

**Business Facilitation Advisory Committee  
Food and Related Services Task Force**

***Review of Liquor Licensing***

**Purpose**

This paper reports the outcome of the public consultation on the review of liquor licensing conducted by the Food and Health Bureau between July and September 2011 and sets out the proposed way forward.

**Background**

2. The Administration launched a two-month public consultation in July 2011 to gauge the public's views on the review of liquor licensing, including proposals on the regulation of upstairs bars and further streamlining of licensing procedures. By the end of the public consultation in September 2011, the Administration received some 180 written submissions from individuals and organisations including the Food Business Task Force of the Business Facilitation Advisory Committee. Many constructive views were also received from the community and the trade at various meetings.

**Outcome of Public Consultation and Way Forward**

3. On 10 January 2012, the Administration presented the public consultation outcome and the proposed way forward to the Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene of the Legislative Council. A copy of the Panel paper is at **Annex** for Members' information. In gist –

- (a) by and large, the trade was supportive of the proposed trade facilitation measures but against tightening of the regulation over liquor-licensed premises including upstairs bars. In contrast, representatives and residents of local communities

where larger numbers of bars existed urged the Government to impose more stringent control on liquor-licensed premises and enhance enforcement against premises causing nuisances;

- (b) the Administration sees a need to address public concerns about public order, safety and nuisance of upstairs bars, but does not propose to impose additional across-the-board statutory restriction on such bars in certain areas or buildings, which could be unnecessarily restrictive and lacks flexibility. We are however inviting the Liquor Licensing Board (LLB) to consider adopting more stringent criteria in assessing liquor licence applications from upstairs bars and drawing up a set of guidelines in this regard. To enhance transparency, LLB may also consider publicising such guidelines in an appropriate manner and publishing, on a regular basis, buildings and locations of rejected upstairs bar applications; and
- (c) we will discuss with LLB the implementation of the various trade facilitation measures proposed. Those proposals of an administrative nature, such as allowing the posting of liquor licence application advertisements on the internet, if agreed by LLB, could be implemented ahead of proposals which require legislative amendments, such as the proposed extension of the maximum licence duration and the reserve licensee mechanism.

4. Members of the Food and Related Services Task Force are requested to note the above outcome of public consultation and the way forward.

**Food and Health Bureau**  
**February 2012**

LC Paper No. CB(2)719/11-12(03)

For discussion  
on 10 January 2012

**Legislative Council Panel on Food Safety  
and Environmental Hygiene**

**Report on Public Consultation on Review of Liquor Licensing**

**PURPOSE**

This paper reports the outcome of the public consultation on the review of liquor licensing conducted by the Food and Health Bureau between July and September 2011 and sets out the proposed way forward.

**BACKGROUND**

2. At the meetings of this Panel on 15 February and 12 April 2011, we briefed Members on the Administration's initial thinking on various proposed trade facilitation measures in respect of liquor licensing and the problems besetting upstairs bars in Hong Kong. Taking into account the views of Members, the Liquor Licensing Board (LLB) and other stakeholders, we launched a public consultation on 13 July 2011 to gauge the public's views on the regulation of upstairs bars and further streamlining of licensing procedures. The consultation document set out for public discussion the following –

- (a) more stringent licensing proposals relating to upstairs bars;
- (b) an alternative means for liquor licence applicants to advertise their applications other than on newspapers;
- (c) proposed extension of the maximum duration of liquor licences to not more than two years;
- (d) an optional “reserve licensee” mechanism while maintaining the requirement for a liquor licence to be applied for and held by a natural person; and

- (e) possible classification of liquor licences so as to better manage the risks of different types of liquor-selling premises.

A copy of the consultation paper has been provided to Members of this Panel on 13 July 2011.

## **OUTCOME OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

3. The Administration received some 180 written submissions from individuals and organisations. Besides, Government officials attended a number of trade consultation forums, the Food Business Task Force under the Business Facilitation Advisory Committee, the Retail and Tourism Committee of the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce, and District Councils of the three districts with most liquor-licensed premises in Hong Kong (Yau Tsim Mong, Wan Chai, Central and Western) and received many constructive views from the community and the trade.

