commercial/trading activities on his own/at his expenses.

5.3 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) CTP/UD&L, PlanD (on urban design and visual aspects only);
- (c) Commissioner for Transport (C for T);
- (d) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (CHE/NTW, HyD);
- (e) Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (CE/MN, DSD);
- (f) Director of Fire Services (D of FS); and
- (g) District Officer/Yuen Long, Home Affairs Department (DO/YL, HAD).

5.4 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) Project Manager (West) (PM(W)), CEDD;
- (e) Chief Officer (Licensing Authority), HAD; and

- (f) Commissioner of Police (C of P).

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

- 6.1 On 17.3.2023, the review application was published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection period, four public comments from the Conservancy Association, Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation and individuals (**Annexes E-1 to E-4**) were received objecting to the review application mainly on the following grounds:
- (a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “CPA” zone and the WBA;
 - (b) the Site is located in proximity to ecological sensitive receivers along the Deep Bay coastline and the Tsim Bei Tsui Site of Special Scientific Interest;
 - (c) the proposed development is a suspected ‘destroy first, build later’ case. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent;
 - (d) insufficient information regarding the sources of wastewater, and how it would be collected and discharged is provided. Moreover, no information on waste management and utility installations is provided. There is concern that the Site and its surrounding areas would be susceptible to serious environmental and hygiene problem;
 - (e) the proposed development would cause adverse noise, drainage and traffic impacts;
 - (f) no information is provided as to how would the Site be reinstated upon decommissioning of the proposed development; and
 - (g) there is no justification for approving the review application.
- 6.2 A total of three public comments were received objecting to/raising concerns on the application at the section 16 application stage as set out in paragraph 11 of **Annex A**.

7. Planning Considerations and Assessments

- 7.1 The application is for a review of the RNTPC’s decision on 3.2.2023 to reject the subject application for proposed holiday camp at the Site zoned “CPA” on the OZP (**Plan R-1**). The application was rejected for the reasons that (1) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “CPA” zone; (2) the proposed development within the WBA was not in line with TPB PG-No. 12C in that no EcoIA is submitted; and (3) the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not be susceptible to adverse environmental impact and would not have landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.
- 7.2 In support of the review application, the applicant proposes to reduce the maximum number of tent camping places from eight to four and the maximum visitors to be

accommodated from 60 to 30. To address departmental comments, the applicant also proposes changes to the operational arrangements of the proposed holiday camp, including allowing defecation at the proposed toilet within the Site, handling refuse generated by the proposed development at his own means, as well as posting site notice indicating that the Site would be susceptible to odour nuisance from the adjacent pig farm.

- 7.3 Apart from the proposed changes as summarised in paragraph 7.2 above, there is no change to the other proposals of the proposed development in the review application. Since the consideration of the subject application by the RNTPC on 3.2.2023, there has been no major change in planning circumstances. Having considered the review submission, the planning considerations and assessments on the review application are set out below.

Not in line with the planning intention of the “CPA” zone

- 7.4 The “CPA” zone is intended to conserve, protect and retain the natural coastlines and the sensitive coastal natural environment, including attractive geological features, physical landform or area of high landscape, scenic or ecological value, with a minimum of built development. There is a general presumption against development in this zone. In general, only developments that are needed to support the conservation of the existing natural landscape or scenic quality of the area or are essential infrastructure projects with overriding public interest may be permitted.
- 7.5 In this regard, whilst the applicant proposes to reduce the maximum tent camping places and number of visitors accommodated, and claims that the proposed building height is lower than that of the developments in the vicinity, no information is given in the review submission to justify that the proposed holiday camp, irrespective of its scale, is needed to support the conservation of the existing natural landscape or scenic quality of the area, or is an essential infrastructure project with overriding public interest. Hence, the proposed holiday camp is considered not in line with the planning intention of the “CPA” zone. There is no strong planning justification given in the submission to warrant a departure from the planning intention.

Not in line with TPB PG-No. 12C

- 7.6 The Site is located near the coast of Deep Bay. Off the coast is the Ramsar Site, whilst to the further east is the Inner Deep Bay SSSI which falls within the WCA. According to TPB PG-No. 12C, the Site falls within the WBA, wherein an EcoIA has to be submitted for development requiring planning permission from the Board. DAFC advised that there are shrubland, marsh and mangrove to the north of the Site, and that the disturbance to natural wetland habitats including the coastal fauna and flora thereat should be avoided during the construction and operation of the proposed holiday camp. However, no EcoIA or other information is provided in the review submission to address DAFC’s concerns. As such, the proposed development is considered not in line with TPB PG-No. 12C.

