

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 594<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 8.12.2017**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),  
Transport Department  
Mr Wilson W.S. Pang

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department  
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Richard W.Y. Wong

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department  
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr K. K. Cheung

**In Attendance**

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 593<sup>rd</sup> MPC Meeting held on 24.11.2017

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 593<sup>rd</sup> MPC meeting held on 24.11.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported that there were no matters arising.

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting]

Y/KC/11                      Application for Amendment to the Draft Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KC/28, To Rezone the Application Site from “Industrial” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Funeral Parlour and Green Funeral Facility”, Kwai Chung Town Lot 351, 13-15 Wing Kei Road and 20-22 Wing Lap Street, Kwai Chung  
(MPC Paper No. Y/KC/11A)

---

3.                      The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA) and MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - having current business dealings KTA and MVA;  |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho   | - having current business dealings with MVA; and |
| Mr Franklin Yu      | - having past business dealings with MVA.        |

4.                      The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Franklin Yu had yet to arrive to join the meeting. As Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

5.                      The Committee noted that the applicant’s agent requested on 24.11.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information mainly to address the comments of the Transport Department. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including revised section plan, floor plans, updated pages of Environmental Assessment,

revised Traffic Impact Assessment etc. in response to departmental comments.

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for the preparation of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Esther M.Y. Tang, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 4**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/791            Wholesale Trade in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business 2”  
Zone, Workshops B8 to B10, 9/F, Block B, Hong Kong Industrial  
Centre, 489-491 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/791)

---

7.            The Secretary reported that RHL Surveyors Ltd. (RHL) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon	]	
	]	
Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung	]	personally know the Managing Director of
	]	RHL.
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	]	

8.            The Committee agreed that as Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had no discussion on and no involvement in the application, they could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

9.            With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Esther M.Y. Tang, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the wholesale trade;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Fire Services (D of FS) objected to the application as the wholesale trade use under application was a kind of commercial activity. Such use on 9/F of the subject industrial building was unacceptable as it would attract people who could be exposed

to risks which they would neither be aware of nor prepared to face. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from an individual expressing concerns and the major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. While the planning intention of “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(Business)”) zone was primarily for general business uses and allow for greater flexibility in the use of existing industrial or industrial-office buildings provided that the use would not induce adverse fire safety and environmental impacts, D of FS objected to the application from the fire safety point of view and considered the subject application unacceptable. As such, the application did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D. No similar application was approved for wholesale trade on the upper floors of an industrial building in “OU(Business)” zone in Cheung Sha Wan Planning Area and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent. Regarding the public comment received, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

10. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

11. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons were :

- “(a) the wholesale trade use under application does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D for Development within “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone due to the fire safety concern;

and

- (b) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would aggravate fire hazards in industrial buildings.”

[The Chairman thanked Ms Esther M.Y. Tang, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Wilson W.S. Pang arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

[Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H7/173                      Proposed Eating Place (Restaurant) in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, 4th Floor (portion), Li Shu Pui Block, Hong Kong Sanatorium & Hospital, 2 Village Road, Happy Valley  
(MPC Paper No. A/H7/173)

---

12.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Hong Kong Sanatorium & Hospital Ltd. (HKSH) and the application premises were located in Happy Valley. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr K.K. Cheung      | - his firm having current business dealings with HKSH, and co-owning with spouse a property in Happy Valley;                  |
| Dr. Wilton W.T. Fok | - his family members owning a property in Happy Valley;   |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - co-owning with spouse a property in Happy Valley, and being the Chairman of Happy Valley Residents’ Association (HVRA); and |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - his spouse owning a property in Happy Valley in close proximity to the Causeway Bay area.                                   |

13.            The Committee noted that Dr Wilton W.T. Fok and Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee also agreed that as the properties of Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had no direct view of the premises, and Mr Lau’s interest was remote, they could stay in the meeting.

14.            The Committee noted that a number of Members indicated that they/their family members were users of medical services at HKSH and agreed that these interests were remote and these Members could stay in the meeting.

