

**REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/YL-LFS/359**  
**UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Filling and Excavation of Land for Permitted Agricultural Use**  
**in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 1236 S.B in D.D. 129, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long**

**1. Background**

- 1.1 On 23.1.2020, the applicants, Mr. So Shu Yuen and Ms. Tang Lai Ha, sought planning permission for filling and excavation of land for permitted agricultural use under section 16 (s.16) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) at the application site (the Site). The Site falls within an area zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) on the Approved Lau Fau Shan and Tsim Bei Tsui Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-LFS/9 (**Plan R-1**).
- 1.2 On 20.3.2020, 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 application was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone and the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for Application for Developments within the “GB” Zone (TPB PG-No. 10) in that the filling and excavation of land, which had been completed, involved clearance of natural vegetation, thereby adversely affecting the natural landscape and incompatible with the surrounding areas; and
  - (b) the applicants failed to justify the need for land filling and excavation.
- 1.3 For Members’ reference, the following documents are attached:
- (a) RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/359 (Annex A)
  - (b) Extract of minutes of the RNTPC Meeting held on 20.3.2020 (Annex B)
  - (c) Secretary of the Board’s letter dated 8.4.2020 (Annex C)

**2. Application for Review**

On 27.4.2020, the applicants, under section 17(1) of the Ordinance submitted a letter for a review of the RNTPC’s decision to reject the application (**Annex D**). On 2.7.2020, the applicants provided supplementary information for their submitted letter (**Annex E**).

### **3. Justifications from the Applicants**

The justifications/responses put forth by the applicants in support of the review application are detailed in the submissions at **Annexes D and E**. They can be summarised as follows:

- (a) The applicants are the current land owners of the Site and have the rights to manage and maintain the slope within the Site.
- (b) Officers from Planning Department (PlanD) and Geotechnical Engineering Office of Civil Engineering and Development Department (GEO of CEDD) have conducted inspection of the Site from a distance without measuring the gradient or investigating the soil but concluded their agricultural land as sloping ground.
- (c) Although villagers and their representatives objected to the application, they agreed that the slope within the Site should be stabilized by excavation and land filling. After the applicants had carried out the slope stabilization works, they received a letter from the officer of PlanD (**Annex E**) indicating that GEO of CEDD pointed out the slope would unlikely pose safety problem.

### **4. Background**

The Site is subject to an active planning enforcement case (No. E/YL-LFS/490) (**Plan R-2**) and the alleged unauthorized development (UD) is filling of land. The Enforcement Notice (EN) was issued to the registered land owners (i.e. the applicants of the current application) on 12.7.2019 requiring the UD to be discontinued by 26.7.2019. The Reinstatement Notice (RN) was issued on 29.8.2019 requiring to remove the leftover, debris and fill materials (including hard-paving) on the land and to grass the land by 29.11.2019. The concerned applicants on 5.9.2019 sought to review the decision of the Planning Authority. The review is being handled by the Secretary for Development (SDEV) and the RN is being suspended pending SDEV's decision on the RN review application. The Site will be kept under close monitoring for further action.

### **5. The Section 16 Application**

#### **The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans R-2 to R-4b)**

- 5.1 The situation of the Site and its surrounding areas at the time of the consideration of the s.16 application by the RNTPC was described in paragraphs 8.1 and 8.2 of **Annex A**. There has been no major change in the situation since then.
- 5.2 The Site is:
  - (a) located on a sloping ground ranging from 18.7 mPD to 22 mPD from west to east and 13.6 mPD to 21.3 mPD from south to north (**Plan R-2**);
  - (b) currently partly hard-paved, partly excavated and partly grassed with some temporary structures and converted containers (**Plans R-3a, R-4a and R-4b**); and
  - (c) accessible via a local track leading from Deep Bay Road (**Plan R-3a**).