4. By and large, the trade was supportive of the proposed trade facilitation measures but against tightening of the regulation over liquor-licensed premises including upstairs bars. In contrast, representatives and residents of local communities where larger numbers of bars existed urged the Government to impose more stringent control on liquor-licensed premises and enhance enforcement against premises causing nuisances. Most of them did not express views on the trade facilitation measures in the consultation document, although some did not agree with the proposed extension of the maximum licence period.

5. A full report summarising mainstream opinions gathered in the public consultation is enclosed at **Annex** for Members' information. This report has been uploaded to the Food and Health Bureau's website.

## **WAY FORWARD**

6. Based on the consultation outcome, we are inclined to pursue the implementation of various proposals as set out in paragraphs 7 to 13 below.

### ***Upstairs Bars***

7. We need to address public concerns about public order, safety and nuisance of upstairs bars. In fact, when LLB considers liquor licence

applications, members will satisfy themselves that the premises are suitable for selling or supplying intoxicating liquor having regard to, among others, the fire safety and hygienic conditions in the premises pursuant to Regulation 17(2) of the Dutiable Commodities (Liquor) Regulations (“DCLR”) (Cap. 109B). Public interest is one of the criteria upon which LLB will consider if an application for a liquor licence shall be approved. In view of the legislative requirements already in place which empower LLB to vet each application from upstairs bars according to the circumstances of the case, we do not propose to impose additional across-the-board statutory restriction on such bars in certain areas or buildings, which could be unnecessarily restrictive and lacks flexibility. However, LLB may consider adopting more stringent criteria in assessing liquor licence applications from upstairs bars to address the public concern about public order, safety and nuisance. In this regard, LLB may consider drawing up a set of guidelines on the vetting of upstairs bar applications. It is abundantly clear from the public consultation that safety should be accorded the first priority in the vetting criteria. To enhance transparency, LLB may consider publicising such guidelines in an appropriate manner and publishing, on a regular basis, buildings and locations of rejected upstairs bar applications.

8. At present, the Police and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) inspect all liquor-licensed premises at least once a year. The frequency of inspection will be adjusted according to the risk profile of the premises.<sup>1</sup> We will discuss with the relevant Government agencies ways to enhance their inspection of and better their enforcement strategy for liquor-licensed premises.

### ***Advertising an Application***

9. Respondents to the public consultation generally raised no objection to allowing liquor licence applications to be advertised on the Internet. According to Regulation 16 of DCLR, the manner in which liquor licence applications should be advertised is to be decided by LLB. Advertising on a designated website accords with the trend of obtaining information through the Internet, incurs less cost and sustains for a longer period than a one day newspaper advertisement. We will invite LLB to consider this proposal and

---

<sup>1</sup> FEHD conducts inspections to licensed food premises on a regular basis according to their risk types under the “Risk-based Inspection System”. High, medium and low risk food premises are inspected at intervals of once every four, 10 and 20 weeks respectively. Besides, FEHD conducts inspections to clubs with catering services once every 10 weeks. At present, most liquor-licensed premises are licensed restaurants or clubs issued with Certificate of Compliance.

provide necessary administrative support. LLB may also wish to consider whether newspaper advertisements should be retained as an alternative, as suggested by some respondents, and whether there is any need for a transition period in which newspaper advertisements will be placed alongside Internet advertisements but in a reduced number of local newspapers.

### ***Duration of a Licence***

10. Given the trade's strong support and LLB's agreement, we propose to extend the liquor licence period to a maximum of two years for those businesses with a good track record for at least two consecutive years. To address the concerns of some respondents, we will discuss with LLB the establishment of a review mechanism to enable LLB to tackle any negative developments of licensed premises (e.g. sudden increase in complaint cases) during the extended licence period. Under Regulation 20 of DCLR, the liquor licence, if granted by LLB, shall be for a period of 12 months or such lesser period as the Board shall determine. Extension of liquor licence period would require amendments to DCLR.

### ***Natural Person and Reserve Licensee***

11. The community generally supports maintaining the existing requirement that liquor licensees must be natural persons, so as to maintain a clear legal responsibility. As a business facilitation measure, we intend to implement the proposed reserve licensee mechanism, which was generally welcomed by the trade. In working out the operational details of the scheme, we will adhere to a few principles –

- (a) there should be a clear delineation of responsibility at any one time during the licence period, i.e. there should only be one and only one licensee, who is a natural person, responsible for the management of the licensed premises; and
- (b) a simplified procedure should be in place to facilitate the reserve licensee to take over the licence in a matter of days, so as to minimise the disruption to the business.