[Mr Sunny L.K. Ho and Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed eating place (restaurant);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, 22 public comments, including 20 in support of the application and two expressing concerns, were received from individuals. The major grounds of the public comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The application was for the conversion of an existing canteen in HKSH to a proposed restaurant that could serve both the staff and the general public visiting the hospital. The Director of Health had no objection to the proposed restaurant, which would provide catering services to the staff, patients and visitors, as it was regarded as part of the supporting services of the hospital. The proposed restaurant with a floor area of about 662m<sup>2</sup> was considered not substantial in scale and would not affect the provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in the district. It was also not incompatible with the other uses of the existing building (i.e. Li Shu Pu Block). Relevant government departments consulted had no adverse comment on the application. The proposed use was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the “Government,

Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone and the application was generally in compliance with Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 16 (TPB PG-No. 16). Regarding the public concerns on land matters, visual blight and air emission of the proposed restaurant, the planning assessments and comments of government departments above were relevant.

16. The Vice-chairman and some Members raised questions on the following aspects:

- (a) background to the application and whether ‘canteen’ use in the hospital require planning permission;
- (b) whether HKSH was a charitable organisation as claimed by one of the commenters;

*Requirement for licence/planning permission*

- (c) noting that similar application for using a canteen as temporary restaurant in a “G/IC” zone in Tsim Sha Tsui had been approved by the Committee in 2016, what the main difference was between ‘canteen’ and the restaurant under application and how PlanD would assess whether a use was genuinely ancillary to a permitted use;
- (d) whether there was any planning restriction on the ‘canteen’ use for providing services to the general public who were not staff/patients/visitors of the hospital;

*Operation of the proposed restaurant*

- (e) information on the mode of operation, including operation hours, and pricing of the proposed restaurant;
- (f) whether the conversion of the existing canteen into a restaurant on the 4/F of the hospital would affect (i) the existing patrons i.e. staff of the HKSH, in particular during peak hours, as the future increase in customers from

outside would result in longer serving time; and (ii) the overall operation of HKSH;

*Similar applications and potential impacts*

- (g) any similar examples for converting canteen to restaurant in other hospitals; and
- (h) whether the concerns on potential environmental and visual impacts as raised by one of the commenters could be addressed.

17. Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo, STP/HK, made the following responses:

*Background of the canteen/restaurant and HKSH*

- (a) all ancillary uses of the permitted hospital use, including canteen use, were always permitted within the “G/IC” zone and no separate planning permission was required. The existing canteen, which aimed to serve the staff, patients and their visitors of HKSH, was always permitted in this regard. In 2015, there were reports in the media that the subject canteen was opened to outside visitors which was not in line with the intended use. Subsequently, HKSH had applied to FEHD for a general restaurant licence, however the application was rejected by FEHD;
- (b) currently, the canteen staff made inquiry with each customer to confirm whether they were genuine users of HKSH. According to the applicant, such practice had caused great inconvenience in terms of operation and possible privacy concerns. The main reason for converting the existing canteen to a restaurant was to reduce the administration burden on the canteen staff and inconvenience caused to its patrons;
- (c) HKSH was a privately-funded hospital and not a charitable organisation. There was no lease condition restricting the proposed conversion of the existing canteen to a restaurant;

*Requirement for licence/planning permission*

- (d) upon referral of general restaurant licence applications from FEHD, PlanD would assess whether a planning permission was required on a case-by-case basis, based on the provision of the relevant Outline Zoning Plan. If the catering facilities were proportional in nature and scale, they could be considered as an ancillary use of the hospital and no planning permission would be required;

*Operation of the proposed restaurant*

- (e) according to the applicant, the existing canteen served the staff of HKSH and prepared meals for patients. The proposed restaurant would operate in the same manner as the existing canteen, except that the canteen staff would no longer be required to ask all visitors of the restaurant if they were genuine users of the hospital. At the moment, the canteen's operation hour was from 7:00a.m. to 9:00p.m as shown in a site photo provided by the applicant. No pricing information for the proposed restaurant was provided by the applicant;
- (f) while no detailed information had been provided by the applicant in relation to measures to safeguard the operation of the hospital from being affected by the restaurant use on the 4/F, the applicant had repeatedly stated that there was no intention to advertise or boost the business and patronage of the proposed restaurant should the application be approved;

*Similar applications and potential impacts*

- (g) applications for a proposed coffee shop in Queen Elizabeth Hospital and conversion of an existing canteen into restaurant in Caritas Medical Centre had been approved by the Committee in 2008 and 2011 respectively;
- (h) the proposed restaurant was small in scale compared to the whole HKSH.

