

**Minutes of 1366th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 18.9.2026**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Doris P.L. Ho

Chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Mr Eric C.B. Chan

Professor Janet K.Y. Chan

Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung

Dr Chris K.T. Lam

Mr Wilson H.K. Shum

Mr Gary X.Y. Zhang

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East)
Transport Department
Mr K.L. Wong

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

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

Director of Lands
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Dr C.M. Cheng

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Professor Herbert P.K. Chia

Dr Kelvin K.Y. Leung

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

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

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Edward H.C. Leung

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1365th Meeting

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1365th meeting held on 4.9.2026 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plan

2. The Secretary reported that on 8.9.2026, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (renumbered as S/K10/32) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the OZP was notified in the Gazette on 18.9.2026.

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong and Mr Derrick S.M. Yip joined the meeting at this point.]

General

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to Town Planning Board Guidance Notes and Town Planning Board Guidelines for Submission of Planning Applications, Representations and Related Procedures (TPB Paper No. 11074)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

3. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting:

Mr K.K. Lee	- Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board (CTP/TPB)
Ms Tracy C.Y. Wong	- Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board (STP/TPB)

4. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on TPB Paper No. 11074 (the Paper). Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, said that the Paper was to seek Members' agreement to the proposed amendments to five Town Planning Board (TPB/the Board) Guidance Notes (GN) and two TPB Guidelines for the purposes of streamlining the requirements on submission of technical assessments for planning applications, stipulating requirements on the use of artificial intelligence (AI)-generated images/videos in planning submissions, and updating the probity requirements in the GN to remind the applicants' authorised agents that they were also subject to the same probity requirements as the applicants. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Tracy C.Y. Wong, STP/TPB, briefed Members on the background, and the proposed amendments to the following TPB GN and Guidelines, as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) GN on Application for Amendment of Plan under Section 12A of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) (s.12A GN);
- (b) GN on Application for Permission under Section 16 of the Ordinance (s.16

GN);

- (c) GN on Application for Amendment to Permission under Section 16A(2) of the Ordinance (s.16A(2) GN);
- (d) GN on Electronic Submission for Applications for Amendment of Plan, Permission, Amendment to Permission and Review under Sections 12A, 16, 16A(2) and 17 of the Ordinance Respectively and the Submission of Further Information (GN on Electronic Planning Application Submission System (EPASS));
- (e) GN on Attending the Meeting for Consideration of Representations under the Ordinance (GN on Representation Hearing);
- (f) TPB Guidelines on Submission and Processing of Representations and Further Representations under the Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 29C); and
- (g) TPB Guidelines on Publication of Applications for Planning Permission and Review and Submission of Comments on Applications under the Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 30C).

5. As the presentation of PlanD's representatives had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members.

Proposed Streamlining Requirements of Technical Assessments in Planning Applications

6. A Member indicated support for the proposed amendments on streamlining, which aimed to streamline the requirements for submission of technical assessments in respect of s.12A applications, thereby saving the applicants' time and resources during the development process. The Member considered that this was particularly beneficial for cases involving sites of small or medium size that were not located adjacent to major highways or roads and had nil or negligible impacts.

7. In response to a Member's enquiry as to whether the Secretariat or the applicant was

responsible for determining which technical assessments should be submitted to support a planning application, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) applicants could refer to Annex B of the s.16 GN (Attachment II of the Paper), which was recommended to be applicable to s.12A applications as the requirements for technical assessments were generally similar for the two types of applications. In fact, the requirements and guidelines for submission of technical assessments in the original s.12A GN and s.16 GN were identical. Annex B of the s.16 GN specified the types of proposed developments/uses for which the submission of certain technical assessments would or would not be required. The requirements and scope of technical assessments varied according to the nature of developments/uses concerned. For example, a traffic impact assessment (TIA) was not required for application for minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction without change in plot ratio (PR)/gross floor area (GFA), or small-scale development/premises-based use;
- (b) for complicated cases, applicants could make pre-application enquiries/submissions to PlanD before submitting formal applications to the Board. PlanD would seek comments from relevant government bureaux and departments (B/Ds), and their comments/requirements would be conveyed to the applicants for preparation of formal application submissions; and
- (c) while PlanD would process planning applications that had met the statutory provisions and requirements, the applications would be circulated to relevant B/Ds for comment. The applicants would be informed of any necessary information/technical assessment(s) as required by B/Ds. They could then submit the required information/technical assessment(s) as further information to supplement the applications, or request the Board to defer decisions on the applications should more time be needed to prepare the information or conduct the technical assessment(s).