- 5.3 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:
- (a) to the north is a burial ground;
  - (b) to the east are residential dwellings (the closest residential dwelling is about 41m away);
  - (c) to the west and south west are some existing tree clusters and woodland; and
  - (d) to its immediate south are fallow agricultural land and to the further south in the “V” zone are residential dwellings in Mong Tseng Wai.

#### Planning Intention

- 5.4 There has been no change in planning intention of the concerned “GB” zone as mentioned in paragraph 9 of **Annex A**. The planning intention of the “GB” zone is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl, as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. As filling of land/pond and 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.

#### Previous Application

- 5.5 There is no previous application at the Site.

#### Similar Applications

- 5.6 When the s.16 application was considered by the RNTPC on 20.3.2020, there were eight similar applications for various pond/land filling for agricultural use within the same “GB” zone (**Plan R-1**). There is no additional similar application since then. Details of the applications are summarised at Appendix III of **Annex A** and their locations are shown on **Plan R-1**.

### **6. Comments from Relevant Government Departments**

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

#### **Planning Enforcement Matters**

- 6.2.1 Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Central Enforcement & Prosecution, Planning Department (CTP/CEP, PlanD):
- (a) Regarding the justifications provided by the applicants (para. 3(b) above), he clarifies that GEO of CEDD had been consulted on the reinstatement works of the UD under the planning enforcement case

(No. E/YL-LFS/490) and GEO of CEDD conducted a site inspection accordingly in November 2019. GEO of CEDD advised that the provision of cement paved area for part of the Site was not necessary from slope safety point of view. Since the gradient of the Site was gentle, removing the cement paving from and then grassing the Site would unlikely pose risks to the stability of land.

- (b) Regarding the justifications provided by the applicants (para. 3(c) above), he clarifies that the Planning Authority has only issued EN, RN and letters regarding the suspension of the RN under review submitted to SDEV to the applicants in respect of the planning enforcement case No. E/YL-LFS/490 (**Plan R-2**).

### **Geotechnical Matters**

#### 6.2.2 Comments of the Head of GEO, CEDD (H(GEO), CEDD):

- (a) In response to applicants' justifications (para. 3(b)&(c) above), he clarifies that GEO inspected the Site on 11.11.2019 at the request of CTP/CEP, PlanD for geotechnical advice on the RN at the Site after the lot owners had submitted a review of the RN to SDEV. The inspection conducted was not a joint site inspection with PlanD as claimed by the applicants. The following geotechnical advice was given to CTP/CEP, PlanD in respect of the planning enforcement case No. E/YL-LFS/490:
  - (i) The site was generally on sloping ground and there was no landslide in the site at the time of inspection;
  - (ii) The provision of cement paved area was considered not necessary from slope safety point of view;
  - (iii) The proposed reinstatement works comprising the removal of the cement paving and provision of grassing would unlikely pose risks to the stability of land; and
  - (iv) GEO's advice was not related to acceptance of any works carried out at the site.
- (b) He maintains his previous comment of no adverse geotechnical comment on the application. Meanwhile, there is currently insufficient background information to assess the applicants' claim that the land filling and excavation works at the Site are required for slope stabilization. Nonetheless, all proposed building works (including site formation and slope stabilization works) within private lots are required to submit to the Buildings Department (BD) for approval under the Buildings Ordinance.

### **Land Administration**

#### 6.2.3 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department (DLO/YL, LandsD):

- (a) His office received an application for Letter of Approval (LoA) on Lot No. 1236 S.B in D.D. 129 referred by Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) on 7.8.2017. Since the aforesaid lot's owner has been changed during the processing of the application for LoA, the applicants were required to provide the consent from the new lot's owner. As the applicants could not provide such consent, the application for LoA was deemed to be withdrawn on 28.8.2018.
- (b) He also maintains his previous comments that the Site comprises Old Schedule Agricultural Lot held under the Block Government Lease which contains the restriction that no structures are allowed to be erected without the prior approval of the Government.
- (c) Should the planning application be approved, the lot owner(s) of the lot without STW will need to apply to his office for permitting the structures to be erected or to regularize any irregularities on site, if any. Besides, only application for regularization or erection of temporary structure(s) will be considered. Application(s) for any of the above will be considered by the LandsD acting in the capacity of the landlord or lessor at its sole discretion and there is no guarantee that such application(s) will be approved. If such application(s) is approved, it will be subject to such terms and conditions, including among others the payment of premium or fee, as may be imposed by the LandsD.