Relevant departments had no adverse comment on the application. The application was considered acceptable from planning perspective; and

- (i) one of the commenters whose residence had a direct view of the subject premises opined that the items currently stored within the application premises (i.e. the existing canteen) were untidy, and was concerned about the adverse impact brought by the air exhaust of the proposed restaurant. The comment of the public had been duly considered by concerned government departments in the planning assessment.

### Deliberation Session

18. The Vice-chairman said that based on the information provided by the applicant and the comments of relevant departments, the proposed use would unlikely cause any significant adverse impact and there was no strong reason to reject the application.

19. A Member had reservation on the application and said that despite the proposed restaurant was small in scale, the restaurant would be opened to the general public and without proper management measures, the existing service to staff of HKSH during peak hours might be affected. There was no general shortage of restaurant in the Happy Valley area and approving the application might be misinterpreted as the Committee agreed that particular floor space was no longer needed for GIC or other related uses.

20. A Member said that canteens in hospital were often visited by the general public other than staff, patients and their visitors. Other than offering a discounted price to staff or displaying signs stating the service was only intended for related users of the hospital, it was not administratively practical to screen every customer to ensure they were genuine users of the hospital. Notwithstanding that, land in "G/IC" zone should be dedicated for provision of services to the benefit of the general community. The same Member had some reservation on permitting the conversion of the existing canteen into a restaurant that would be run solely on a commercial basis. Another Member had a different view and said that from a business perspective, HKSH would probably have more incentive to convert the current canteen to hospital beds to increase its capacity and there was no strong reason to suggest that the current application for converting the existing canteen to restaurant was a mere commercial

consideration. Furthermore, since there were already plenty of restaurants in the area, people would unlikely be specially attracted to the proposed restaurant, which was inside a hospital, and thus the anticipated impact arising from approving the application should be minimal.

21. The Chairman remarked that as a general principle, in assessing whether a use could be considered as ancillary to a permitted use, the nature and scale of the use, in terms of its proportion to the main use, would be the major considerations. The mode of operation of the canteen/restaurant in hospitals in Hong Kong, including pricing strategy, might vary depending on the operators.

22. A Member said unlike hospitals located in remote areas such as the Queen Mary Hospital, users of the HKSH were well-served by large number of restaurants in the Happy Valley area. Given that the proposed operation hour of the restaurant under application was generally similar to other restaurants in the area, there was no strong reason to justify providing a restaurant inside HKSH.

23. The Committee noted that similar applications had been approved by the Committee for a coffee shop (84m<sup>2</sup> in area) at Queen Elizabeth Hospital in 2008 and conversion of an existing canteen into a restaurant (554m<sup>2</sup> in area) in Caritas Medical Centre in 2011. When the applications were considered by the Committee, there was no detailed discussion on whether there were sufficient restaurants in the vicinity of the sites and the main consideration for the two applications was land use compatibility.

24. A Member said that the major consideration should not be on the operation hours and detailed administrative arrangement of the restaurant as these matters should be handled by HKSH. Instead, the focus of the Committee should be whether the subject premises was suitable for the proposed restaurant use. The same Member considered that it was not unreasonable to have a small-scale restaurant within a hospital to serve its users and visitors. Similar restaurants and coffee shops could be found in other hospitals in Hong Kong.

25. In response to the question of a Member, Mr Simon S.W. Wang, Assistant Director (Regional 1), LandsD said that the subject premises fell within private lots and the respective leases of the site had no specific user restriction; and licence to permit certain

trades under the non-offensive trades clause of the respective leases had already been granted. The proposed restaurant under application was not in conflict with the lease conditions. As such, if the application was approved by the Board, the applicant was not required to seek a lease modification from LandsD.

26. In response to the question of the Vice-chairman regarding compliance with TPB PG-No. 16 particularly on whether the proposed development would adversely affect the normal operation of the existing GIC facilities, the Chairman said if the Committee decided to approve the application, additional approval conditions and/or advisory clauses could be considered, as appropriate.

27. The Committee generally agreed that the proposed restaurant which was small in scale, would unlikely induce significant adverse impact compared to the existing canteen which was already serving the staff and related users, i.e. patients and their visitors, of HKSH. While a Member had reservation on the application, another Member said that land in “G/IC” zone should be used for the general benefit of the community and suitable advisory clauses should be incorporated to remind the applicant that the operation of the proposed restaurant should not adversely affect its service to the staff and operation of HKSH. In response to the Vice-chairman’s query, the Chairman said that it might not be suitable to incorporate an approval condition requiring the proposed restaurant to give priority to serving the staff of HKSH as such approval condition might not be enforceable. The Committee agreed that advisory clauses were more appropriate in this regard.

28. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 8.12.2021, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting within six months from the date of the approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 8.6.2018; and
- (b) if the above planning condition is not complied with by the specified date,

the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

29. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix III of the Paper in addition to the following :

“(e) suitable measures should be adopted to ensure that the restaurant would not adversely affect the normal operation of the hospital and provision of service to its staff.”

[The Chairman thanked Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 6**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H19/76                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Hotel Development within “Commercial (1)” Zone and Proposed ‘Hotel’ Use within an area shown as ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’ in “Commercial (1)” Zone, 7 Stanley Market Road and 78 and 79 Stanley Main Street, Stanley (Stanley Inland Lot 124 and Stanley Lots 427 and 428)  
(MPC Paper No. A/H19/76)

---

30. The Secretary reported that Barrie Ho Architecture Interiors Ltd. (BHA) and Landes Ltd. (Landes) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr K. K. Cheung                      - his firm having current business dealings with BHA; and

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau                      - having current business dealings with Landes.

31. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application and Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the

meeting. The Committee also agreed that as Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had no involvement in the application, he could stay in the meeting.

32. The Committee noted that the applicant's agent requested on 20.11.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of response and assessment to address the comments of relevant government departments and the public. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

33. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 7**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/752            Proposed Office in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone,  
Portion of 3/F, How Ming Factory Building, 99 How Ming Street, Kwun  
Tong  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/752)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

34.            With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a)    background to the application;
- (b)    the proposed office;
- (c)    departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Fire Services (D of FS) did not support the application from fire safety point of view as the proposed general office might be visited by customers frequently. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d)    during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received; and
- (e)    the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. While the proposed office was generally in line with the planning intention of “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(Business)”) zone and compatible with the changing land use character of the Kwun Tong

Business Area, D of FS objected to the application from the fire safety point of view as the proposed general office might be visited by customers frequently. The application did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D (TPB PG-No. 22D) in that it would induce adverse fire safety impact on the developments within the subject building.

35. In response to a Member's question, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, said that while 'Office (excluding those involving direct provision of customers services or goods)' use, such as headquarters or back offices, was always permitted in industrial buildings in the "OU(Business)" zone, the applicant had indicated in his submission that the proposed office was expected to be frequently visited by customers. Based on TPB PG-No. 22D, the application, which would induce adverse fire safety impact, was not supported by D of FS. A Member asked whether fire safety requirements in industrial buildings could be relaxed to facilitate transformation of industrial premises to other suitable non-industrial uses. Ms Kwan responded that the Development Bureau had been tasked to review the feasibility of allowing conversion of lower floors of industrial buildings for non-industrial uses in consultation with other relevant departments including the Fire Services Department (FSD). The Chairman remarked that there was no firm programme regarding completion time of the review.

36. A Member noted that the subject premises were currently being used as office, restaurant and furniture shop and might be subject to lease enforcement action. In response to this Member's query, the Chairman remarked that whether the premises were under lease enforcement action should not be a material consideration on whether planning permission could be granted. Mr Simon S.W. Wang, Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department (LandsD) supplemented that lease enforcement action would be taken by LandsD if lease conditions were breached. Notwithstanding that, upon obtaining planning permission from the Town Planning Board, the relevant land owner could apply to LandsD for lease modification to rectify the irregularities.

#### Deliberation Session

37. A Member said the application, which would induce fire safety concern, should not be supported. Another Member echoed that view but considered that while the result of

review on feasibility of allowing conversion of lower floors of industrial buildings for non-industrial uses was pending, PlanD could continue to liaise with FSD in the interim to explore ways to allow more flexibility for suitable uses in industrial buildings. The Chairman remarked that PlanD had been liaising with FSD to improve flexibility for alternative uses in industrial buildings. Uses that would not attract additional fire risks, such as ‘Arts Studio (excluding those involving direct provision of services or goods)’ use, were being incorporate into the Notes of “Industrial” and “OU(Business”) zones of Outline Zoning Plans as an always permitted use as and where appropriate.

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reason was :

“the proposed ‘Office’ use, which involves direct provision of customer services or goods, is considered not acceptable in an industrial building from the fire safety point of view.”

[The Chairman thanked Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 8**

#### **Any Other Business**

39. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10:50 a.m..