8. With the aid of a visualiser, the Secretary supplemented the following main points:

- (a) in view of the ongoing effectiveness of streamlining efforts achieved from s.16 applications since January 2026 and the positive feedback from relevant stakeholders and applicants, it was proposed to extend the same set of streamlined requirements to s.12A applications;
- (b) relevant B/Ds had been consulted on the types and scope/level of details of technical assessments required to support applications for different developments/uses, which were tabulated in Annex B of the s.16 GN. For example, an environmental assessment was not required for application for small-scale and/or premises-based retail shop and eating place as advised by the Environmental Protection Department. For developments/uses that might cause environmental nuisance to the surrounding areas, an environmental review or an environmental impact assessment might be required. Examples were provided in the said Annex;
- (c) the applicants could make pre-application enquiries/submissions to PlanD, which would be circulated to relevant B/Ds, and their comments/requirements would be conveyed to the applicants for follow-up; and
- (d) upon receipt of the planning applications, PlanD would circulate the applications to relevant B/Ds for comment, and their comments would be conveyed to the applicants.

9. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) details of the management plan to be submitted by applicants (i.e. Item 16 of Annex D of the proposed revised s.12A GN and s.16 GN, and Item 16 of Annex B of the proposed revised GN on EPASS);
- (b) noting the strong objections to data centre development in some foreign countries (such as the United States of America) and the expected increase in applications for such development in view of the implementation of university towns in the Northern Metropolis with potentially high demand for computational power, whether there was any requirement for the submission

of technical assessment on power supply for data centre development; and

- (c) for applications for minor relaxation of development restrictions stipulated on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), noting that the term “minor relaxation” might not be defined in quantitative terms, whether specific criteria could be established for the submission of technical assessments based on the magnitude of relaxation, so that the applicants could take these criteria into account when determining the extent of relaxation to be sought; and whether more examples/guidelines could be provided to help applicants avoid making multiple rounds of pre-application enquiries/submissions, thereby expediting the development process.

10. In response, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of a visualiser, made the following main points:

- (a) management plans might refer to those related to traffic management of brownfield sites/vehicle parks or operation of columbarium developments, which were monitored by the Transport Department and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department respectively. No specific requirements were stipulated in the relevant GN for management plans, as they might already be included in relevant technical assessment(s) or were not typical documents required to support planning applications. That said, applicants could liaise with relevant government departments regarding their requirements on management plans, as appropriate;
- (b) technical assessment on power supply was also not common. When planning applications such as those for data centre developments were received, they would be circulated to relevant B/Ds, such as the Civil Engineering and Development Department and the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, for comment from infrastructure perspective. If the proposal would have significant impact on infrastructure, including power supply, the applicant would be required to submit relevant technical assessments to support the planning application. Each application would be considered on a case-by-case basis in determining the requirements for

infrastructure assessments; and

- (c) while relevant B/Ds had been consulted on the requirements and scope/level of details of technical assessments for different developments/uses, there might not be a clear-cut line as to the type(s) of technical assessment that should be submitted to support applications for minor relaxation of development restrictions. That said, for applications involving relaxation of PR/GFA restrictions, technical assessments were required to demonstrate that the proposed development with minor relaxation in PR/GFA would not be susceptible to or cause adverse traffic, drainage and sewerage impacts on the surrounding areas. For applications involving minor relaxation of BH restriction only, with the proposed PR/GFA within the statutory limit specified on the OZP, there was no need to submit technical assessments on traffic, drainage and sewerage aspects. A visual impact assessment (VIA)/visual appraisal to demonstrate that there would be no adverse visual impact caused by the proposal would suffice, depending on the extent of the relaxation. That said, each case would be considered on a case-by-case basis, and it was difficult for relevant B/Ds to provide a clear-cut line in that regard. Applicants were encouraged to make pre-application submissions and closely liaise with relevant B/Ds regarding their requirements on the submission of technical assessments, as and when necessary. In principle, technical assessments should be submitted only when they were essential for demonstrating the technical feasibility of the proposed development(s)/use(s) in a planning application.