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

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

- (a) His office has received one comment from the village representative (VR) of Mong Tseng Wai Tsuen on the review application objecting to the application mainly on the grounds of pollution, sewage, fung shui, ancestral graves, traffic, slope and pedestrian safety problems (**Annex F**).
- (b) One comment was received by his office at the s.16 application stage from the same VR above, and is set out in paragraph 10.1.12 of the RNTPC paper in **Annex A**.

6.3 For the review application, the following government departments have been further consulted and they maintain their previous comments which are recapitulated below:

#### **Landscaping**

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

- (a) The Site which is located to the north of Mong Tseng Wai lies in an area of "GB" zone. The current application seeks planning permission for land filling and excavation for permitted agricultural use. The Site is not subject to any previous planning application.

- (b) With reference to the site visit by her office on 2.3.2020 and the aerial photo taken in 2018, the eastern part of the Site is partly hard paved and some mature trees are observed in this area. The rest of the Site is generally covered with wild vegetation. Scattered piles of construction materials are found stacked in the Site. The Site is situated in a rural landscape character surrounded by woodland to the south and west, and existing tree clusters to the north and east. Village houses are found to the further south of the Site. The extensive hard paving is considered not compatible with the landscape character of the surrounding area. According to the submitted layout plan, the filling and excavation of land at the eastern part of the Site for construction of farm house, tool storage, animal shelters and watering hole would likely involve removal of the existing mature trees. However, no information on condition of the existing landscape resources and their proposed treatments is provided in the application. The potential landscape impacts arising from the proposed development could not be ascertained.
- (c) When comparing the aerial photos taken in 2018 and 2015 (**Plans R-3b and R-3c**), an extensive site clearance was carried out since 2015 and all the large existing trees at the northern and western parts of the Site were removed. Significant adverse landscape impact has taken place.
- (d) Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent to encourage other similar developments to blanket clear the site prior to obtaining planning approval. The cumulative impact of which would result in a general degradation of the landscape quality of the surrounding environment and undermine the integrity of the “GB” zone. In view of the above, she has reservation on the application from landscape planning perspective.

### **Nature Conservation**

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

- (a) The Site falls within the “GB” zone and possesses a potential for agricultural rehabilitation. The applicants should provide more details of the agricultural activities (e.g. cultivation area, type of crops to be grown, market channel for the crop produce, etc.) to be conducted at the Site, justify the need for filling and excavation of land for agricultural use, and provide more information about the fill materials for the Board’s consideration.
- (b) According to AFCD’s record, they have received an application for LoA for erecting agricultural structures at Lots 1236 S.B in D.D. 129 in August 2017 by another applicant and forwarded the application to LandsD in September 2017 for further processing and approval. However, she has no information on whether the application has been approved or not.
- (c) The Site is partly paved and partly covered with vegetation of common species. She has no comment on the application from nature conservation point of view.

