

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)895/19-20
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/HS/1/19

Subcommittee on Issues Relating to Policy on Industrial Buildings

**Minutes of the third meeting held on
Tuesday, 19 May 2020, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex**

Members present : Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho (Chairman)
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, BBS, JP
Hon SHIU Ka-chun
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Members absent : Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH

Member attending : Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, SBS, JP

[Pursuant to section 15(1)(a) of the Legislative Council Ordinance (Cap. 542), HO Kai-ming ceases to hold office as a member of LegCo upon his resignation on 1 June 2020.]

**Public Officers
attending**

: Agenda item III

Ms Doris HO, JP
Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning &
Lands)1
Development Bureau

Mr Jackie LIU
Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning & Lands)7
Development Bureau

Miss Rebecca CHEUNG
Principal Assistant Secretary (Security)B
Security Bureau

Mr CHUI Man-leung
Assistant Director (Fire Safety)
Fire Services Department

Mr Gabriel TSANG
Assistant Director (Operations)1
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Mr Kevin NG
Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
(Specialist)
Planning Department

Ms Rosanna TSE
Chief Estate Surveyor/Development Control
Lands Department

Ms Stella CHAN
Chief Building Surveyor/D
Buildings Department

Agenda item IV

Ms Doris HO, JP
Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning &
Lands)1
Development Bureau

Mr Jackie LIU
Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning & Lands)7
Development Bureau

Miss Rebecca CHEUNG
Principal Assistant Secretary (Security)B
Security Bureau

Mr CHUI Man-leung
Assistant Director (Fire Safety)
Fire Services Department

Mr Gabriel TSANG
Assistant Director (Operations)1
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Mr Kevin NG
Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
(Specialist)
Planning Department

Ms Rosanna TSE
Chief Estate Surveyor/Development Control
Lands Department

Ms Stella CHAN
Chief Building Surveyor/D
Buildings Department

Clerk in attendance : Mr Daniel SIN
Chief Council Secretary (1)6

Staff in attendance : Ms Mandy LI
Senior Council Secretary (1)6

Mr Patrick CHOI
Council Secretary (1)6

Miss Yolanda CHEUK
Legislative Assistant (1)6

I. Matters arising from previous meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)541/19-20(01) -- List of follow-up actions arising from the meeting on 21 January 2020

LC Paper No. CB(1)541/19-20(02) -- Administration's response to the list of follow up actions arising from the meeting on 21 January 2020)

II. Confirmation of minutes

(LC Paper No. CB(1)539/19-20 -- Minutes of meeting held on 21 January 2020)

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2020 were confirmed.

III. Enforcement actions against non-industrial and non-conforming uses in industrial buildings

(LC Paper No. CB(1)541/19-20(03) -- Paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)541/19-20(04) -- Paper provided by the Administration)

IV. Fire safety of and enforcement actions in industrial buildings

(LC Paper No. CB(1)541/19-20(05) -- Paper provided by the Administration)

Discussion

2. The Chairman suggested and members agreed that the discussion of agenda items III and IV be combined as they were inter-related.

3. The Subcommittee deliberated (index of proceedings in the **Appendix**).

(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials (Chinese version only) was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)624/19-20(01) by email on 19 May 2020.)

4. At 4:30 pm, the Chairman extended the meeting for 15 minutes.

Follow-up actions

5. The Administration was requested to provide written response to the questions raised by members on the following issues:

- (a) (i) the number of subdivided flats ("SDUs") in industrial buildings ("IBs") banned under Government's enforcement actions between 2012 and 2020; (ii) the number of tenants rendered homeless as a result of such enforcement actions; and (iii) the number of affected residents admitted to the Transit Centre;
- (b) statistics on SDUs in IBs, including the number of SDUs, the number of residents and rent level;
- (c) the number and locations of upstairs bars operated in IBs with or without valid liquor licences, and the number and percentage of these upstairs bars that do not comply with the structural safety and fire safety requirements;
- (d) periodic inspections of upstairs bars in IBs (licensed or without licence) to ensure compliance with fire safety-related regulations, any irregularities found, prosecutions taken, and convictions made;
- (e) in each of the past three years, the number of prosecutions against factory canteens which provided catering services to persons not employed in the factory building concerned; and
- (f) cases where ground floor spaces of IBs are allowed to be used for shops or for providing services.