Amendments to DCLR would be required to implement this proposal.

### ***Licence Fee***

12. We will take the opportunity to review the licence fee with an

extended licence period and a new reserve licensee mechanism, taking into account the latest cost analysis.

### ***Classification of Licence***

13. Differing views were received during the public consultation on whether there should be different types of licence for different modes of operation, for different types of liquor sold or for different nature of businesses. However, there were no suggestions on how these different categories of licence and the licensing conditions can be configured. There is in any case no perfect way to classify licences and the additional benefits to be reaped in terms of better regulation were not obvious. We will keep an open mind to the suggestions and welcome further discussion with the trade.

### ***Other Matters***

14. During the public consultation, some respondents suggested that a demerit points system similar to the one applicable to food business licences be introduced as a tool to enforce liquor licensing conditions. The Administration has reservation on the proposal because the considerations in granting a liquor licence, which include general public interest, are different from that for food business licences and could be difficult to quantify under a points system. The value added by such a system is also questionable as it should not be a mechanical tool to obviate the need for LLB to exercise its discretion under the DCLR in considering each case. We will further consult LLB on this matter.

## **TIMETABLE**

15. The Administration will proceed to discuss with LLB the various proposals above. Other stakeholders will be involved as appropriate. Those proposals of an administrative nature, such as the adoption of guidelines on assessing upstairs bar applications by LLB and posting of liquor licence application advertisements on the internet, if agreed by LLB, could be implemented ahead of proposals which require legislative amendments to the DCLR, such as the proposed extension of the maximum licence duration and the reserve licensee mechanism. The legislative amendments, in the form of subsidiary legislation to be made by the Chief Executive in Council pursuant to Section 6 of the Dutiable Commodities Ordinance (Cap. 109), would need to be tabled in the Legislative Council. If we are to proceed with these amendments, we will consult this Panel on

the draft legislation beforehand.

### **ADVICE SOUGHT**

16. Members are invited to note and advise on the contents of this paper.

**Food and Health Bureau  
January 2012**



## **Public Consultation on the Review of Liquor Licensing Summary of Opinions**

On 13 July 2011, the Food and Health Bureau published a consultation document on review of liquor licensing and launched a public consultation for two months until 14 September 2011. The purpose of the consultation was to gauge the public's views on the regulation of "upstairs bars" and further streamlining of licensing procedures.

2. There has been growing public concern about crime, nuisance and fire danger brought about by the proliferation of bars in certain multi-storey buildings. At the same time, there were calls from the trade to lower the regulatory burden and nurture a business-friendly environment. We hope that views collected from different sectors would help shed light on how to take forward our liquor licensing system.

3. The consultation document set out for public discussion –

- (a) more stringent licensing proposals relating to upstairs bars (Chapter 2);
- (b) an alternate means of advertisement for liquor licence applicants to advertise their applications other than newspapers (Chapter 3);
- (c) a proposed extension of the maximum duration of liquor licences to not more than two year (Chapter 4);
- (d) an optional "reserve licensee" mechanism while maintaining the requirement for a liquor licence to be applied for and held by a natural person (Chapter 5); and
- (e) possible classification of liquor licences so as to better manage the risks of different types of liquor-selling premises (Chapter 6).

4. During the consultation period, the Government received some 180 written submissions from individuals and organisations. Besides, Government officials attended a number of trade consultation forums, the Food Business Task Force under the Business Facilitation Advisory Committee, the Retail and Tourism Committee of the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce, and District Councils of the three districts with

most liquor-licensed premises in Hong Kong (Yau Tsim Mong, Wan Chai, Central and Western) and received many constructive views from the community and the trade.

5. By and large, the trade was supportive of the proposed trade facilitation measures but against tightening of the regulation over liquor-licensed premises including upstairs bars. In contrast, representatives and residents of local communities where larger numbers of bars existed urged the Government to impose more stringent control on liquor-licensed premises and enhance enforcement against premises causing nuisances. Most of them did not express views on the trade facilitation measures in the consultation document, although some did not agree with the proposed extension of the maximum licence period. The mainstream opinions are summarised in the ensuing sections.