- (d) It is noticed that the applicants also propose to have sheep shed and kennel in the Site. The applicants should be reminded that under the Public Health (Animals) (Boarding Establishment) Regulations, Cap. 139I, any person who provides food and accommodation for animals in return for a fee paid by the owner must apply for a Boarding Establishment Licence from AFCD. The applicants should also be reminded that the establishment and ancillary facilities which is licensed under the Cap. 139I Public Health (Animals) (Boarding Establishment) Regulations must always fulfil the criteria listed in the Regulations.
- (e) On the other hand, the dogs kept by the applicants should also be properly licensed as in accordance with Cap. 421 Rabies Ordinance and they are reminded to observe Cap. 169 Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Ordinance at all times.
- (f) The Public Health (Animals and Birds) (Exhibitions) Regulations, Cap. 139F, regulates all persons who exhibit animals or birds in return for a fee paid by the public admitted to enter the venue for the exhibition. In that regards, the applicants will need to apply for licence if he or she is exhibiting the goats for a fee. Please refer to the following link for details of the regulations.  
[https://www.pets.gov.hk/english/animal\\_business/exhibition\\_licence.html#tab\\_03](https://www.pets.gov.hk/english/animal_business/exhibition_licence.html#tab_03)
- (g) On the contrary, no licence is needed to keep goats in the New Territories areas. To combat nuisance, it is advised that the applicants tend the goats all the time if the goats are roaming and free grazing.

### **Environment**

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

- (a) In view of the nature and scale of the proposed development, he has no objection to the application. The applicant is reminded to strictly comply with relevant pollution control ordinances, including Waste Disposal Ordinance and Water Pollution Control Ordinance, and to implement appropriate pollution control measures to minimise any potential environmental impacts during construction. Reference could be made to relevant publications/guidelines including the following:

Recommended Pollution Control Clauses for Construction Contracts  
[https://www.epd.gov.hk/epd/english/environmentinhk/eia\\_planning/guide\\_ref/rpc\\_1.html](https://www.epd.gov.hk/epd/english/environmentinhk/eia_planning/guide_ref/rpc_1.html)

ProPECC PN 1/94 Construction Site Drainage  
[https://www.epd.gov.hk/epd/sites/default/files/epd/english/resources/pub/publications/files/pn94\\_1.pdf](https://www.epd.gov.hk/epd/sites/default/files/epd/english/resources/pub/publications/files/pn94_1.pdf)

- (b) No substantiated environmental complaint pertaining to the Site has been received in the past three years.

6.4 The following government bureau and departments have no further view/comments on the review application and maintain their previous comments on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 10.1 of **Annex A**.

- (a) Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, BD (CBS/NTW, BD);
- (b) Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (CE/MN, DSD);
- (c) Secretary for the Environment (S for ENV);
- (d) Director of Fire Services (D of FS);
- (e) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (CHE/NTW, HyD); and
- (f) Commissioner for Transport (C for T).

6.5 The following government departments maintain their previous views of having no comment on the review application.

- (a) Project Manager (West), CEDD (PM(W), CEDD);
- (b) Principal Project Coordinator/Special Duty, DSD (PPC/SD, DSD);
- (c) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS);
- (d) Director of Leisure, Cultural and Services (DLCS);
- (e) Commissioner of Police (C of P); and
- (f) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD).

## **7. Public Comments on the Review Application Received During Statutory Publication Periods**

7.1 On 8.5.2020, the review application was published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection period, nine public comments were received from Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, villagers and an individual (**Annexes G-1 to G-9**). They objected to the review application on similar grounds as per the s.16 application stage in that the proposal is not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone and the TPB Guidelines for ‘Application for Development within the Deep Bay Area’; the proposed development will generate possible adverse traffic, environmental, landscape, drainage, sewerage, landslide, health and fung shui impacts and lead to degradation of the surrounding area; the Board should not encourage “destroy first, build later” attitude; and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the same “GB” zone.

7.2 Thirteen public comments, all objecting to the application, were received at the s.16 application stage and are set out in paragraph 11 of **Annex A**.

## **8. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

8.1 The application is for a review of the RNTPC’s decision on 20.3.2020 to reject the subject application for filling and excavation of land for permitted agricultural use at the Site zoned “GB” on the OZP (**Plan R-1**). The application was rejected for the reasons that it was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone and the TPB PG-No. 10 for Application for Developments within the “Green Belt” Zone in that the filling and excavation of land, which had been completed, involved clearance



of natural vegetation, thereby adversely affecting the natural landscape and incompatible with the surrounding areas; and the applicants failed to justify the need for land filling and excavation. The applicants submitted justifications in support of the review application mainly on grounds that filling and excavation of land within the Site is for stabilization of slope. Since the consideration of the subject application by the RNTPC on 20.3.2020, there is no change in planning circumstances.

