Minutes of 1363rd Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 17.7.2026

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) Ms Doris P.L. Ho	Chairperson
Mr Stephen L.H. Liu	Vice-chairperson
Mr Daniel K.S. Lau	
Mr Ben S.S. Lui	
Mr Timothy K.W. Ma	
Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui	
Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan	
Dr C.M. Cheng	
Mr Daniel K.W. Chung	
Mr Ryan M.K. Ip	
Professor B.S. Tang	
Professor Simon K.L. Wong	
Mr Simon Y.S. Wong	
Mr Eric C.B. Chan	
Professor Janet K.Y. Chan	
Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung	
Dr Chis K.T. Lam	

Dr Kelvin K.Y. Leung

Mr Wilson H.K. Shum

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West)
Transport Department
Ms Vilian W.L. Sum

Chief Engineer (Works)
Home Affairs Department
Mr Bond C.P. Chow

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Gary C.W. Tam

Deputy Director of Lands/General
Ms Jane K.C. Choi

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

Deputy Director of Planning/District Secretary
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Absent with Apologies

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Professor Herbert P.K. Chia

Mr Gary X.Y. Zhang

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang (from 11 a.m. onwards)

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Katy C.W. Fung

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr C.H. Mak

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1362nd Meeting

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1362nd meeting held on 3.7.2026 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plan

2. The Secretary reported that on 7.7.2026, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft Ho Man Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (renumbered as S/K7/26) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the OZP was notified in the Gazette on 10.7.2026.

(ii) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations on Draft Outline Zoning Plan

3. The Secretary reported that the item was to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations in respect of the draft Sai Kung Town Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-SKT/7. The Secretary briefly introduced that on 24.4.2026, the draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. During the 2-month exhibition period, five valid representations were received. In view of the similar nature of the representations, the hearing of the representations was recommended to be considered by the full Town Planning Board (the full Board) collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be

allotted to each representer in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for September 2026.

4. The Board agreed to the hearing arrangement in paragraph 3 above.

(iii) New Town Planning Appeal Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 3 of 2026
Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) in "Green Belt" Zone, Government Land in D.D. 209, Kei Ling Ha San Wai, Sai Kung North
Application No. A/NE-SSH/166

5. The Secretary reported that a Notice of Appeal was received by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) on 8.7.2026 against the decision of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 24.4.2026 to reject on review an application No. A/NE-SSH/166 for a proposed house (New Territories Exempted House – Small House). The application site fell within an area zoned "Green Belt" ("GB") on the approved Shap Sz Heung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-SSH/11.

6. The review application was rejected by the Board for the following reasons:

(a) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the "GB" zone which was 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 was a general presumption against development within this zone. There was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention;

(b) the proposed development did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for 'Application for Development within Green Belt Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance' in that the proposed development would involve extensive clearance of existing natural vegetation; and

(c) the proposed development did not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that there was no general shortage of land in meeting the demand for Small House development in the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone of Kei Ling Ha San Wai. It was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the "V" zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.

7. Members noted that the hearing date of the appeal had yet to be fixed and agreed that the Secretary would act on behalf of the Board in dealing with the appeal in the usual manner.

(iv) Appeal Statistics

8. The Secretary reported that as at 14.7.2026, two cases were yet to be heard by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) and two appeal decisions were outstanding.

9. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	46
Dismissed	181
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	215
Yet to be Heard	2
Decision Outstanding	2
Total	446

Deferral Case

Section 17 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Presentation and Question Session

10. The Town Planning Board (the Board) noted that there was one case requesting the Board to defer consideration of the review application. Details of the request for deferral, Members' declaration of interests for the case and the Board's views on the declared interests were in **Annex**.

Deliberation Session

11. After deliberation, the Board decided to defer a decision on the review application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information, as recommended in the Paper.

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Mai Po and Fairview Park Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-MP/9
(TPB Paper No. 11068)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

12. The Secretary reported that Amendment Items A1 and B1 incorporated in the draft Mai Po and Fairview Park Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-MP/9 were to take forward two agreed section 12A (s.12A) applications No. Y/YL-MP/10 and No. Y/YL-MP/9 at Kam Pok Road and Wo Shang Wai respectively. Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) were the consultants of the applicant for application No. Y/YL-MP/10, while Aurecon Hong Kong Limited (Aurecon) was the consultant of the applicant for application No. Y/YL-MP/9. Representations were submitted by the applicant of application No. Y/YL-MP/10, namely Capital Chance Limited, which was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK) (R1), the applicant of application No. Y/YL-MP/9, namely Profit Point Enterprises Limited, which was a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development

Company Limited (HLD) (R2), and Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation (R5). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	-	owning a property in Mai Po;
Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho	-	having current business dealings with HLD, SHK and AECOM;
Dr Tony C.M. Ip	-	having past business dealings with Arup; and
Mr Ryan M.K. Ip	-	being the vice-president and executive director of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which has received donations from HLD, SHK and the Kadoorie family.

13. Members noted that Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho and Dr Tony C.M. Ip had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had no involvement in the projects in relation to Items A1 and B1 under the sponsorships of HLD, SHK and the Kadoorie family, Members agreed that he could join the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

14. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD), representers and representers' representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo	-	District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (DPO/FSYLE)
Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu	-	Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE)

Ms Jessie S.Y. Lau	- Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East
Ms Jane C.K. Lau	- Assistant Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East

Representers and Representers' Representatives

R1 – Capital Chance Limited	
Mr To Lap Kee	]
Dr Miguel Lau	] Representer's Representatives
Ms Ng Sze Nga, Gladys	]
R2 – Profit Point Enterprises Limited	
Mr Poon Fu Kit, Benson	- Representer's Representative
R3 – Mary Mulvihill	
Ms Mary Mulvihill	- Representer
R4 – Fung Kam Lam	
Mr Fung Kam Lam	- Representer
R5 – Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden	
Mr Nip Hin Ming	- Representer's Representative

15. The Chairperson extended a welcome. She then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representations. The representers and representers' representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers and representers' representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representers and representers' representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to PlanD's representatives or the representers and representers' representatives. After the Q&A session, PlanD's representatives, the

representers and representers' representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (TPB/the Board) would then deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

16. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu, STP/FSYLE, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendment items on the OZP, the grounds/views of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11068 (the Paper). The amendment items included:

(a) Item A1 – rezoning of a site at Kam Pok Road (the Item A1 Site) from "Residential (Group D)" ("R(D)") to "Residential (Group C) 1" ("R(C)1"), subject to maximum domestic and non-domestic plot ratios (PRs) of 1.5 and 0.09 respectively, a maximum building height (BH) of 60 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) and provision of an open space with an area of not less than 2,100m^2 for public use, provision of transport lay-by facilities with gross floor area (GFA) of not less than 2,400m^2 and provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facility as required by the Government;