(Post-meeting note: Administration's response to the questions above was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)722/19-20(02) by email on 4 June 2020.)

V. Any other business

6. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:42 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
20 July 2020

Subcommittee on Issues Relating to Policy on Industrial Buildings

**Proceedings of the third meeting held on
Tuesday, 19 May 2020, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex**

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|---|--|---|------------------------|
| Agenda item I — Matters arising from previous meeting | | | |
| 000344 – 000546 | Chairman Mr Frankie YICK Chi- ming | Matters arising from the previous meeting | |
| Agenda item II — Confirmation of minutes | | | |
| 000547 – 000612 | Chairman | Minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2020 | |
| Agenda item III — Enforcement actions against non-industrial and non-conforming uses in industrial buildings | | | |
| Agenda item IV — Fire safety of and enforcement actions in industrial buildings | | | |
| 000613 – 001155 | Chairman Mr Frankie YICK Chi- ming Administration | Mr Frankie YICK noted from the Administration's response to the list of follow up actions arising from the meeting on 21 January 2020 [LC Paper No. CB(1)541/19-20(02)] that courier services were regarded as a "Shop and Services" use (which meant any premises where goods were sold or where services were provided to visiting members of the public), thus not covered under the waiver relaxation policy in individual units within existing industrial buildings ("IBs"). Mr YICK commented that courier services, which were common to IBs, generally did not involve any uses/activities that would attract visiting members of the general public. Mr YICK suggested that the Administration might consider putting in appropriate restrictions for the use of courier services in IBs in the waiver relaxation policy. The Administration undertook to examine the suggestion. | |
| 001156 – 003355 | Chairman Administration | Briefing by the Administration [LC Paper No. CB(1)624/19-20(01)] | |
| 003356 – 003929 | Chairman Mr Andrew WAN Siu- kin Administration | Mr Andrew WAN enquired whether the Administration had taken into account the rehousing arrangement of the affected residents before issuing statutory removal orders or applying for closure orders. He asked whether a joint bureau/department working group could be set up | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>by the Development Bureau to render coordinated support and assistance from relevant departments to those affected by government enforcement actions. He also enquired (a) the number of residents who were forced to leave their subdivided units ("SDUs") in IBs due to government's enforcement actions between 2012 and 2020; and (b) the number of affected residents admitted to the Transit Centre and subsequently to public housing.</p> <p>The Administration said that enforcement actions against illegal domestic premises in IBs were necessary. Meanwhile, the in-house social services teams of the Buildings Department ("BD") would render suitable support and assistance for owners and occupiers affected by BD's enforcement actions. For the 193 units used as illegal domestic premises in IBs which were eradicated by BD through large scale operations between April 2012 and April 2020, 16 persons were admitted to transit centres through referrals by BD. Among them, 12 were later admitted to interim housing.</p> | |
| <p>003930 – 004721</p> | <p>Chairman Mr Tony TSE Wai- chuen Administration</p> | <p>Mr Tony TSE commented that stringent enforcement action, such as re-entry, should be carried out against domestic premises in IBs to effectively deter such uses. Mr TSE queried whether the decision to re-entry was based on lease conditions or statutory requirements.</p> <p>The Administration confirmed that re-entry action would be taken in cases where the following two conditions were met: (a) there were other premises in the same IB currently issued with Licenses for Manufacture and/or Storage of Dangerous Goods by the Fire Services Department ("FSD"); and (b) the uses that were in breach of the lease conditions would attract footfall. Under such circumstances, the Lands Department ("LandsD") would first issue warning letters to the owners of these IB units requiring rectification within 14 days. LandsD would proceed with re-entry or vesting action under the Government Rights (Re-entry and Vesting Remedies) Ordinance (Cap. 126) if the breaches were not rectified in time.</p> <p>Mr Tony TSE queried if the dual roles played by the Administration, as signatory of land leases and enforcement body of statutory requirements, would be conflicting. The Administration advised that LandsD would normally request breaches of uses be rectified in accordance with land leases first,</p> | |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>before resorting to law enforcement actions. Most of the lease breach cases meeting the above two conditions were resolved successfully after issuance of warning letters.</p> <p>Mr Tony TSE asked whether the former owner might request taking back his/her lands or tenements upon which the Government had taken re-entry or vesting actions. The Administration said that according to Cap. 126, the former owner might apply for relief against re-entry or vesting, by petitioning or applying to the Court. The Administration added that recurrent lease breaches that led to re-entry action were rarely seen.</p> | |
| 004722 – 005437 | Chairman Mr Frankie YICK Chi- ming Administration | <p>Mr Frankie YICK commented that warning letters registered in the Lands Registry, commonly known as "imposing an encumbrance", had no practical effect on the owners/occupiers of a property with breach of use under lease until they want to sell their properties.</p> <p>Mr YICK asked (a) whether such a practice would encourage more and more owners/occupiers to take advantage of lease breaches; and (b) what the penalties were on property owners/occupiers who failed to ensure that fire service installation and equipment installed in their premises were in efficient working order at all times.</p> <p>The Administration advised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) it was reviewing the related policies, in particular whether it should take re-entry or vesting actions against a property that had warning letters persistently registered in the Lands Registry; and(b) if fire hazard in relation to fire service installations or equipment was observed at the time of inspection, FSD would usually serve a Fire Hazard Abatement Notice ("FHAN"), which required the owners/occupiers to abate the fire hazard within the period specified in the FHAN. It was an offence to fail to comply with a requirement of FHAN within the specified period. Offenders should be liable on conviction to a fine of \$100,000 and to a further fine of \$10,000 for each day during which the offence continued. In 2019, there were seven prosecutions against contravention of the Fire Service | |