#### Justifications for the Need for Land Filling and Excavation

- 8.2 In response to the applicants' claim that the land filling and excavation are required for slope stabilization, GEO, CEDD had been consulted on the reinstatement works of the UD on the Site under the planning enforcement case (No. E/YL-LFS/490) (**Plan R-2**) and they conducted a site inspection on 11.11.2019. Head of GEO, CEDD advised that the Site was generally on sloping ground and there was no landslide in the Site at the time of inspection. The provision of cement paved area in the Site was not necessary from slope safety point of view. Besides, Head of GEO, CEDD also advised that there is currently insufficient background information to assess the applicants' claim that the land filling and excavation works at the Site are required for slope stabilization. In view of the above, the applicants still fail to justify the need for land filling and excavation under the application.

#### Planning Intention of "GB" Zone

- 8.3 The Site falls within an area zoned "GB" on the OZP, which is to define the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl, as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. Whilst agricultural use is always permitted within the "GB" zone, filling and excavation of land within "GB" zone is subject to planning permission as it may cause adverse drainage impact on the adjacent areas and adverse impact on the natural environment. The applicants are applying for filling and excavation of land at the eastern portion of the Site (about 1,185m<sup>2</sup> (about 30%)) for ancillary agricultural use (i.e. for farm house, storage, toilet, lookout, sheep shed, kennel, electric room, temporary structures as resting place uses, water tank and internal access). The Site is currently partly hard-paved, partly excavated and partly grassed with some temporary structures and converted containers (**Plans 3a, R-4a to 4b**), where filling and excavation of land has been carried out at the Site without planning permission. The applied use is not in line with the planning intention of the "GB" zone.

#### Land Use Compatibility

- 8.4 The Site is situated in a rural landscape character comprising fallow agricultural land, burial ground and residential dwellings (**Plans R-2 and R-3a to 3c**). The applied use of filling and excavation of land (involving about 1,185m<sup>2</sup>) for agricultural use is considered not compatible with the surrounding areas.

#### Adverse Landscape Impact on the Surrounding Areas

- 8.5 According to the TPB PG-No.10, any proposed development should be compatible with the surrounding areas and should not involve extensive clearance of existing natural vegetation, affect the existing natural landscape, and cause any adverse visual impact on the surrounding environment. CTP/UD&L, PlanD has reservation on the

application from landscape planning perspective as the applied use involving extensive hard-paving and vegetation clearance is considered not compatible with the landscape character of the surrounding areas, which comprise woodland, tree clusters and village houses. He also points out that approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent to encourage similar developments to the area. The cumulative impact of which result in a general degradation of the landscape quality of the surrounding environment and undermine the integrity of the “GB” zone. In this regard, the applied use is not in line with the TPB PG-No.10.

#### No Strong Justification

- 8.6 Although DAFC considers that the Site possesses potential for agricultural rehabilitation, she indicates that the applicants should provide more details of the agricultural activities (e.g. cultivation area, type of crops to be grown, market channel for the crop produce, etc.) to be conducted at the Site, justify the need for filling and excavation of land for agricultural use, and provide more information about the fill materials for the Board’s consideration. In this regard, there is no strong justification for the need for filling and excavation of land for the ancillary agricultural uses.

#### Other Departmental Comments

- 8.7 Other relevant departments including C for T, CE/MN of DSD, DEP and D of FS have no adverse comment on the application on the traffic, drainage, environmental and fire safety aspects.