(b) Item A2 – rezoning of sites to the west of Chuk Yuen Tsuen from "R(D)" to "Village Type Development" ("V") to reflect the existing conditions being mostly within the village 'environs' ('VE') of Chuk Yuen Tsuen and partly occupied by scattered residential structures, and to rationalise the zoning boundary upon rezoning of the Item A1 Site;

(c) Item A3 – rezoning of a site from "R(D)" to "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") to reflect its existing condition being occupied by the Chuk Yuen Stormwater Pumping Station operated by the Drainage Services Department (DSD);

(d) Item B1 – stipulating a maximum BH of 42mPD and incorporating a maximum PR of 1.3 for a site zoned "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area (WRA)" ("OU(CDWRA)")

at Wo Shang Wai (the Item B1 Site) (the WRA in its northern portion already completed). Submission of layout plan to the Board was required;

(e) Item B2 – rezoning of a site from "OU(CDWRA)" to "G/IC" to reflect the existing Mai Po Ventilation Building for the Hong Kong Section of Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link; and

(f) Item B3 – rezoning of a site from "OU(CDWRA)" to "R(C)" to reflect the existing development boundary of a residential development, namely the Royal Palms.

17. The Notes of the OZP had also been amended to reflect the above rezonings, as well as incorporate other amendments to align with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans and other technical amendments, amongst others, allowing provision, maintenance or repair of small unmanned aircraft (SUA) take-off and landing facilities on land falling within the boundaries of the OZP except (a) where the uses or developments are specified in Column 2 of the Notes of individual zones; or (b) as provided in paragraph (9) of the covering Notes in relation to areas zoned "Site of Special Scientific Interest" ("SSSI") or "SSSI(1)" or "Conservation Area" ("CA") or "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Comprehensive Development and Wetland Protection Area" ("OU(CDWPA)") under paragraph 8(b) of the covering Notes.

18. The Chairperson then invited the representers and representers' representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R1 – Capital Chance Limited

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Ng Sze Nga, Gladys, made the following main points:

Item A1

(a) Item A1 was supported as it reflected the s.12A application (No. Y/YL-MP/10) agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Board in July 2025;

(b) being about 700m from the Ngau Tam Mei New Development Area (NTM NDA) located to the east of the Item A1 Site, the proposed development at the Item A1 Site was in line with the Broad Land Use Concept Plan for NTM NDA released in November 2024 and was commensurate with the proposed high-density residential developments (with maximum PRs of 6.5 and 6.8 and maximum BH of 200mPD for residential developments in the NTM NDA located to east of San Tin Highway) on the draft Ngau Tam Mei (NTM) OZP No. S/YL-NTM/15 gazetted in October 2025 and approved in May 2026;

(c) the s.12A application had proposed various merits, including a wind path, building separations, a 50m building setback from the NTM Drainage Channel (NTM DC) with a low-rise neighbourhood activity node comprising commercial floor space, a neighbourhood elderly centre (NEC) and a transport lay-by serving the future residents of the proposed development and the public;

(d) the proposed development was confirmed to be technically feasible, with no objection or adverse comment received from relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) at the s.12A application stage; and

(e) the representer had commenced land exchange procedures as well as the statutory procedures under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance with a view to fulfilling the requirements of relevant government departments.

R2 – Profit Point Enterprises Limited

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Poon Fu Kit, Benson made the following main points:

Item B1

(a) Item B1 was supported as it reflected the s.12A application (No. Y/YL-MP/9) agreed by RNTPC in November 2025;

(b) the Item B1 Site was situated within the 'Innovation and Technology (I&T) Zone' of the Northern Metropolis (NM), and was in line with the overall planning principle of striking a balance between development and conservation;

(c) the proposed development was compatible with the surrounding developments and would provide a quality living environment as a housing option to attract global talents, taking into account the San Tin Technopole (STT) and NTM NDA with high-density developments, and infrastructure such as the Northern Link with a planned intermediate station at NTM and the planned NM Highway, etc.;

(d) design merits and ecological measures had been proposed, including a stepped BH profile under which only three-storey houses would be built within the 50m setback area from the completed WRA in the northern part of the Item B1 Site, a 7.5m-wide planting buffer (including 5m within the residential portion and 2.5m within the WRA), building setbacks, visual corridors, landscaped and recreation areas, and wildlife viewing points to allow bird watching for future residents of the proposed development and their visitors. Besides, a privately-operated residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) would be provided within the proposed development; and

(e) no objection or adverse comment were received from relevant B/Ds on the proposed development at the s.12A application stage.

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu joined the meeting during presentation of R2's representative.]

R4 – Fung Kam Lam

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Fung Kam Lam made the following main points:

Amendment to the Covering Notes regarding SUA Take-off and Landing Facilities

(a) he noted the amendment to add the provision, maintenance or repair of SUA take-off and landing facilities on land falling within the boundaries of the OZP, and opposed the incorporation of the said amendment at the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Wetland Conservation Park" ("OU(WCP)") zone, which was intended for the development of the planned Sam Po Shue Wetland Conservation Park (SPS WCP), but appreciated the exclusion of conservation zones such as "CA" under this amendment;

(b) he clarified that he did not oppose to the use of SUA in general, but opposed its take-off and landing activities in ecologically important areas such as the SPS WCP, especially as the noise generated would have impacts on wild birds and their habitats. The planned SPS WCP and the Ramsar Site in Mai Po containing substantial wetlands were important areas for biodiversity;

(c) although the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) would be the responsible party to oversee the future management of the SPS WCP, it was understood that its implementation would be in phases. There would be no control on the use of SUA and its take-off and landing facilities on private lots in the planned SPS WCP prior to land resumption and implementation of the remaining phase;

(d) under the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C for 'Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance' (TPB PG-No. 12C), there was a requirement to conduct ecological impact assessment for development proposals within the wetland conservation area (WCA) and wetland buffer area. It was unclear whether SUA take-off and landing facilities should also be subject to such requirement;

(e) the Northern Metropolis Development Bill and its subsidiary legislation, which were currently undergoing legislative process, contained provision for streamlining the town planning procedures in non-conservation zones. Under this framework, the "OU(WCP)" zone was regarded as a conservation zoning

to be excluded from the streamlining arrangement. Nevertheless, the amendment to the covering Notes had not accorded the "OU(WCP)" zone the same treatment as other conservation zonings that were covered in the said NM Legislation;

(f) in considering an application within STT by RNTPC in March 2026 concerning a private initiative to carry out pond filling works for permitted I&T facilities, the Transport and Logistics Bureau (TLB) had raised concerns about the potential bird strike hazard in ecologically sensitive areas including the Mai Po Nature Reserve and the planned SPS WCP from the operation of low-altitude flying activities proposed under that development; and

(g) the recent news report regarding the alleged modification of fish ponds showed the fragile state of the ecologically sensitive areas, where existing regulation on private land was insufficient to protect such ecologically sensitive areas. Given the lack of information on the operation of SUA and the scale of the take-off and landing facilities, incorporating SUA-related activities in the covering Notes as an always permitted use including in the "OU(WCP)" zone would have great impacts on birds particularly if there was a larger scale of SUA operation. He considered that planning application for SUA-related facilities should be required in ecologically sensitive areas including the planned SPS WCP.