Proposed Requirements on Use of Generative AI in Planning Submissions

11. A Member said that in the 2026 Policy Address and the First Five-Year Plan for Economic and Social Development of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (2026-2030), the Chief Executive placed considerable emphasis on the application of AI. This clearly indicated that the global trend towards the wider application of AI was continuing to gather momentum, and the Board should embrace, accept and welcome it rather than resist it. The use of AI to visually express impact of a development proposal should be permitted, as a total ban would run counter to current technological advancement. In view of the increasing

adoption of AI, appropriate regulatory guidelines should be established. The inability of the human eye to distinguish between AI and non-AI-generated images and/or videos was a concern. While Members should be capable of exercising judgement when considering development proposals supported by AI-generated images and/or videos, which ought to be accorded appropriate weighting during the Board's consideration, such visual materials, if misleading and inaccurate, could create a false public impression of the future conditions upon implementation of the proposals, thereby potentially giving rise to misunderstanding of, or unwarranted public concern about, the basis and merits of the Board's decisions. To address the concern, it was suggested that a template for AI-generated images and videos could be prepared for adoption by applicants and representers. This would explicitly notify the public that the concerned visual materials were AI-generated and might not accurately reflect the actual or projected conditions, while also facilitating the Board's operational efficiency in considering the cases.

12. In response to the Member's suggestion, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that under the currently proposed amendments to the relevant TPB GN and Guidelines, the source of any image or video submitted or presented to the Board, including the date and location at which the image or video was taken, should be specified. It was expected that an appropriate labelling disclaimer could at least be provided to indicate any image and/or video that was generated by AI tools as the first step. Detailed administrative arrangements could be formulated after the new requirements were implemented for a period of time, drawing on the experience gained and, where necessary, developing more comprehensive requirements as the next step.

13. The Secretary supplemented the following main points:

- (a) according to the proposed amendments to the relevant TPB GN and Guidelines, the applicants/commenters on applications/representers/further representers were required to clearly specify whether the image and/or video submitted or presented to the Board was generated by AI tools. Any further requirements/specifications could be reviewed in future, as appropriate; and
- (b) under the current practice, for photomontages in a VIA submitted by the applicant, the location, angle and timing of taking the site photos should be

specified. Nevertheless, there were no detailed requirements on how to present the above information and where to present such information in the submission. Officers of PlanD responsible for handling the case would liaise with the applicant if such information was missing or not clearly stated in the submission. A similar arrangement could be adopted for AI-generated images and/or videos. Consideration could also be given to preparing a template for applicants and representers if AI-generated images or videos were used in written submissions or oral presentations, taking into account the amount of effort involved and the difficulties they might encounter in using such a template.

14. Another Member pointed out that in a recent representation hearing meeting, some of the representers used AI-generated images in oral presentation, which exaggerated the projected impacts or other situations, which might influence the Board's decision. It was problematic to rely on such images as Members might be misled when making decisions under such circumstances. The Member was concerned about whether the currently proposed amendments could address the above scenario. It was suggested that applicants and representers should be required to make a formal declaration stating that the AI-generated images merely represented one possible future situation. In response, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, said that for each discussion item at TPB/PC meeting, a paper would be prepared by PlanD, incorporating comments from relevant B/Ds and planning assessments, for consideration by the Board. Relevant layout plans, site photos and other visual materials submitted by applicants would be extracted and attached as drawings to the paper for Members' reference. Any submitted visual materials deemed to exaggerate the projected impacts or other situations would not be attached as drawings to the paper, or a remark might be added to the paper in that regard, thereby facilitating Members in assessing the credibility and accuracy of such visual materials. Under the current proposal, the concerned parties were required to make a declaration when presenting AI-generated images or videos in written submissions/at meetings.

15. A Member sought clarification on whether visual materials that exaggerated the projected impacts or other situations would be withheld from the Board's consideration. There was a concern that doing so could render the Board's decision susceptible to legal challenge on the basis that the Board had failed to take into account all the materials submitted by the applicant before making a decision on the case. In response, the Secretary said that

taking planning application as an example, under established practice, relevant floor plans, section plans and photomontages, submitted by the applicant would be attached to the paper as drawings for Members' easy reference. Nevertheless, any misleading materials might not be selected for attachment to the paper as drawings. That said, all materials submitted under the application would be appended to the paper for the Board's consideration and made available for public inspection. Comments from the Urban Design and Landscape (UD&L) Section of PlanD on the visual materials submitted by the applicant, such as photomontages, would also be included in the paper, including an assessment of the accuracy and acceptability of the submissions.