| | | (Installations and Equipment) Regulations. | |
|--------------------|---|--|--|
| 005438 – 010104 | Chairman Mr SHIU Ka-chun Administration | <p>Mr SHIU Ka-chun said that from the feedback he had received, limited support was given by BD's social services teams to affected households, and they were present only during clearance operations. He asked what roles and functions these teams had.</p> <p>The Administration responded that the social services teams provided social welfare assistance and counselling services for owners and occupiers affected by BD's enforcement actions. Apart from responding to requests for services, the teams would also visit the affected occupiers proactively to render suitable support and assistance to the occupiers depending on their circumstances, assist them in applying for the "Relocation Allowance for Residents of Illegal Domestic Premises in Industrial Buildings Who Have to Move out as a Result of the Buildings Department's Enforcement Action" ("the Relocation Allowance") under the Community Care Fund ("CCF") and make referral to relevant departments for follow-up, including Housing Department, Social Welfare Department and Home Affairs Department. The teams would leave their contact information to those residents who were away during their visits.</p> <p>Regarding the Relocation Allowance under CCF, Mr SHIU queried whether it was reasonable that new residents of illegal domestic premises in IBs were deprived of their eligibility for the Allowance just because the former resident(s) of the same IB had received the Allowance before. Mr SHIU suggested that tenants would not know whether the former occupiers had taken the Allowance or not.</p> <p>The Administration said that the list of IBs with BD's enforcement action taken against illegal domestic premises was available in BD's website for members of the public to read. To prevent abuse, if allowance under the Relocation Allowance had been granted to the resident(s) of an illegal domestic premises in IBs to move out from the premises, future residents subsequently moved into such premises were not eligible for application of the Relocation Allowance. Owners of these premises also had the responsibility to cease the illegal domestic use of the premises and should not lease the premises to other tenants for domestic use again after BD's enforcement action.</p> | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Mr SHIU also enquired (a) the number of subdivided flats ("SDUs") in IBs eradicated by BD through large scale operations between 2012 and 2020; (b) the number of tenants rendered homeless as a result of such enforcement actions; and (c) the number of affected residents admitted to transit centres. He further requested the Administration to provide statistics on SDUs in IBs, including the number of SDUs, the number of residents and rent level.</p> <p>The Administration undertook to provide the requested information after the meeting.</p> | <p>The Administration to take action as per paragraph 5 of the minutes.</p> |
| <p>010105 – 010720</p> | <p>Chairman Mr CHAN Chi-chuen Administration</p> | <p>Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired (a) whether it was a breach of land lease conditions to use a former IB, which had been converted for non-industrial uses, for industrial purposes; (b) whether The Mills, originally an IB which had been wholesale-converted for non-industrial use, had breached the land lease conditions if it had indeed been used for manufacturing CuMask+™ ordered by the Government as reported in the media; and (c) generally speaking, how the Administration would follow up, if any, a retrospective lease breach which had already been rectified.</p> <p>The Administration replied that:</p> <p>(a) if a former IB having undergone wholesale conversion for non-industrial uses was used for industrial purpose, it might be in breach of waiver conditions unless the owner had applied for and obtained approval from the LandsD for a waiver or modification of the user clause to allow for industrial purpose;</p> <p>(b) LandsD had conducted a site inspection at The Mills. Meanwhile, legal advice and advice from relevant bureaux were being sought as to whether the reported use was a non-compliant/industrial use; and</p> <p>(c) generally speaking, the ultimate goal of LandsD's lease enforcement actions was that the substantiated lease breach cases be purged or cease operation to LandsD's satisfaction within the period specified in the warning</p> | |