R5 – Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden

22. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Nip Hin Ming made the following main points:

Item A1

(a) NTM DC was ecologically important as it was frequently used by wild ducks and endangered migratory birds such as the black-faced spoonbill. It was observed that these birds flew at low altitudes between the wetlands in Mai Po and NTM DC to forage. Given its proximity to the wetlands in Mai Po,

NTM DC was in essence an extension of the Deep Bay wetland, providing habitat for these birds; and

(b) the Item A1 Site was not located in proximity to NTM NDA which was separated by San Tin Highway and Castle Peak Road-Tam Mi, but was located near the planned SPS WCP. It was improper to make reference to the development density and height of NTM NDA for the proposed development at the Item A1 Site. The proposed development with buildings of more than 10 storeys at the Item A1 Site, which was near NTM DC, would lead to deterioration of the environment and deter wildlife from visiting and using the ecologically-rich watercourse of NTM DC.

R3 – Mary Mulvihill

23. With the aid of a visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

General

(a) the proposed developments at the Items A1 and B1 Sites, which were large in land area and located near wetland, had not incorporated sponge city measures to respond to climate change;

(b) to support the proposed developments, additional public expenditure would be incurred for road improvements and provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities to meet the needs of residents. The lack of job opportunities in the area would also result in long commuting time for residents;

(c) while BH restrictions had been imposed for the Items A1 and B1 Sites, the developers might submit section 16 (s.16) application for minor relaxation of BH restrictions to relocate the basement carparks proposed under the s.12A applications to aboveground in view of the latest government policy;

(d) she noted that the applicants' representatives of the two s.12A applications No. Y/YL-MP/10 under Item A1 and No. Y/YL-MP/9 under Item B1 had attended the meeting to answer questions from Members;

Item A1

(e) she strongly opposed the proposed development as there was only a NEC provided in the proposed development of the Item A1 Site, and there was no information on the scale of the NEC. The proposed kindergarten was regarded as a form of commercial service, but considering the size of the residential units proposed, there would not be sufficient demand for the proposed kindergarten;

(f) the proposed development was not in line with research carried out by Mainland experts, which concluded that wetland areas close to the coast should be conserved. Being close to the wetland, the applicant proposed a large-scale development with over 2,000 flats in a wetland sensitive area. The previous application No. Y/YL-MP/6 was rejected as the proposed development was not in line with the then TPB PG-No. 12B. Besides, the excavation works would also pose potential flooding risks during inclement weather;

(g) the proposed residential towers would have visual impact when viewed from Ngau Tam Shan as they were out of scale with surrounding developments, resulting in light pollution and disturbance to wildlife. The proposed development should take into account the surrounding low-rise development context instead of that of NM;

(h) with the inclusion of additional land (about 9,000m^2), the area of the Item A1 Site was larger than that of the application site under s.12A application No. Y/YL-MP/10, giving a bonus area for development. The portion of additional government land (GL) included should be reserved for GIC uses to meet the shortfall while the portion of additional private land included should be retained for low-rise developments;

Item A2

(i) she strongly opposed the rezoning of part of the former "R(D)" zone to "V" as it should have been rezoned to "GB" as a buffer zone, given that there were ample undeveloped lands in Chuk Yuen Tsuen to meet the demand for New Territories Exempted Houses;

Item A3

(j) the rezoning of part of the "R(D)" zone to "G/IC" to reflect the as-built Chuk Yuen Stormwater Pumping Station was supported, but a BH restriction should be stipulated as per current practice;

Item B1

(k) she strongly opposed Item B1 as the site was located close to WCA and the drastic increase in parking provision would affect local traffic;

(l) there was inadequate provision of GIC facilities as there was only a small-scale RCHE planned to serve around 10,000 additional residents arising from the proposed development, while there were significant shortfalls in the provision of GIC facilities in the district. Making reference to the GIC table at Annex V of the Paper, GIC facilities such as community care services facilities, RCHE, pre-school rehabilitation services, day rehabilitation services, residential care services, integrated community centre for mental wellness were in shortfall;

Item B2

(m) the rezoning of part of the "OU(CDWRA)" zone to "G/IC" for the Mai Po Ventilation Building was supported, but a BH restriction should be stipulated as per current practice;

Item B3

(n) Item B3 was a housekeeping amendment;

Amendment to the Notes

(o) she strongly opposed the revision to paragraph (8)(b) of the covering Notes to include the provision, maintenance and repair of SUA take-off and landing facilities on land falling within the boundaries of the OZP, as such amendment would allow commercial activities in parks, generating noise pollution and creating hazards. Areas of high ecological value such as wetlands should be protected from intrusion and exploitation. She expressed agreement with the objection raised by R4 as the legislation governing the use of SUA did not address the issues of disturbance and invasion of privacy. There would also be concerns about the impacts of SUA operation on schools; and

(p) she strongly opposed the revision of the Remarks of the Notes on exempting government works from the filling of pond/land or excavation of land clause under "R(D)", "V", "Open Space", "Recreation", "OU(CDWRA)", "OU(CDWPA)", "CA", "SSSI" and "SSSI(1)" as this would allow the Government to carry out such works without going through the statutory planning process. The exemptions should only be restricted to maintenance and repair of existing structures.

[Mr Ryan M.K. Ip joined the meeting during R3's presentation.]
[The meeting was adjourned for a 15-minute break.]

24. As the presentations of PlanD's representative, the representers and representers' representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representers, representers' representatives and/or PlanD's representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board nor for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Items A1 and B1

Area of Item A1

25. Noting R3's query on the discrepancy between the area of the Item A1 Site and that of the application site under s.12A application No. Y/YL-MP/10, two Members enquired about the reason for the discrepancy, and whether the area rezoned to "V" was part of an existing village.

26. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the boundary of the Item A1 Site was determined with reference to the boundary of the application site of s.12A application No. Y/YL-MP/10 with an area of about 6.57 hectares (ha), as well as the boundary of the original "R(D)" zone. In formulating the proposed amendments to take forward the agreed s.12A application No. Y/YL-MP/10, PlanD undertook a review of the original "R(D)" zone and boundary of the s.12A application site and residual areas. Upon review, sections of Kam Pok Road and Ha Chuk Yuen Road originally within the "R(D)" zone were rezoned to "R(C)1" to avoid piecemeal zonings and these areas would not be included in the calculation of PR for the proposed development within the "R(C)1" zone. For the other remaining areas, the existing Chuk Yuen Stormwater Pumping Station and areas mostly falling within the village 'environs' ('VE') of Chuk Yuen Tsuen were rezoned to "G/IC" and "V" respectively, and the areas rezoned to "V" fell within the 'VE' of Chuk Yuen Tsuen and were mainly occupied by existing residential structures.

Impact on NTM DC

27. Noting R5's concern about the impacts of Items A1 and B1 on NTM DC, which had ecological value, and that there were other developments along NTM DC, a Member enquired whether the technical assessments conducted under the two agreed s.12A applications had assessed the cumulative impacts of the various developments on the ecological value of NTM DC.

28. In response, Mr To Lap Kee and Dr Miguel Lau, R1's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

(a) the Item A1 Site was situated in the Deep Bay and Mai Po area, where thousands of migratory birds visited each winter. The area with the highest ecological value was situated around the mudflats and the Ramsar Site in Mai Po where the migratory birds roosted, while the birds would forage around the Northwest New Territories, including NTM NDA and STT;

(b) NTM DC was a man-made watercourse connected to Kam Tin River and Deep Bay. The water level of NTM DC was affected by tidal changes, and birds would forage along the channel depending on its condition;

(c) under s.12A application No. Y/YL-MP/10, a 50m building setback from NTM DC was proposed in the indicative scheme. Within this 50m setback area, a landscape pond with ecological features and a low-rise neighbourhood activity node were proposed to minimise potential disturbance to the ecology at NTM DC; and

(d) a 2-year ecological survey of NTM DC had been conducted under s.12A application No. Y/YL-MP/10 to ascertain the existing ecological conditions within a 500m radius of the application site. According to the findings of the survey, birds would fly along NTM DC and Kam Tin River and forage along the river banks during low tides. It was considered that the proposed building setback from NTM DC, together with existing trees of over 10m in height along Kam Pok Road, would provide adequate buffer for birds along NTM DC. With reference to some international studies, passive human activities would have limited impact on the abundance and use of watercourses by birds. Tin Shui Wai River Channel (TSW RC) with footpath and cycle track along was cited as an example where human activities did not have direct or major impact on birds.

Traffic Impact on Kam Pok Road

29. A Member enquired whether traffic impact assessments (TIAs) conducted for proposed developments along Kam Pok Road had taken into account all other known projects under planning, and whether the Government would consider taking the initiative to implement the various road improvement works proposed under these developments in a holistic manner.

30. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD said that for each of the development proposal seeking approval from the Board, TIA submitted by the respective applicant had taken into account the cumulative impact brought by all the known projects at the time of application, with mitigation measures proposed. Currently, the Government had no improvement plan for Kam Pok Road. Relevant government department(s) would monitor and review the situation if there were additional traffic needs arising from any changes in development circumstances and would coordinate with different parties in the implementation of the related proposed road improvement works.

Flooding Risks at the Item B1 Site

31. A Member enquired about the site formation level and mitigation measures in relation to the proposed development under Item B1 as it was located adjacent to wetland, which might be subject to flooding risks during storm surges associated with typhoons. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that according to the information provided under application No. Y/YL-MP/9, the site formation level of the indicative scheme at the Item B1 Site was 6.8mPD and the relevant assessment conducted by the applicant demonstrated that the site formation level was considered appropriate taking account of the potential flooding risks at that location.

SUA

Supervision of SUA Operation

32. Some Members raised the following questions:

(a) whether there was any regulation on the operation of SUAs, including the minimum safety distance from objects;

(b) which authority had control over the airspace and the locations of take-off and landing facilities for SUA in Hong Kong; and

(c) whether there would be a case where the take-off and landing facilities,

particularly for SUA with weight of 150 kilograms (kg) or more, would be placed along river channels/water bodies, which might cause disturbance, including noise impact, to birds.

33. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

(a) the SUA Order (Cap. 448G), a subsidiary legislation under the Civil Aviation Ordinance, took effect on 1.12.2022. It established a regulatory regime on the use of SUA, which was defined as that with weight not exceeding 150kg. Permission from the Civil Aviation Department (CAD) might be required for SUA operations, depending on the weight of the SUA and the operation risk level. For example, permission from CAD was required for SUA weighing above 7kg and not more than 150kg, and for advanced operations such as cross-boundary operations. Additionally, according to the Safety Requirements Document for SUA issued by CAD (SUA Requirements), SUA pilots operating SUA weighing above 250g had to be certified, and detailed flight logs, including flight paths and flying altitudes, had to be properly maintained. Further, specific minimum lateral separation from uninvolved people/structures/vehicles/vessels was specified for different categories of SUA at different speeds. For instance, a 10m minimum lateral separation was required for SUA weighing up to 7kg operating at a maximum speed of 20km/hr, whereas a 30m minimum lateral separation was required for SUA weighing between 250g and 7kg operating at a maximum speed of 50km/hr;

(b) the airspace was under the control of the Government through CAD. CAD had designated Restricted Flying Zone (RFZ) for SUA operation. According to the SUA Requirements, SUA should avoid flying over or close to densely populated areas, above highways and bridges, etc.; and

(c) SUA take-off and landing facilities were not permitted as of right in the conservation zones within the OZP area. For development zones, if the take-off and landing facilities were of public nature, relevant government department(s) would carefully consider the appropriate location(s), and it

would be very unlikely that such facilities would be placed on GL. For private take-off and landing facilities on private land, SUA operation and its related facilities would have to comply with relevant regulations, the conditions of the Government lease and any other Government requirements.

34. Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, further explained that the amendment to the covering Notes to incorporate the take-off and landing facilities of SUA as an always permitted use was to provide flexibility under the planning regime to enable and promote the use of SUA, not only for economic purposes but also for other purposes such as community service, aligning with the Government's policy to promote the low-altitude economy (LAE). While there were other rules and regulations to control the operation and related facilities of SUAs, the take-off and landing facilities were anticipated to involve landing areas with or without structures and staff to oversee the operation, potentially constituting a land use under the planning regime. In order to facilitate the use of SUA and provide flexibility for its take-off and landing facilities, amendment was made to the covering Notes of the OZP.