### **Upstairs Bars**

6. Local community leaders and residents, as well as individual members of the catering industry, recognised that upstairs bars bore a higher risk in respect of public safety and public order, and supported the tightening of regulation. Some respondents opined that the current licensing and enforcement regime was not able to satisfactorily address the concerns of residents affected by liquor-licensed premises nearby.

7. Some District Council members considered that bars should not be allowed in the vicinity of residential zones so as to avoid nuisances to the nearby residents. Bars should also not be allowed to co-exist with residence in the same building. The opening hours of these premises should also be restricted. More resources should be deployed by the Government to enforce the licensing conditions under the liquor licence and to address residents' complaints against these premises.

8. The Liquor Licensing Board (LLB) also expressed concerns on the potential public safety risks of upstairs bars, and has been imposing necessary licensing conditions on upstairs bars to ensure better management when approving applications. LLB considered that tightening regulation of these premises was necessary. However, LLB also noted that introducing more stringent control measures might have implications on the operating costs of such liquor-licensed premises, and therefore suggested granting a grace period.

9. The trade, on the other hand, opposed to the proposals of imposing more stringent regulatory or legislative control on upstairs bars, as these measures would further increase the burden on the trade, which was already facing many regulations and difficulties (such as increasing rentals). Some trade members pointed out that nuisances and problems associated with liquor-licensed premises were often not caused by licensed premises but factors beyond the licensees' control (e.g. customers getting outside to smoke due to the smoking ban in indoor premises). Some crime problems related to unlicensed premises were also mistaken by local residents as problems of licensed premises. In their view, the existing liquor licensing regime was basically able to balance the trade's views and residents' concerns, and sufficient to handle different situations on a case-by-case basis.

10. On the specific measures proposed in Chapter 2, a number of trade members queried if it would be appropriate to limit the number of liquor-licensed premises in multi-storey buildings or refuse new licences for premises in buildings concurrently used for residential purposes or in high risk targeted buildings. They were concerned that investors, without knowing in advance the relevant limits applicable to individual buildings and premises, would suffer from losses if their applications for liquor licences were rejected because of the limits. Questions were also raised as to how the targeted buildings could be identified and how bars could be defined (e.g. whether bars would include upstairs nightclubs, karaoke establishments, etc.). Furthermore, trade members generally objected to applying a discount factor to reduce the maximum capacity of upstairs bars, as they believed that the current capacity limits worked out by Government departments should have taken into account all relevant factors to ensure safety.

11. They were, however, more receptive to LLB adopting appropriate criteria in assessing applications to address various issues relating to upstairs bars. Respondents from the trade and other sectors generally saw the factors set out in the consultation document (e.g. whether the building is located among densely populated blocks and if separate access exists in the building to cater for different user groups) as relevant considerations. Some trade members raised concerns about how such criteria would be applied in practice, such as whether the opening of a new education institution in a building would affect the licence renewal of a pre-existing bar in the same building; and whether the number of alcohol-related crimes and public nuisance reports in a building or a precinct should be considered in granting liquor licences.

12. Some respondents suggested that the criteria adopted by LLB in assessing applications, as well as information on districts, buildings and/or premises allowed for liquor licence applications, should be made available to the trade and the general public for information.

### **Advertising an Application**

13. The vast majority of respondents agreed that liquor licence applications could be advertised on the internet. Most trade members regarded this option as a feasible way to reduce administrative burden and cost. However, while there was no objection to posting internet advertisements, some respondents were of the view that newspaper advertisements should be retained as an alternate for the trade to choose.

### **Duration of a Licence**

14. The trade indicated strong support for the proposal to extend the licence period to a maximum of two years of those businesses with a good track record for at least two consecutive years. This was also supported by LLB. On the other hand, a few District Council members had reservation, worrying that an extended licence period might mean less control, more nuisance for a longer period of time.

15. Most respondents from the trade agreed with a mid-term review mechanism to examine the performance of the premises concerned when a certain number of complaints were received. Trade members considered that for premises without major problems or complaints, a mid-term review should not be mandatory and the extension of licence period should be granted automatically. Some also suggested that in conducting a mid-term review, the authority should not only look at the number of complaints received but also look into the nature and significance of those complaints.