16. A Member expressed that when making a decision, Members would take into account the information in the paper and the presentation materials used by the applicants/representers during the oral presentations. The paper also included comments from relevant B/Ds and the applicants'/representers' written submissions. Government professionals from various disciplines should have scrutinised the technical reports submitted by the applicants to ensure their accuracy and factual correctness, and the applicants/representers should have declared the authenticity of their written submissions. In view of the growing prevalence of AI use, detecting AI-generated content posed a significant challenge at the current juncture. To ensure the ethical and responsible use of AI, some Members suggested that applicants/representers should clearly specify whenever images or videos were generated by AI tools, and should submit a formal declaration on the use of AI at the time of submission of the applications, which could serve as a viable interim solution. In that regard, the general declaration could be amended to incorporate a clause on the use of AI in both written submissions and oral presentations. It should be emphasised that making a false declaration would constitute a criminal offence. Applicants and representers should be made fully aware of the consequences of delivering misleading presentations or making false declarations. In response, the Secretary said that in view of the upcoming enactment of the Northern Metropolis Development Ordinance, amendments to the application forms would be required. It might be worth exploring whether to take this opportunity to simultaneously revise the general declaration regarding the use of AI-generated images and/or videos in written submissions and oral presentations at TPB/Planning Committee (PC) meetings, as appropriate.

17. A Member expressed appreciation that the Secretariat submitted the proposed amendments to the relevant TPB GN and Guidelines in relation to AI-generated images and/or

videos to address Members' previously raised concerns within a short period of time. In response to the Member's suggestion of using AI tools to determine whether the submitted images and/or videos were AI-generated, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) photomontages were common visual materials showing both the existing views and future views with a proposed development implemented. The methodology for preparing photomontages was detailed in TPB Guidelines No. 41A on Submissions of VIA for Planning Applications to the Board. The UD&L Section of PlanD was responsible for verifying the accuracy of the photomontages;
- (b) with regard to AI-generated images illustrating the visual impact of a proposed development, PlanD could employ technology and methodology similar to those used for photomontages to verify the accuracy of the images; and
- (c) some AI-generated images were produced without a solid raw data basis, such as those used by the representers at the hearing meeting on the draft Tsuen Wan OZP in June 2026, which might exaggerate the potential impacts (such as flooding) caused by the proposed development on the surrounding areas, and the accuracy of such images was therefore doubtful.

18. The Secretary supplemented the following main points:

- (a) colleagues of PlanD had extensive experience in verifying the accuracy of photomontages and renderings under planning submissions. Any significant deviation from reality or modification of the images could be identified;
- (b) the Secretariat could explore the possibility of using AI to verify whether the concerned image or video was generated by AI tools. Colleagues of PlanD in the Information Technology Section might assist in verifying the authenticity of any suspected AI-generated images, if necessary;

- (c) according to the currently proposed amendments to the relevant TPB GN and Guidelines, the applicants/commenters on applications/representers/further representers were required to specify the source of any image and video submitted or presented to the Board, including the date and location at which the image or video was taken;
- (d) when submitting a planning application, the applicant was required to make a declaration that the particulars given in the application were correct and true to the best of the applicant's knowledge and belief. Making a false declaration would constitute an offence; and
- (e) Members could exercise their judgement as to whether the images and/or videos submitted or presented to the Board truly reflected the reality, the projected impacts or other situations.

19. In response to a Member's suggestion that the Secretariat should review the presentation materials of the applicants and the representers prior to TPB/PC meetings as such materials might give a misleading impression to the public regarding the concerned development proposal during the live broadcast of the meeting, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of a visualiser, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the current practice, there was no such administrative arrangement for the prior vetting of applicants' or representers' presentation materials at TPB/PC meetings; and
- (b) with the new requirements, if an applicant or representer failed to provide an appropriate disclaimer or specification on the use of AI-generated image or video, the Chairperson could request the concerned party to discontinue the presentation of such image or video under the proposed revised TPB GN. Members could exercise their judgement in that regard before making a decision on the case.