#### Setting of Undesirable Precedent

- 8.8 No previous approval has been granted at the Site. Within the same “GB” zone, there were eight similar applications with different site extents for various pond/land filling for agricultural use. Three applications (No. A/YL-LFS/9, 10 and 132) were approved. The first two for pond filling for agricultural use outside the Wetland Buffer Area (WBA) were approved on the considerations of in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone, compatible with the surrounding area, not within the WBA, no objection from relevant departments while the last one for land filling within the WBA was approved in view of no pond filling within the WBA. The other five similar applications (No. A/YL-LFS/101, 133, 136, 201 and 202) for pond/land filling for agricultural use were rejected between 2003 and 2010 for the reasons of not in line with the relevant TPB Guidelines for ‘Application for Development within the Green Belt zone’ and ‘Application for Development within the Deep Bay Area’; no information to demonstrate no adverse drainage and landscape impacts on the surrounding area and the need for pond/land filling; and setting an undesirable precedent for similar applications.
- 8.9 No approval for similar land filling and excavation for ancillary agricultural use (i.e. for farm house, storage, toilet, lookout, sheep shed, kennel, electric room, temporary structures as resting place uses, water tank and internal access for this current application) has been granted by the RNTPC/the Board for those applications within the WBA and with adverse departmental comments. Eastern portion of the Site has been filled and excavated without planning permission and subject to active enforcement actions. The applicants fail to justify the need for filling and excavation of land at the Site. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent and encourage proliferation of similar filling and excavation of land within the same

“GB” zone thereby frustrating its planning intention. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation of the environment of the area. As such, rejecting the current application is in line with the RNTPC/the Board’s previous decisions.

#### Public Comments

8.10 Regarding the public comments objecting to the review application on the grounds as detailed in paragraphs 6.2.4 and 7 above, the planning considerations and assessments in paragraphs 8.1 to 8.9 above are relevant.

### **9. Planning Department’s Views**

9.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 8, and given that there is no change in the planning circumstances since the consideration of the subject application by the RNTPC on 20.3.2020, the Planning Department maintains its previous view of not supporting the review application for the following reasons:

- (a) the application is not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone and the TPB PG-No. 10 for Application for Developments within the “Green Belt” Zone in that the filling and excavation of land, which has been completed, involves clearance of natural vegetation, thereby adversely affecting the natural landscape and incompatible with the surrounding areas; and
- (b) the applicants fail to justify the need for land filling and excavation.

9.2 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the application on review, no time clause for commencement of development is proposed as the land filling and excavation works under application have already been completed. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members’ reference:

#### Approval conditions

- (a) the submission and implementation of drainage proposal within **9** months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board by **17.4.2021**;
- (b) the submission and implementation of fire service installations proposal within **9** months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by **17.4.2021**; and
- (c) if any of the above planning conditions (a) or (b) is not complied with by the above specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.

#### Advisory clauses

The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Annex H**.

**10. Decision Sought**

- 10.1 The Board is invited to consider the application for a review of the RNTPC's decision and decide whether to accede to the application.
- 10.2 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.
- 10.3 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.

**11. Attachments**

<b>Plan R-1</b>	Location Plan with Similar Applications
<b>Plan R-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plans R-3a to 3c</b>	Aerial Photos
<b>Plans R-4a to 4b</b>	Site Photos
<b>Annex A</b>	RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/359
<b>Annex B</b>	Extract of minutes of the RNTPC Meeting held on 20.3.2020
<b>Annex C</b>	Secretary of the Board's letter dated 8.4.2020
<b>Annex D</b>	Letter of 27.4.2020 from the applicants applying for review
<b>Annex E</b>	Supplementary information of 2.7.2020 from the applicants
<b>Annex F</b>	Public comment of the review application relayed from DO/YL, HAD
<b>Annexes G1-G9</b>	Public comments received during statutory publication period of the review application
<b>Annex H</b>	Recommended advisory clauses

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
JULY 2020**

**TPB Paper No. 10664**

**For Consideration by  
the Town Planning Board on 17.7.2020**

**REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/YL-LFS/359  
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Filling and Excavation of Land for Permitted Agricultural Use  
in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 1236 S.B in D.D. 129, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long**