### **Natural Person and Reserve Licensee**

16. Some trade members saw no reason for not licensing a body corporate. There was however support from other respondents, mainly local residents and District Council members, for maintaining the existing requirement that liquor licensees must be natural persons so as to maintain a clear legal responsibility. There was also another suggestion from some trade members of having more than one licensee per premises.

17. The proposed reserve licensee mechanism was unanimously supported by trade members and there were no strong views from other respondents. No mainstream views emerged on the practical aspects of the reserve licensee mechanism, i.e. the number of reserve licensee applications allowed during a licence period; whether or not more than one reserve licensee should be allowed for one liquor licence; and whether each person should be permitted to be the reserve licensee for more than one – and up to three – premises.

### **Classification of Licence**

18. Views were divided as to whether a statutory liquor licence classification system would be beneficial and practicable for Hong Kong. While some proposed classifying liquor licences by the business nature or operating hours of liquor-licensed premises, others considered such classification unnecessary. Generally speaking, there was not much elaboration by the advocates on how any classification model might work to bring substantial benefits to the public or the trade that would not be achievable under the existing licensing regime. Those not in favour of the idea, on the other hand, pointed out that as a wide range of liquor products was currently offered by liquor-licensed premises to their customers, introducing classification might bring about unnecessary business restrictions.

### **Other Views**

19. One point rather consistently raised during consultation with District Council members, and mentioned by some trade members, was that the relevant authorities should step up enforcement to ensure that liquor-licensed premises complied with their licensing conditions. The authorities should also take actions against unlicensed premises. Some respondents also suggested introducing a demerit point system for liquor-licensed premises. Some also expressed concerns that LLB tended to be more sympathetic towards the trade than the local residents when considering liquor licence applications.

20. Some District Council members proposed that instead of (or on top of) imposing a limit on the number of liquor-licensed premises for a building, a similar limit should be set for a particular district especially a residential area. They considered that the Government should regulate the development and proliferation of bars by urban planning means, such as designating certain commercial areas for liquor-licensed premises.

## **Conclusion**

21. Based on the consultation outcome summarised above, the Food and Health Bureau, in consultation with LLB and other Government agencies, will decide on the way forward. In doing so, we will exercise prudence in balancing the views of various stakeholders in order to ensure that the proposals will meet the interests of the community as a whole.

**Food and Health Bureau**  
**November 2011**

## **Annexes**

Annex A – Summary of Trade Consultation Forums

Annex B – Summary of Views by the Retail and Tourism Committee of the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce

Annex C – Minutes of relevant District Council meetings:

- (a) Wan Chai District Council meeting on 19 July 2011  
(*relevant extract, Chinese only*)
- (b) Yau Tsim Mong District Council Food and Environmental Hygiene Committee meeting on 21 July 2011  
(*relevant extract, Chinese only*)
- (c) Central and Western District Council meeting on 28 July 2011  
(*relevant extract, Chinese only*)

Annex D – List of Written Submissions Received

## **Public Consultation on the Review of Liquor Licensing Summary of Trade Consultation Forums**

### **Background**

As part of the public consultation on the review of liquor licensing, the Administration organised two forums in August 2011 to gauge the views of the trade on issues set out in the consultation document published on 13 July 2011.

2. Trade organisations and liquor licence holders were invited to the forums by letters issued by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department. The first forum, held on 15 August 2011 in Hong Kong Science Museum, was attended by some 210 participants. The second one, held on 27 August 2011 in Hong Kong Central Library, had around 40 attendees.

3. Apart from the two forums, Government officials joined a trade consultation meeting on 22 August 2011 convened by The Honourable Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, Legislative Council Member of the Catering Functional Constituency.

### **Views of the Trade**

4. The ensuing paragraphs provide a summary of views expressed by trade representatives attending the consultation forums/meeting.

#### *Upstairs Bars (Chapter 2 of the consultation document)*

5. Participants generally disagreed that liquor-licensed premises including upstairs bars should be subject to more stringent licensing controls. Common arguments and concerns raised included –

- (a) It was not clear how the Government would define the types of premises and buildings to be subject to more stringent control. For instance, if the Government intended to enhance regulation on upstairs bars, it should also consider whether the same



standards should apply to bars operating in basements, upstairs nightclubs, karaoke establishments, etc.