20. A Member said that in addition to images and videos, the content of technical assessments, such as TIA, could be generated by AI tools. In some countries, guidelines had

been established specifying that the content of TIA reports should not be produced or assisted by AI tools unless a comprehensive site survey had been conducted for the assessment. It was suggested that the above consideration should be incorporated when elaborating on the general declaration. Another Member raised concerns about the declaration of AI tool usage for the text of submissions, noting that it was common practice for individuals to employ AI to correct grammatical mistakes or refine written content. Applicants should bear the responsibility for the accuracy of such submissions, and therefore a declaration in that regard was deemed unnecessary. On this issue, the Board noted that the amendments to the TPB GN and Guidelines were proposed with reference to the Hong Kong Generative AI Technical and Application Guideline issued by the Government, which encompassed text, image, audio and video generation. The proposed amendments excluded text generation by AI tools in technical assessments because such assessments were subject to scrutiny by the relevant government departments. A Member highlighted that the primary concern pertained to the reliability of technical assessments rather than the text itself, and it was agreed that such reports should be reviewed by professionals in the Government. That said, the general declaration could be revised to ensure that no misleading materials were submitted to the Board. The Chairperson remarked that technical assessments such as TIA should involve on-site traffic counts and mathematical calculations of traffic flow to assess the traffic impact of a proposed development on road junctions. It was acknowledged that the use of AI tools to polish the text of technical assessment reports was common. The proposed amendments to the TPB GN and TPB Guidelines focused specifically on the use of AI-generated images and videos.

21. Some Members had expressed the following comments/views:

- (a) technical assessment reports (such as those adopting the fire engineering approach with the use of Computational Fluid Dynamics for smoke extraction systems in buildings) had been consistently relied upon to ascertain the technical feasibility and engineering integrity of development proposals. Technical assessments related to once-in-a-century rainstorms and flooding, as well as air ventilation and wind tunnel studies, had all been generated through computer modelling based on established parameters. While conventional expert reports might incur substantial costs, the emergence of AI offered a valuable tool for addressing technical issues. The current issue concerned the accuracy and acceptability of adopting AI in the

applicant's/representer's submission. Given that conventional expert evaluations were already computer-based, technical assessments adopting AI might also be considered acceptable;

- (b) traditional computer modelling method for technical assessments might lack realism, while the use of AI was a general trend. Any technical assessments/submitted materials should be evaluated by reviewing the underlying raw data rather than merely relying on visual images;
- (c) the application of AI to simulate proposed developments or buildings or future environmental conditions might yield results that were closer to reality than those produced by photomontages. Given the widespread adoption of AI in video editing and the production of simple visual effects, the primary concern was whether the content was misleading. It was foreseeable that all images and videos would likely be generated by AI tools in future. It was of paramount importance that Members exercised their independent judgment and questioned the applicants/representers to identify any misrepresentations. Members might question the underlying basis of any images or videos that appeared to exaggerate the projected impacts or other situations at the meeting. This line of questioning would clarify for both Members and the public whether the presented visual materials constituted a distorted representation of future conditions; and
- (d) photomontages using site photos offered distinct advantages for illustrating proposed developments or buildings and could not be entirely replaced by AI-generated images, as site photos were relatively difficult to modify and served as a reliable background for illustrating the visual impacts such as those on the ridgeline.

Proposed Updating on the Probity Requirements for Submission of Planning Applications

22. Given that Members worked in different sectors with diverse backgrounds (such as in professional institutes, business associations, consultative committees, non-governmental organisations and enterprises), a Member raised concern over Members' accepting advantages

from individuals or parties in their private capacity (i.e. not as a TPB Member). In response, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) the probity requirements for applicants were already stipulated in the relevant GN;
- (b) such requirements as set out in the relevant GN were general in nature rather than tailored to any specific situation; and
- (c) the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) reviewed the operation of public bodies and government departments from a corruption prevention perspective from time to time. In light of recent feedback from the ICAC, the Secretariat had been advised to revise the relevant paragraph under the section on “Important Points to Note” of the said GN, with a view to reminding the applicants’ authorised agents, who were also subject to the same probity requirements as the applicants, on the offence of offering any advantage to a civil servant or Member with reference to the Prevention of Bribery Ordinance.