35. Noting that the use of SUA would bring benefits to economic development and social service while the operation would also have to be balanced against the impact on the nature and environment, a Member enquired whether the same amendment in respect of SUA take-off and landing facilities had been made to the covering Notes of other OZPs. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD said that it was the general direction to incorporate the same amendment in other OZPs for promotion of LAE, while exceptions for conservation zones would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning (D of Plan), supplemented that the same amendment had already been made to 10 other OZPs so far.

Noise

36. A Member asked whether there was any measurement of the noise level of SUAs during operation. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD said that with reference to general data available to the public, the noise level of a SUA of 7kg in operation was about 45 A-weighted decibels (dB(A)) to 60dB(A), while that for a larger SUA for commercial use was about 70dB(A) to 85dB(A).

37. Mr Gary C.W. Tam, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment) (AD(EA)), Environmental Protection Department (EPD) supplemented that the assessment of noise impact was not solely dependent on the sound power level of the SUA in operation, but also on other factors such as the distance between the noise source and the noise sensitive receiver. EPD had conducted tests with reference to the LAE Regulatory Sandbox projects. Based on the requirement specified by CAD on the minimum safety lateral distance, the preliminary assessment revealed that there would be no adverse noise impact from the operation of SUAs weighing under 150kg.

SUA Operation in Relation to Birds

38. Noting R4's concerns about the impact of the take-off and landing operations of SUAs on birds, and that the development of LAE including the use of SUAs as a logistical tool, particularly to deliver goods such as medications and meals for elderly people residing in remote villages, was seen as an effective means to improve people's well-being, a Member enquired whether Mr Fung Kam Lam (R4) had any suggestions on the rules for operating SUA so that the impact on birds could be minimised.

39. In response, Mr Fung Kam Lam, R4, said that he was not an expert on SUA operation nor bird behaviour. As SUA take-off and landing facilities were a use that was always permitted except in conservation zones, the Board would not have the opportunity under the planning application system to seek information from relevant government departments such as CAD, AFCD and PlanD on the impacts of SUA operations. It should be more appropriate for AFCD's experts to provide information with regard to the Member's enquiry on the impact of the operation of SUA on bird behaviour. Based on experience, changes in environmental conditions arising from SUA operations could alter bird behaviour, while the severity of the impact would depend on the size of the SUA, the noise generated, and the location of SUA operation. If Members considered that an assessment of the impact of SUA operation or the location of SUA facilities was crucial for protecting birds, such use should be subject to planning applications under the planning regime.

40. Noting Mr Fung Kam Lam (R4)'s indication that he was not an expert on bird behaviour, a Member invited Mr Nip Hin Ming, R5's representative, and Dr Miguel Lau, being an ecological expert and R1's representative, to give their views with regard to the operation of

SUA and its impact on birds, in particular at locations/areas of high ecological value such as the Ramsar Site in Mai Po, which were frequently visited by migratory birds and other faunas with high ecological value.

41. Mr Nip Hin Ming, R5's representative, said that being a certified SUA pilot, he considered that the SUA take-off and landing facilities and the associated human disturbance in natural environment from their operation would drive away birds, whereas such operation in villages would unlikely cause a similar issue. Suitable restrictions on flight paths and the extent of the flight zones would be required to minimise the impacts of SUAs on birds and other faunas. As an example, operation of SUAs was prohibited in Long Valley Nature Park under the management of AFCD. He also made a comment that the built environment of TSW RC was different from that of NTM DC in that TSW RC, was a wider watercourse and high-rise buildings only stood on one side of the river channel.

42. Dr Miguel Lau, R1's representative, said that wetlands in Mai Po and around Deep Bay were not areas without human activities. It was observed that helicopters would fly over the Mai Po area, sometimes at low altitudes, causing water birds to disperse and fly away, though they would return to forage once the helicopters had passed. While he noted that AFCD would use SUAs to survey wildlife such as egrets in remote areas, it was important to have proper guidance on SUA operations. With regard to the comment made by R5's representative in respect of TSW RC in his response in paragraph 41 above, Dr Lau said that the high-rise public housing developments along TSW RC were up to 40 storeys tall and were located within about 30m to 40m of the river channel, whereas there was about a 50m setback of building blocks in the proposed development under Item A1 from NTM DC, which provided a spacious flying corridor for birds. It was observed that birds mainly flew along the river channel for foraging, which was the same as that observed at NTM DC.

43. In response to two Members' enquiries, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD said that she had no information at hand on SUA operation in relation to bird behaviour or records of the number of accidents involving collisions between SUAs and birds.

SUA-related Facilities in the SPS WCP

44. A Member asked whether the amendment related to SUA in the covering Notes was to facilitate the use of SUA in wetland areas by AFCD. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD said that the amendment for SUA take-off and landing facilities was applicable to the land within the boundaries of the OZP, except for some conservation zones, and was applicable to all users. Ms Lo further said that for areas within the SPS WCP under the future management of AFCD, appropriate rules and regulations would be established for the use of SUA and the location of take-off and landing facilities. Having said that, AFCD could also utilise SUA for surveys, monitoring and surveillance of areas under its management to investigate possible non-compliant activities. Therefore, it was considered reasonable to allow relevant government departments including AFCD or their authorised parties to set up SUA take-off and landing facilities in the SPS WCP for the abovementioned functions. In fact, SUA operation could be regulated by administrative means at the site management level instead of under the planning regime, citing the Hong Kong Wetland Park as an example.

45. Noting R4's concern mainly on the impact of take-off and landing facilities of SUA, a Member enquired Mr Fung Kam Lam (R4)'s views on the situation where such use was not always permitted under the OZP, in which case SUAs would have to fly longer distances owing to the lack of take-off and landing facilities in the Mai Po area.

46. In response, Mr Fung Kam Lam, R4, said that he did not object to LAE, but the crux of the matter was that there was private land within the boundary of the planned SPS WCP, and resumption of private land for Phase 2 of the planned SPS WCP would not commence for some time. During the interim period before AFCD assumed management of the SPS WCP, SUA take-off and landing activities, along with associated facilities, might occur on private land without prior consultation with or application to CAD. Such activities could potentially be large in scale, raising concerns regarding their potential impact on wildlife, including birds in the planned SPS WCP. SUA operation and related facilities could be considered as ancillary use to the SPS WCP when AFCD assumed its management responsibility in future, if the amendment to the covering Notes was not made. To quote an example, there was news report regarding the illegal pond filling within the area of the planned SPS WCP and the enforcement issue needed to be resolved. As an area intended to be protected for its ecological value as specified under the subsidiary legislation on town planning of the NM Development Bill, there

appeared to be inconsistency between the subsidiary legislation and the subject OZP.