- (b) As regards the proposals to limit the number of liquor-licensed premises in multi-storey buildings or refuse to issue new licences in respect of certain buildings, some participants saw those as unfair to the trade and were concerned that investors/operators, without knowing in advance the relevant limits applicable to individual buildings and premises, would suffer from investment losses.
- (c) The Government should facilitate business but not increase the burden on the trade. Many trade members were already operating under difficulties due to reasons such as the ever increasing rent. Restricting upstairs bars would drive them out of business and push up rents of those premises available for liquor-licensed premises.
- (d) There appeared to be a lack of concrete evidence of correlation between liquor consumption and fire risk or the ability to escape during emergencies, hence no grounds for imposing a discount factor to reduce the maximum capacity of liquor-licensed premises. It would be unreasonable to impose upon the trade fire safety and environmental hygiene standards that were above normal and not applied to other sectors.
- (e) The existing liquor licensing regime was already able to balance the trade's needs and residents' concerns. There would be no need for change.
- (f) Nuisances and problems associated with liquor-licensed premises were often not caused by licensed premises. Some were the results of factors beyond the licensees' control (e.g. customers going outside to smoke due to smoking ban in indoor premises), and others, especially crimes, were caused by unlicensed premises. The Government should enforce against unlicensed establishments instead of tightening control on law-abiding premises.

*Advertising an Application (Chapter 3 of the consultation document)*

6. A number of participants agreed that posting liquor licence application advertisements on the internet should be allowed, although some suggested keeping newspaper advertisements especially for those who were not familiar with electronic means.

*Duration of a Licence (Chapter 4 of the consultation document)*

7. Participants largely agreed with the proposal to extend the licence period to a maximum of two years for businesses with a good track record. Some suggested that the licence renewal process should be further streamlined.

*Natural Person and Reserve Licensee (Chapter 5 of the consultation document)*

8. Some participants expressed that the Government should consider granting liquor licences to corporations or allowing for more than one licensee per premises.

9. Participants generally agreed with the proposal to introduce a reserve licensee mechanism. There was also a suggestion to allow a reserve licensee to act as a deputy licensee or licensee's representative, taking up the role of a licensee temporarily absent. Some participants noted that it was unreasonable to require a liquor licensee, without a deputy or alternate, to be supervising his/her premises all the time.

*Classification of Licence (Chapter 6 of the consultation document)*

10. Participants had diverse views on whether a statutory liquor licence classification system would suit Hong Kong's situation. While some proposed classifying licences by the business nature or operating hours of premises, others considered such classification unnecessary.

Food and Health Bureau  
September 2011

**Summary of Views by the Retail and Tourism Committee  
of the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce (HKGCC)  
on Review of Liquor Licensing**

Date of Meeting: 14 September 2011

Time: 9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Place: Chamber Boardroom, 22/F United Centre, 95  
Queensway, Hong Kong

- Attendance:
- Retail and Tourism Committee, HKGCC:
    1. Mr Roy NG (Star Lite (HK) Limited) - Chairman
    2. Ms Sylvia CHUNG (L'Hotel Management Co. Ltd.)
    3. Mr Frank K T LEE (Tom Lee Music Co. Ltd.)
    4. Mr Glenn Smith (Sims Trading Co. Ltd.)
    5. Mr Ronald LAM (Cathay Pacific Airways Ltd.)
    6. Mr Peter Johnston (A.S. Watson Group)
    7. Mr Michael R A Duck (UBM Asia Ltd.)
    8. Mr Michael H Hobson (Mandarin Oriental Hotel Group Ltd.)
    9. Ms Shirley YUEN, CEO, HKGCC
    10. Ms Charlotte CHOW, Senior Manager, HKGCC
  - Government representatives:
    1. Mr Kevin YEUNG, Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Food) 1, Food and Health Bureau
    2. Mr LAM Wing-hong, Senior Superintendent (Licensing), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Summary of comments raised by members of the HKGCC Retail and Tourism Committee:

- When considering the measures to tighten the control over upstairs bars, the government should strike a balance between the interest of the trade and the public.
- Particular attention should be paid to those upstairs bars located in buildings with only one single staircase.
- Public safety should be the main concern. The government should take into consideration the capacity limit of the buildings where upstairs bars were located.
- The government would need to have a mechanism to deal with objections from the public, even some possibly from trade competitors, if internet applications were allowed in future.
- There should be very few upstairs bars located in a residential building.
- There was a market demand for upstairs bars. The lower price charged by the upstairs bars appealed to many consumers, especially the younger generation.
- There was a problem of under-age drinking in upstairs bars, especially during school holidays. Illegal drugs might also be a problem at these premises. It was more difficult for the police to deal with upstairs bars than those bars situated at street level.
- Convenience stores were also another major source of supply of liquor to people under 18 years of age.
- A longer licence period, say five years, was supported for the licensed premises in hotels.