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--|
| | | letters. | |
| 010721 – 011504 | Chairman Administration | <p>The Chairman enquired (a) whether the Administration had considered requiring banks to perform periodic search of land records to ensure that no warning letter was registered in the Lands Registry under any property taking out the banks' mortgages.</p> <p>Noting that factory canteens situated on street level were regulated in the same way as those inside an IB, the Chairman asked (b) whether the Administration could relax the policy for those factory canteens located on the street level, given that the fire safety risk of premises on the street level of an IB was generally lower than that of premises on other floors, and many of these canteens were already admitting customers not employed in the factory buildings.</p> <p>The Administration said that:</p> <p>(a) whenever LandsD registered a warning letter against a property in the Lands Registry, it would inform the bank(s) from which mortgage(s) were taken out of it. To enhance this measure, LandsD was planning to invite The Hong Kong Association of Banks to remind its members that when necessary, LandsD might take further lease enforcement actions including re-entry or vesting under Cap. 126; and</p> <p>(b) at present, around 60% of all factory canteens were located on the ground floor. Regardless of the floor on which factory canteens were located in an IB, they would not be issued any type of food business licences other than the factory canteen licence ("FCL"). Factory canteens were subject to less stringent requirements than general restaurants with regard to the provision of food room and sanitary fitments.</p> | |
| 011505 – 012231 | Chairman Mr Andrew WAN Siu-kin Administration | <p>Mr Andrew WAN enquired whether a joint working group could be set up by the Development Bureau to render coordinated support and assistance from relevant departments to those affected by government enforcement actions.</p> <p>The Administration explained that enforcement action against illegal domestic premises in IBs was</p> | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>mainly under BD's and LandsD's purview. BD's in-house social services teams had been taking a "people-focused" approach in providing social welfare assistance and counselling services for owners and occupiers affected by BD's enforcement actions. Nonetheless, the Administration undertook to examine the social services teams' work and to look for room for improvement.</p> <p>Mr WAN noted that between December 2011 and December 2018, \$530,000 was disbursed on the Relocation Allowance under CCF. He questioned whether the annual disbursement amount, as well as the eligible income level for the applicants, was unreasonably low. Mr WAN commented that the eligibility criteria for the Allowance were even stricter than that for public rental housing.</p> <p>The Administration explained that in order to be eligible for the Relocation Allowance, (a) applicant/family members should pass the family-based/household-based means test of the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme, student financial assistance schemes under the Student Financial Assistance Agency, Hospital Authority's Medical Fee Waiving Mechanism or Work Incentive Transport Subsidy; or (b) household income should not exceed 100% of the Median Monthly Domestic Household Income ("MMDHI") of all households for one-person households or 75% of MMDHI of all households for two-or-more-person households.</p> | |
| <p>012232 – 013020</p> | <p>Chairman Dr CHIANG Lai-wan Administration</p> | <p>Dr CHIANG Lai-wan asked (a) whether the Administration would relax the regulations concerning the non-industrial use of IBs; (b) whether hydroponics and band practice or performance were regarded as permissible industrial uses of IBs designated for industrial and/or godown purposes; and (c) as wholesale conversion of IBs was difficult to realize, whether certain low-risk non-industrial uses could be individually permitted in some flats of an IB on the condition that users would meet all fire safety requirements.</p> <p>The Administration replied that:</p> <p>(a) under the new round of revitalization of IBs announced in 2018, five categories of uses were permitted to operate at premises within</p> | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>existing IBs without the need for making separate waiver applications to LandsD, and paying waiver fees and an administrative fee which would otherwise be payable, so long as such uses were always permitted under the land use zoning of the site on the relevant Outline Zoning Plan as "Column 1" (i.e. always permitted) uses;</p> <p>(b) as far as land lease was concerned, hydroponics, especially one that made use of new technology, was a permissible industrial use in IBs. Band practice or performance, however, was not an industrial use; and</p> <p>(c) allowing industrial and non-industrial activities to co-exist in an IB would create fire safety hazard. Imposing stringent fire safety requirements only in certain parts of an IB could not eliminate the risks of fire and other accidents to occupiers and visitors.</p> | |