23. While the Board noted that as per previous discussions on the part on Declaration of Interests under the TPB Procedure and Practice (TPB P&P), guidelines were in place regarding the acceptance of advantages under Members’ private capacity and declaration of interests, Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning, with the aid of a visualiser, supplemented the following main points:

- (a) the subject of the current amendment was the probity requirements for the applicants and their authorised agents of planning applications, and not for Members. The purpose of proposing amendments to the relevant TPB GN was to indicate that the applicants’ authorised agents were also subject to the same probity requirements as the applicants; and
- (b) the issues related to Members’ declaration of interests would be discussed separately when the further revised TPB P&P were submitted for the Board’s consideration.

24. With the aid of a visualiser, the Secretary also supplemented the following main points:

- (a) the probity requirements were already stipulated in the said GN and were broad in nature. In response to feedback from the ICAC, it was proposed to amend the relevant GN by including “applicants’ authorised agents”, who were also responsible for the submission of planning applications and were subject to the same probity requirements as the applicants. This mainly served as a reminder; and
- (b) as for Members’ declaration of interests, comments received from Members in previous discussions would be taken into account in amending the TPB P&P to provide clearer guidelines for further discussions at a separate TPB meeting.

25. In response to a Member’s enquiry about event invitations referred to Members by the Secretariat, the Board noted that invitations to events such as annual dinners organised by professional institutes were not related to the applicants of planning applications and no conflict of interests was involved. Members might decide whether to attend the events at their own discretion. The Chairperson remarked that the Hong Kong Institute of Planners (HKIP), for example, was highly relevant to the Board’s work. There should generally be no issue with Member’s participating in HKIP’s events or activities in their capacity as TPB Members upon invitation. Nevertheless, Members were advised to exercise careful consideration before accepting invitations from private developers.

26. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally agreed with the proposed amendments to the TPB GN and Guidelines as detailed in the Paper. The Secretariat would follow up on the administrative arrangements, taking into account Members’ comments and suggestions made at the meeting, including exploring the possibility of using AI tools to determine whether AI was involved in generating images and/or videos submitted by applicants, commenters, representers and further representers, and creating a template to indicate AI-generated images and/or videos for adoption by them in future, as appropriate. In addition to the administrative arrangements, both the Chairperson and Members should exercise a high degree of vigilance, particularly during oral presentations made by the applicants, the

representers and their authorised agents/representatives. If they failed to provide an appropriate disclaimer or specification on the use of AI-generated image or video, the Chairperson would request the concerned party to discontinue the presentation of such image or video. Members should question the concerned party to assess the reliability of images and/or videos presented to the Board so as to ensure that an objective, informed and balanced discussion was held before a decision was made on the case.

27. After deliberation, the Board agreed that the proposed amendments to the s.12A GN, s.16 GN, s.16A(2) GN, GN on EPASS and GN on Representation Hearing, and the revised TPB PG-No. 29C and 30C (to be renumbered as TPB PG-No. 29D and 30D) at Attachments I to VII of the Paper respectively, subject to detailed checking, should take effect upon promulgation and uploading to the TPB's website (i.e. upon confirmation of the minutes of the subject meeting).

28. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Post-meeting note: To enhance the discernibility of submitted AI-generated image or video in response to Members' concerns, the corresponding requirements on disclaimer in the relevant paragraphs in the s.12A GN, s.16 GN, s.16A(2) GN, GN on EPASS, GN on Representation Hearing, TPB PG-No. 29D and TPB PG-No. 30D had been refined, with the following elaborations (in **bold** and *italic*) to be incorporated into the s.16 GN as an illustration, and other TPB GN and Guidelines to be revised as appropriate:

“31. The applicant should specify the source of any image or video submitted or presented to the Board, including the date and location at which the image or video was taken. If the image or video is artificial intelligence (AI)-generated or is an artist's impression, this should be clearly specified ***in the image caption or at the bottom of the image*** in the submission, ***and/or at the beginning of the video in the form of a banner or screenshot in the presentation.*** ***If the AI-generated image or video involved the use of real photo or video footage, the date and location at which the image or video was taken should also be indicated.***”]

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

29. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:30 a.m.