Land Use Incompatibility and Environmental Susceptibility

- 7.7 While the Site is immediately surrounded mainly by agricultural land, ponds and shrubland, there is a pig farm located to the west of the Site (about 25m away). In this connection, DEP does not support the application as the buffer distance of at least

200m between livestock yards (viz. the licensed pig farm) and sensitive uses (viz. the proposed holiday camp) as stipulated under HKPSG cannot be met, and the visitors of the proposed holiday camp may be affected by the odour nuisance generated from the pig farm. While the applicant proposed to post a notice informing the visitors that the Site would be susceptible to odour nuisance from the adjacent pig farm, there is no change to the insufficient buffer distance from the pig farm, and the fact that the proposed holiday camp may be subject to environmental nuisance. As such, the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not be susceptible to adverse environmental impact.

- 7.8 In view of the discussion in paragraphs 7.6 and 7.7 above, the proposed holiday camp is considered not compatible with the surrounding land uses and environment.

Adverse Landscape Impact

- 7.9 By comparing the site condition through time-series aerial photos/site photos taken between January 2021 and April 2023 (**Plans R-3b, R-4d, R-3a and R-4a**), it is noted that tree felling and vegetation clearance had been undertaken at the Site. The Site was gradually transformed from mainly a shrubland to bare land. In this regard, CTP/UD&L of PlanD considers that the proposed holiday camp is not compatible with the surrounding landscape setting, and has reservation on the application. However, no information is provided in the review submission to address CTP/UD&L of PlanD's concern. Hence, the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas.

Failure to Demonstrate Geotechnical Feasibility

- 7.10 H(GEO) of CEDD advises that some unregistered slopes and a steep slope are present within and to the northeast of the Site respectively. The applicant has not submitted a GPRR or other information in the review submission to demonstrate the geotechnical feasibility of the proposed development.

Setting Undesirable Precedent

- 7.11 There is no previous application covering the Site nor similar application within the subject "CPA" zone. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent and encourage proliferation of similar use within the same "CPA" 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 "CPA" zone.

No Adverse Comment on the Revised Toilet Use and Waste Disposal Proposals

- 7.12 In response to the previous concerns on the toilet use and waste disposal proposals, the applicant proposes in the review submission to allow defecation at the proposed toilet and handle refuse at the applicant's own means. In these regards, DFEH has no adverse comment on the application.

Other Departmental Comments

- 7.13 Other concerned departments, including C for T, CE/MN of DSD and D of FS, have no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed holiday camp from traffic,

drainage and fire safety perspectives.

Public comments

- 7.14 Regarding the public comments objecting to the review application on the grounds as summarised in paragraph 6 above, the planning considerations and assessments in paragraphs 7.1 to 7.13 above are relevant.

8. Planning Department's Views

- 8.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 7, having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 6 and given that there has been no major change in the planning circumstances since the consideration of the subject application by the RNTPC on 3.2.2023, the Planning Department maintains its previous view of not supporting the review application for the following reasons:
- (a) the proposed use is not in line with the planning intention of the “CPA” zone, which is intended to conserve, protect and retain the natural coastlines and the sensitive coastal natural environment, including attractive geological features, physical landform or area of high landscape, scenic or ecological value, with a minimum of built development. There is a general presumption against development in this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intention;
 - (b) the proposed use, 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 no ecological impact assessment is submitted to demonstrate the ecological impact of the proposed development and propose any mitigation measures; and
 - (c) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not be susceptible to adverse environmental impact and would not have adverse landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.
- 8.2 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the review application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until **1.6.2027**, 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 development, and implementation of the ecological mitigation measures identified therein before commencement of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;

- (c) the submission of a geotechnical assessment report to assess the stability of existing geotechnical features that may affect or be affected by the proposed development, and the implementation of stabilisation/protection measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office of Civil Engineering and Development Department or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the provision of fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (e) if the above planning condition (a) 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 F**.

9. Decision Sought

- 9.1 The Board is invited to consider the application for a review of the RNTPC's decision and decide whether to accede to the application.
- 9.2 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.
- 9.3 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.

10. Attachments

Plan R-1	Location Plan
Plan R-2	Site Plan
Plan R-3a and R-3b	Aerial Photos taken in January 2022 and January 2021
Plans R-4a to R-4c	Site Photos taken in March/April 2023
Plan R-4d	Site Photo taken in March 2021
Annex A	RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/450
Annex B	Extract of Minutes of the RNTPC Meeting Held on 3.2.2023
Annex C	Secretary of the Board's letter dated 17.2.2023
Annex D-1	E-mail Dated 9.3.2023 from the Applicant Applying for a Review of the RNTPC's Decision
Annex D-2	Written Representation of the Applicant
Annexes E-1 to E-4	Public Comments Received During the Statutory Publication Period of the Review Application
Annex F	Recommended Advisory Clauses

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
MAY 2023**