- Problems arising from consumption of liquor were not limited to upstairs bars. The number of upstairs bars increased because of the limited supply of and higher rent for premises at street level. There had been lots of complaints against upstairs bars in Mongkok. It was understandable that the government would like to have better control over them.
- Any additional control measures should be risk-based. A longer duration of liquor licence for those premises, such as restaurants, with lower risk was supported. Internet advertisement as an option for advertisement was also supported because it was difficult to find information on application for liquor licence in a newspaper.
- As one person could only hold one liquor licence, it was common for a business to nominate an employee, e.g. a chef, to be the liquor licensee. The government should consider whether it was necessary to maintain the requirement of “natural person” as licensee, especially for low-risk establishments like restaurants. A limited company was already allowed to be the holder of a restaurant licence.
- There were more problems, such as crime, smoking, etc. associated with upstairs bars and government should consider tightening up the control over them.

Food and Health Bureau  
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department  
September 2011

**香港特別行政區  
第三屆灣仔區議會  
第二十三次會議記錄**

日期：二〇一一年七月十九日(星期二)  
時間：下午二時三十分  
地點：香港軒尼詩道130號修頓中心21樓灣仔區議會會議室

**出席者**

**主席**

孫啓昌議員, BBS, MH, JP

**副主席**

吳錦津議員, MH, JP

**區議員(依筆劃序)**

伍婉婷議員  
李均頤議員  
李碧儀議員  
邱浩波議員, BBS, MH, JP  
麥國風議員  
黃宏泰議員, MH  
黃楚峰議員  
黎大偉議員  
鄭其建議員  
鄭琴淵議員, BBS, MH  
鍾嘉敏議員  
蕭志雄議員

### 核心政府部門代表

陸綺華女士, JP	民政事務總署灣仔民政事務專員
黃佩心女士	民政事務總署灣仔民政事務助理專員
吳慧鈞女士	民政事務總署灣仔民政事務候任助理專員
陳小萍女士	民政事務總署灣仔民政事務處高級聯絡主任
廖志偉先生	食物環境衛生署灣仔區環境衛生總監
林曼茜女士	香港警務處灣仔警區指揮官
唐思敏女士	香港警務處灣仔區警民關係主任
楊秀婷女士	運輸署總運輸主任(港島)
陳本標先生	土木工程拓展署總工程師
孔得泉先生	康樂及文化事務署灣仔區康樂事務經理
沃郭麗心女士	社會福利署東區及灣仔區福利專員
鄒敏兒女士	地政總署地政專員(港島東區地政處)

### 其他政府部門及機構代表

馬利德先生, JP	水務署署長	出席議程第1項
吳孟冬先生, JP	水務署助理署長(發展科)	
江覺靜先生	水務署總工程師(顧問工程管理)	
楊錫駒先生	水務署總工程師(香港及離島區)	
林文鵬先生	水務署總工程師(客戶服務)	
梁卓偉教授, JP	食物及衛生局副局長	出席議程第3項
楊潤雄先生	食物及衛生局首席助理秘書長(食物)	
陳智遠先生	食物及衛生局局長政治助理	
林永康先生	食物環境衛生署高級總監(牌照)	
許曉暉女士, JP	民政事務局副局長	出席議程第4項
林達賢醫生	醫院管理局律敦治及鄧肇堅醫院及東華東院行政總監	出席議程第5項
鄭慧敏女士	醫院管理局律敦治及鄧肇堅醫院高級院務經理	

負責人

年。雖然署方預期在二零二零年前，本港仍無須進行海水化淡，但適宜居安思危，預先進行前期規劃工作。

(vi) 東江水質

署方在東江水第一接收點木湖抽水站，設有 24 小時監察系統，而內地亦恆常提供相關數據。水質事務諮詢委員會由何建宗教授擔任主席，聯同委員會的專業委員向署方提供意見，監察供港水質。此外，署方與廣東省設有緊密的通報機制，由吳孟冬先生負責，以專線聯繫，通報污染事故，確保東江水的水質不受污染。