| <p>013021 – 013527</p> | <p>Chairman Mr SHIU Ka-chun Administration</p> | <p>Mr SHIU welcomed the Administration's undertaking that it would review the work of BD's in-house social services teams. He suggested that The Hong Kong Council of Social Service and Community Development Alliance be consulted in the process. As regards the case of alleged breach of lease conditions at the Mills mentioned by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr SHIU expressed that his primary concern was whether regulations were applied equally and professionally to all entities, regardless of their political orientations.</p> <p>After reiterating his earlier request for the SDU-related statistics, Mr SHIU further requested from the Administration to provide information on: (a) the number and locations of upstairs bars operated in IBs with or without valid liquor licences, and the number and percentage of these upstairs bars that do not comply with the structural safety and fire safety requirements; and (b) periodic inspections of upstairs bars in IBs (licensed or without licence) to ensure compliance with fire safety-related regulations, any irregularities found, prosecutions taken, and convictions made.</p> <p>The Administration undertook to follow up with Mr SHIU's request after the meeting.</p> | <p>The Administration to take action as per paragraph 5 of the minutes.</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--|
| 013528 – 014039 | Chairman Mr Frankie YICK Chi- ming Administration | <p>Mr Frankie YICK asked (a) whether it was a good sign that the numbers of prosecutions against contravention of the Fire Services (Fire Hazard Abatement) Regulation in IBs were low compared to the numbers of FHANs issued against such contraventions in IBs from 2016 to 2019.</p> <p>Expressing concerns over the lack of affordable premises for the operation of the logistics industry, Mr YICK enquired about (b) the current vacancy rate of IBs; and (c) whether the Administration would adopt a district-based IB policy with a view to make sure that affordable IB premises would be available in peripheral districts.</p> <p>The Administration replied that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) operators/owners of premises in IBs had usually complied with FHANs quickly, therefore, the corresponding prosecution figure is not high;(b) the vacancy rate in IBs had been nearly 6% in recent years; and(c) the Administration might not be well grounded if it were to disallow revitalization of IBs in certain districts while allowing it in other districts. To resolve the land shortage problem faced by the logistics industry, a fundamental solution might be to increase the amount of land to be designated for warehouse and open storage in future land-use planning. <p>Mr Frankie YICK commented that modifying land-use planning could not solve the problem in the short term. The sale of government land by tender would also be disadvantageous to the logistics industry.</p> | |
| 014040 – 014840 | Chairman Dr CHIANG Lai-wan Administration | <p>Dr CHIANG Lai-wan asked (a) whether premises for manufacturing of food and film studios were regarded as permissible industrial uses of IBs designated for industrial and/or godown purposes; and (b) whether the Administration could relax the use of IBs to certain purposes which would not attract a large flow people and would be difficult to be based elsewhere.</p> <p>The Administration replied that:</p> | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>(a) industrial activities often involved a manufacturing process of turning raw materials into products. While film studios were not an example of industrial use of IBs, LandsD would need to examine the actual production process and seek legal advice before determining whether manufacturing of food in industrial premises was an industrial use; and</p> <p>(b) under the new round of revitalization of IBs announced in 2018, the Administration would permit certain uses to operate at premises within existing IBs on a time-limited basis without the need for making separate waiver applications to LandsD, and paying waiver fees and an administrative fee which would otherwise be payable. One of the five uses covered by the above-mentioned permission was office (audio-visual recording studio), which included premises for audio-visual recording and small-scale film making. Art studio which would not involve uses/activities that would attract visiting members of the general public was another permitted use under the prevailing policy.</p> | |