47. In response to the Member's follow-up enquiry, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD said that there was no conflict between the subsidiary legislation on town planning of the NM Development Bill and the statutory planning provision of SUA take-off and landing facilities under the covering Notes of the statutory plans, as the statutory plan prepared under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) was to provide guidance and control on the development and use of land within the planning area of the OZP and the incorporation of SUA take-off and landing facilities in the covering Notes was applied to zones (except conservation zones) covered by the OZP.

48. The Chairperson made the following main points with regard to the NM Legislation and the "OU(WCP)" zone covering the planned SPS WCP:

(a) the provision in the covering Notes to allow landing and take-off facilities for SUA had no conflict with the proposed NM Legislation. One of the key proposals under the NM Legislation was to allow s.16 application for uses not falling under Columns 1 and 2 of the Notes of the non-conservation zones, thereby obviating the need for s.12A application and accelerating the NM development, while s.12A application would still be required for development proposals within area currently under the conservation zones, including the "OU(WCP)" zone covering the planned SPS WCP. The policy thinking was to expedite development in non-conservation zones of NM through streamlined planning procedures (s.16) but for conservation zones, existing planning procedures (s.12A) would still apply;

(b) the planned SPS WCP with a total area of about 340 ha was one of the mitigation measures required to be fulfilled under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance for STT. Phase 1 of the planned SPS WCP involved GL of about 150 ha, and Phase 2 involved private land of about 190 ha. According to the latest plan, major works for Phase 1 of the planned SPS WCP would commence after securing funding approval in end-2026 while works for Phase 2 would commence after the completion of Phase 1, which was targeted for 2031, with land resumption procedures anticipated to start

around 2 years before commencement of works, i.e. around 2029. Upon completion of the SPS WCP, AFCD would take up the park management including specifying and enforcing with regard to the use of SUA in the SPS WCP; and

(c) pending land resumption by Government, there would be several years during which land under Phase 2 remained privately owned. Any use/development that might involve land/pond filling within the planned SPS WCP which was zoned "OU(WCP)" on the OZP would be subject to submission of s.16 application to the Board under the Ordinance. Land enforcement action might be taken should structures be erected on agricultural lots predating land resumption if such structures were not permissible under lease.

49. With regard to any potential unauthorized development, including unauthorized land/pond filling operations purporting to be SUA operation and take-off and landing facilities within the area of the planned SPS WCP, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD explained that filling of land/ponds within the "OU (WCP)" zone required planning permission and enforcement action under the planning regime would be undertaken if unauthorized land/pond filling works were identified within the area. Other building-related legislation and land administrative measures such as land lease could also be used to enforce against unlawful uses or works, as appropriate.

Provision of GIC Facilities

50. Noting R3's concern about the insufficient provision of GIC facilities in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and noting the GIC table at Annex V of the Paper, a Member enquired about the actual shortfall in provision based on the existing population, taking into account the two proposed developments under Items A1 and B1.

51. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD made the following main points:

(a) the assessment on provision of GIC facilities in the GIC table was based on the estimated population of full development of the whole Yuen Long District i.e. about 1,639,000. The planned population included those from Hung Shui Kiu (HSK), Yuen Long South, NTM and STT, which were under different stages of planning and implementation, and full development would take a long period of time. Nevertheless, based on the existing population of Yuen Long District, i.e. about 670,000, shortfalls in some GIC facilities were observed, such as child care centre and integrated family service centre. The provision of GIC facilities was a dynamic process, taking into account policy priorities and resources of relevant government departments;

(b) the population intake in these NDAs would occur in phases over a long period of time. For instance, major population intake for HSK NDA would be from around 2030 to 2038 while that for STT was expected to take place around 2033/2034, with further population intake occurring up to 2041. Within such a long timeframe, relevant government departments would strive to provide adequate GIC facilities to meet the needs of the population;

(c) other than those stated in the GIC table (Appendix V of the Paper), there were other sources of GIC provision that were not reflected therein, including 5% of domestic GFA of planned public housing developments reserved for social welfare facilities, such as those at the planned public housing sites in HSK NDA, Ping Shan, NTM NDA and STT; GIC reserve sites without designated uses in NDAs which could be used to meet the future demand for GIC facilities; GIC facilities provided under newly approved/agreed private development projects such as the RCHE proposed under the agreed s.12A application No. Y/YL-MP/9 (Item B1); and other provisions by the private sector, such as RCHEs and child care centres, which had in practice helped meet the shortfalls in the district; and

(d) PlanD was reviewing the content and format of the GIC table with a view to providing more meaningful information to facilitate better understanding by Members and the public.

52. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. She thanked the representers, representers' representatives and PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The representers and representers' representatives and PlanD's representatives left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

53. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

Items A1 and B1

54. Members generally had no objection to Items A1 and B1. A Member considered that the site formation level of the proposed development under Item B1 was acceptable, and another Member opined that the mitigation measures in respect of ecological and traffic aspects had been incorporated in the indicative schemes of the two s.12A applications. Three Members expressed concerns about the future traffic conditions on Kam Pok Road as there were various large-scale residential developments proposed along the road but no corresponding road improvement works were proposed. While there were road/junction improvement works proposed by the applicants of the proposed developments in the area, the Government should play a leading role in reviewing the overall planning for transport infrastructure and coordinating the works amongst different parties to ensure the timely completion of the road/junction improvement works.

55. Ms Vilian WL Sum, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, Transport Department (TD) said that Kam Pok Road currently carried a light traffic volume, while there were occasionally traffic delays at nearby road junctions, which required improvement works. She explained that in general, traffic congestion would be more related to traffic management issues arising from roadside activities, e.g. illegal roadside parking and ingress/egress arrangements. The regional transport infrastructure would be further improved with the implementation of different sections of NM Highway, which would improve traffic conditions on San Tin Highway, as well as on the local road network. TD would coordinate the proposed road/junction improvement works to be carried out by different parties.

56. Mr C.K. Yip, D of Plan, supplemented that the traffic concerns raised by some Members had previously been discussed at the RNTPC meeting on 10.7.2026 when considering s.12A application No. Y/YL-MP/11 at Kam Pok Road as there were various agreed rezoning applications along Kam Pok Road in the Mai Po area, including those under Items A1 and B1. Relevant government departments, including TD and the Civil Engineering and Development Department, would review the traffic conditions in the area comprehensively under the land use review for Au Tau New Development Area (AT NDA) and would follow up on the recommendations of the land use review.