| <p>014841 – 015508</p> | <p>Chairman Administration</p> | <p>The Chairman queried (a) why factory canteens were subject to less stringent requirements than general restaurants with regard to the provision of food room and sanitary fitments, whether such a distinction represented a lower standard of food safety among factory canteens, and if so, how this could be justified; and (b) besides FCL, whether the Administration would issue other types of food business licences to a food businesses located in an IB which met all relevant licence requirements.</p> <p>The Administration advised that:</p> <p>(a) FCL was designed for food businesses operating in a factory building which provided meals or drinks to persons employed in the factory building concerned. They were subject to less stringent requirements than general restaurants with regard to the provision of food room and sanitary fitments as the types of food provided by them and their mode of operation were relatively simple; and</p> <p>(b) the licensing regime for food businesses in</p> | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>IBs had taken into account an array of concerns, including food safety and the risks of fire hazards and accidents to be exposed to the members of the public if they were permitted to visit these businesses.</p> <p>The Chairman commented that customers of factory canteens were not all employed in the factory buildings concerned. Factory canteens, especially those located on the ground floor, were regarded by many customers as general restaurants. It appeared that they were not restricted to serve simple dishes only and were seldom prosecuted for providing catering services to persons not employed in their factory buildings.</p> <p>The Administration clarified that enforcement actions had been taken against factory canteens which had violated licence conditions. Upon the Chairman's request, the Administration undertook to provide the number of prosecutions against factory canteens which provided catering services to persons not employed in the factory building concerned in each of the past three years.</p> | <p>The Administration to take action as per paragraph 5 of the minutes.</p> |
| <p>015509 – 015932</p> | <p>Chairman Mr Andrew WAN Siu-kin Administration</p> | <p>Mr Andrew WAN asked whether low-risk non-industrial uses, such as party rooms, could be permitted in IBs.</p> <p>The Administration reiterated that as a measure to address the demand for safe and lawful space, five uses within existing IBs had already been permitted without the need for making waiver applications and paying waiver fees under the new round of revitalization of IBs announced in 2018, so long as such uses were always permitted under the land use zoning of the site on the relevant Outline Zoning Plan as "Column 1" (i.e. always permitted) uses.</p> | |
| <p>015933 – 020810</p> | <p>Chairman Administration</p> | <p>The Chairman noted that those commercial premises on the ground floor of an IB which would not attract a large number of public members to stay for a long period of time, such as local provisions store/convenience store, bank, electrical shop for selling electrical accessories, etc., were accepted to be operated in IBs without buffer floor.</p> <p>The Chairman queried why a bank should be permitted as it might often hold a large number of people who frequently stayed for more than "a short period of time". He queried (a) the rationale</p> | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | <p>for permitting a bank but not other retail uses on the ground floor of an IB; and (b) whether a shop selling other products would be riskier than an electrical shop from the fire safety perspective.</p> <p>The Administration replied that:</p> <p>(a) the permitted uses were considered ancillary to or for the purposes of supporting the industrial activities and the routine activities of the workers in IBs; and</p> <p>(b) upon receiving waiver applications, LandsD would consult relevant government departments, including FSD and consider them on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The Chairman commented that it was undesirable, in terms of maintaining a favourable business environment, if there were no objective measurement to specify "commercial premises which do not attract a large number of public members to stay for a long period of time".</p> <p>Upon the Chairman's request, the Administration undertook to cover this matter, as well as the issue on factory canteens, in future reviews. For cases about ground floor space of IBs allowed to be used for shops or for providing services, it undertook to provide details in written after the meeting.</p> | <p>The Administration to take action as per paragraph 5 of the minutes.</p> |
| 020811 – 021138 | Chairman Dr CHIANG Lai-wan Administration | <p>Highlighting that IBs were originally designed for people-intensive industrial activities, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan queried how the Administration would define a flow of people that was too large to be safe in IBs. Considering the high rental level of office buildings, Dr CHIANG further commented that non-industrial purposes in IBs should be tolerated to the widest extent possible so that young entrepreneurs could have the space they might need to start their businesses.</p> | |
| Agenda item V — Any other business | | | |
| 021139 – 021439 | Chairman | Closing remarks | |