57. The Chairperson said that MTR Corporation Limited was currently undertaking the land use review for AT NDA, which was located to the southeast of the Items A1 and B1 Sites, and the infrastructure capacity of the surrounding road network, including the area near Fairview Park Interchange where the Items A1 and B1 Sites were located, would be assessed. Upon completion of the said land use review in end-2026, the NM Coordination Office and TLB, together with TD, would review the findings of the land use review, including the proposed traffic improvement measures, and decide on the implementation of the required road/junction improvement works in coordination with the parties concerned.

58. A Member suggested that the Government could explore the use of AI-based modelling to present dynamic simulations of projected situations, e.g. air ventilation and visual impacts, to facilitate understanding of the impacts of the proposed developments.

SUA Take-off and Landing Facilities

59. Majority of the Members had no objection to the amendment to the covering Notes of the OZP to incorporate SUA take-off and landing facilities as an always permitted use, except specified under Column 2 of the Notes of individual zones and in conservation zones. Some Members considered that CAD was the key government department responsible for overseeing and monitoring the safe operation of SUAs, and that CAD could liaise with AFCD to consider whether any restrictions should be imposed on SUA operations and the setting up related facilities in ecologically sensitive areas, including the planned SPS WCP. The amendment provided flexibility to enable the use of SUA, including for conservation purposes and for the promotion of LAE. Some Members had the following comments and suggestions:

(a) there was concern as to whether it was necessary to include the SUA take-off and landing facilities as a use under the planning regime, given that in general SUA and associated facilities were small in scale or could be regarded as ancillary use. Such facilities were in fact essential infrastructure;

(b) while promotion of LAE was supported, a cautious approach, e.g. putting the use under Column 2 of the Notes of the "OU(WCP)" zone for the planned SPS WCP, might be more appropriate due to the ecological value of the Mai Po area and the planned SPS WCP and its importance to birds. Consideration would also be given as to whether the size and dimensions of the SUA take-off and landing facilities should be defined for clarity;

(c) while there were guidelines on the use of SUA, there was concern regarding the enforcement of controls against improper use of SUA in ecologically sensitive areas;

(d) it was the responsibility of the Board to protect conservation areas such as the SPS WCP and endangered species such as black-faced spoonbill, which was one of the migratory birds found in Mai Po Nature Reserve as well as nearby ecologically sensitive areas, and a cautious approach to SUA operation and its related facilities should be adopted for nature conservation purpose and to avoid collision incidents. Such cautious approach should also be adopted when considering eco-tourism initiatives. Consideration should be given to specifying restrictions on the use of SUA and its related facilities to avoid adverse impacts on the ecologically sensitive areas;

(e) for similar amendment to OZPs in future, there should be review and special consideration with respect to areas intended for conservation, taking into account public perception, and a more robust response to public concerns on the possible ecological impact of the amendment as well as on the monitoring and enforcement aspects should be prepared;

(f) while the safety control of SUA operations would rest with CAD to oversee and for approval, AFCD should liaise with CAD on the control of SUA operations within conservation areas including the SPS WCP;

(g) other than delivering food, there were various functions of SUA, including conducting surveys and investigating suspected illegal activities in conservation areas. Based on information available in the public domain, SUA weighing up to 150kg was considered mid-sized and could be used for protective works associated with agricultural activities and inspection of power lines, etc.; and

(h) the impact on the planned SPS WCP prior to land resumption by the Government for its Phase 2 development was of concern, and it would be more desirable if CAD had been invited to attend the meeting to provide the related information. CAD should review whether some areas having high ecological value should be designated as RFZ.

60. Regarding the need to specify the take-off and landing facilities of SUA as a land use under the planning regime, Mr C.K. Yip, D of Plan, said that under certain scenarios, SUA and related facilities could be regarded as ancillary use such as the facilities in commercial buildings to serve the needs of the occupiers of the buildings. Nevertheless, if such facilities were standalone and not ancillary to any main use, such as setting up standalone SUA take-off and land facilities in the SPS WCP, which were not directly related to but might assist the operation of the WCP, the facilities could not be considered as ancillary use. The scale of the facilities was not expected to be large, and the amendment provided flexibility for setting up such facilities within the planning area of the OZP.

61. The Secretary supplemented that as in a case in Tai Po, residents of a rural village at remote location were benefitted from the delivery of food, medications and daily supplies by SUA from the Hong Kong Science and Technology Park, with the take-off and landing facility being a standalone facility located on vacant land within the village. The incorporation of such use in the covering Notes would provide flexibility for the establishment of these facilities that would benefit the residents.

62. Regarding the control on the operation of SUA by CAD, Mr Gary C.W. Tam, AD(EA), EPD said that for SUAs weighing between 7kg and 150kg, prior permission from CAD on the flight details, including flight path, geofencing boundary, speed and altitude, etc., was required.

[Ms Vilian WL Sum left the meeting at this point.]

63. In view of Members' views and concerns related to the SPS WCP, the Chairperson made the following main points:

(a) the amendment to add SUA take-off and landing facilities as a use that was always permitted under the covering Notes was applicable to the whole OZP, including the SPS WCP, while conservation zones such as "CA", "SSSI", "SSSI(1)" and "OU(CDWPA)" zones covering areas including Mai Po Nature Reserve and Lut Chau were excluded from this provision;

(b) noting that CAD had regulations on the use of SUA and AFCD would eventually take over the management of the planned SPS WCP, future control of SUA operations within the planned SPS WCP should be handled by AFCD. Taking Long Valley Nature Park as an example, the restriction on SUA use over the park was an administrative measure of AFCD being the manager of the park, even though the park was not designated as an RFZ under CAD's authority. Once AFCD took over the management responsibilities of the SPS WCP, similar restrictions could be set out and suitable location(s) of SUA take-off and landing facilities would be identified carefully, taking into account the ecologically sensitive locations within the SPS WCP. The planning intention of the SPS WCP was to conserve the wetlands. The SUA take-off and landing facilities permitted within the park were not to promote LAE, but could facilitate the use of SUA to conduct survey/research/investigation of illegal activities for conservation purpose. Unlike the conservation areas that were zoned "CA", "SSSI", "SSSI(1)" or "OU(CDWPA)", the SPS WCP would be a unique area where some human activities would be allowed as there would be areas open to the public for eco-educational purpose, and other areas would be used for value-added fisheries

enhancement, while some areas would not be open to the public for conservation reasons;

(c) regarding the concern on the lack of control on the use/operation of SUA and the associated facilities before resumption of private land within the planned SPS WCP, enforcement against unauthorised development or non-compliant activities could be undertaken under relevant planning and land regimes; and

(d) to address Members' concerns, the ES of the OZP with respect to the "OU(WCP)" zone could be amended to incorporate Members' views and suggestions raised at the meeting, including stating that the allowance of the provision, maintenance or repair of SUA take-off and landing facilities under the covering Notes was mainly to allow AFCD to enhance its enforcement and management of the SPS WCP in future. AFCD should carefully oversee the use of SUA including identifying appropriate locations for SUA facilities, taking into account ecological considerations, to minimise disturbance to the ecology. Further, it was suggested that CAD and AFCD should work together to review whether there were areas where the use of SUAs should be restricted, thereby providing a clearer framework to the public and government departments. In that regard, PlanD would convey the above message to relevant government departments including CAD and AFCD.

Conclusion

64. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported the OZP amendments and agreed that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representations. All grounds of the representations had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper as well as the presentations and responses made by government representatives at the meeting. The Chairperson remarked that Members' views and concerns on the possible impact of SUA operations on the ecology of the SPS WCP were noted, and the ES of the OZP with respect to the "OU(WCP)" zone covering the SPS WCP would be amended as stated in paragraph 63(d) above.

65. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1**, **R2** and **R3 (part)** and the views of **R1** and **R2**, and decided not to uphold **R3 (part)**, **R4** and **R5** and agreed that the draft Mai Po and Fairview Park Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

"Items A1 and B1

(a) Item A is to take forward the agreed section 12A (s.12A) application (No. Y/YL-MP/10) for proposed residential development with commercial use, transport lay-by, government, institution and community facilities and an open space for public use at the site. Various technical assessments have been conducted by the applicant to ascertain that the proposed development with the proposed mitigation and design measures implemented will be acceptable from, amongst others, visual, ecological and drainage perspectives as concerned. Relevant development restrictions and requirements as well as mitigation and design measures have been suitably incorporated in the Notes and/or the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP for the "Residential (Group C) 1" zone. Relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed development at the site and the subsequent amendments under Item A1. In view of the above, the amendment is considered appropriate (**R3** and **R5**);

(b) Item B1 is to take forward the agreed s.12A application (No. Y/YL-MP/9) for proposed residential development with a residential care home for the elderly and a wetland restoration area. Various technical assessments have been conducted by the applicant to ascertain that the proposed development with the mitigation and design measures implemented will be acceptable from, amongst others, traffic and ecological perspectives as concerned. The relevant development restrictions and requirements as well as mitigation and design measures have been suitably stipulated in the Notes and/or ES of the OZP for the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area" zone. Besides, planning permission from the Board to be sought in the form of a comprehensive development scheme to include a layout plan with supporting documents, including technical

assessments, is also required for the proposed development at the Item B1 Site as detailed in the Remarks of the Notes. Relevant B/Ds had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed development at the site and the subsequent amendments under Item B1. In view of the above, the amendment is considered appropriate (**R3** and **R5**);

Item A2

(c) the rezoning of the sites to "Village Type Development" is intended to rationalise the zoning of these sites, taking into account their existing development conditions and surrounding context, and is considered appropriate (**R3**);

Amendment to the Notes (b)

(d) the amendment to the covering Notes is to facilitate the provision, maintenance or repair of small unmanned aircrafts (SUA) take-off and landing facilities which complements the Government's policy to foster the development of low-altitude economy. The operation of the SUA and provision, maintenance or repair of SUA take-off and landing facilities will be regulated and governed by relevant legislative or regulatory requirements and/or guidelines, as may be applicable (**R3** and **R4**); and

Amendment to the Notes (h)

(e) the incorporation of an exemption clause to exempt filling of land/pond or excavation of land pertaining to public works coordinated or implemented by the Government from the requirement for planning application is in line with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans promulgated by the Board and facilitates streamlining of the planning application process. The exemption clause is only applicable to public works and minor works in which no major adverse impacts are anticipated. If a use requires planning permission from the Board in terms of the Notes of the OZP (i.e. a Column 2 use), the use itself still requires planning permission and the associated filling of

land/pond or excavation of land where applicable would also form part of the proposal. Planning permission for filling of land/pond or excavation of land is still required for a permitted use/development (i.e. a Column 1 use or a use specified in the covering Notes), if the works are not exempted under the Remarks of the Notes of the OZP for the zone. Statutory control over developments in respective zones including conservation-related zonings would not be undermined (**R3**)."

66. The Board also agreed that the draft OZP, together with its Notes and updated ES subject to incorporation of Members' views in paragraph 63(d) above, was suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

[Post-meeting note: To reflect Members' views and address the concern regarding allowing flexibility for the provision, maintenance or repair of SUA take-off and landing facilities at the SPS WCP, paragraph 9.9.19 of the ES of the OZP was amended by adding the following information:

"***9.9.19 …… To safeguard the environment and ecological value of the "OU(WCP)" zone, the Government will explore administrative and/or regulatory control mechanism at the "OU(WCP)" zone over the operations of small unmanned aircraft (SUA) and the location and scale of the associated take-off and landing facilities to mitigate the potential ecological disturbance, if any. The Government will explore utilising SUA operations and the associated take-off and landing facilities for surveys, real-time monitoring and evidence collection against illegal or non-compliant activities in support of law enforcement as well as facilitating the operation and management of the SPS WCP. Any proposal for SUA take-off and landing facilities within the "OU(WCP)" zone will be carefully considered, ensuring that their locations are prudently sited to avoid potential impact on the environment within the "OU(WCP)" zone and its vicinity."***]

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

67. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:45 p.m.

Annex

Minutes of 1363rd Meeting of the Town Planning Board
(held on 17.7.2026)

Deferral Case

Request for Deferment of Review Application by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
4	A/K1/273	1st

Declaration of Interests

The Board noted the following declaration of interests:

Item No.	Members' Declared Interests	
4	The application was submitted by Hong Kong Island Development Limited, which was a subsidiary of New World Development Company Limited (NWD), and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) was the consultant of the applicant	- Dr Tony C.M. Ip for having past business dealings with Arup - Mr Ryan M.K. Ip for being the vice-president and executive director of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had received donations from New World Group/Chow Tai Fook Group - Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung for having current business dealings with New World Group

Members noted that Dr Tony C.M. Ip had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had not joined the meeting yet. As the interest of Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung was considered direct, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion of the item.

** Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/TPB/Agenda/1363_tpb_agenda.html for details of the planning application.*