(vii) 節約用水

署方考慮推出「節水名人堂語錄」，請各區議會主席和議員牽頭，提出節約用水的好主意，上載水務署網站，使推廣節約用水的信息更加鏗鏘有聲。此外，署方會在本年九月十八日的「世界水監測日」，舉辦「節約用水 戶戶相傳」活動。由於在家庭節約用水方面，家庭傭工有相當重要的角色，署方會使用多國語言印製宣傳單張，例如泰文、印尼文和菲律賓文，呼籲家傭節約用水，內容亦會關顧到主僕的良好關係。

14. 主席補充說，水務署的工作範圍廣泛，計劃項目繁多，難以一一盡述，建議馬署長日後邀請議員參觀水務署，屆時再作詳盡交流。

15. 主席多謝馬署長出席會議。

**第 2 項：通過會議記錄**

16. 主席請議員參閱呈於席上附錄甲的修訂建議。由於席上沒有其他修訂，遂由鍾嘉敏議員動議，邱浩波議員和議，通過第二十二次會議記錄。

**討論事項**

**第 3 項：酒牌制度檢討的公眾諮詢  
(灣仔區議會文件第 72/2011 號)**

十八



負責人

17. 主席歡迎食物及衛生局副局長梁卓偉教授、首席助理秘書長(食物)楊潤雄先生、局長政治助理陳智遠先生及食物環境衛生署高級總監(牌照)林永康先生出席會議。

18. 梁副局長表示，政府已在數月前就同一議題諮詢灣仔區議會，議員提出的意見已納入諮詢文件內。諮詢文件的重點如下：

**(a) 樓上酒吧**

諮詢文件提出是否應就設於多層大廈內的樓上酒吧數目、新牌照的審批和酒吧可容納的人數上限等事宜訂立準則。在施加可容納人數上限時，建議除參照有關部門的安全走火規定，亦可考慮顧客受酒精影響下的行為而調低可容納的人數，並就此提供概括指引供酒牌局考慮，以便酒牌局作出決策。

**(b) 牌照有效期**

因應財政司司長辦公室轄下方便營商委員會成員以及業界的建議，考慮把經營記錄良好的持牌處所牌照有效期延長至最長兩年。

**(c) 自然人及後備持牌人**

政府聽取議員在上次諮詢時提出的意見，認為不應放寬持牌人必須是自然人而非公司的規定，以確保持牌人有清晰的法律責任。政府認同社會整體利益應大於方便營商的考慮，有鑑於罪案問題、執法工作和警方的關注，政府同意議員的意見，維持持牌人必須是自然人的要求。至於業界不希望勞資糾紛影響酒吧的經營，政府接納業界的意見，正研究推行後備持牌人制度，據悉議員對此亦無異議。

**(d) 牌照分類**

政府得悉議員的意見，認為把持牌處所分類會難於監管，居民亦較難作出投訴。現時把所有酒牌統歸一類的做法較為簡潔，建議可沿用簡單而有利直接監管的做法，維持清晰的投訴渠道。

十九

25/06/2019 (04版 1)

**(e) 刊登申請公告**

有投訴指酒牌局雖然透過民政事務處和區議會就酒牌申請進行諮詢，但未能尊重反對的意見而仍然批出酒牌。這是諮詢渠道的問題，抑或是審批政策的問題，希望議員提出意見，讓局方和民政事務處可作改善。

**19. 鄭琴淵議員提出以下意見：**

- (i) 應更嚴格規管樓上酒吧的發牌制度，居民認為樓上酒吧的售酒時間應規限在十一時前。
- (ii) 現時刊登公告的規定應該維持，不應放寬。
- (iii) 牌照有效期定為一年仍屬過長，應考慮發出有效期為三個月或六個月的牌照。至於應否把某些酒牌的有效期延長至最長兩年，則須視乎個別情況而定，不可一概而論。不過，樓上酒吧的牌照有效期不應超過一年，可試行發出有效期為六個月的牌照。
- (iv) 不應容許法團或團體出任持牌人，亦無須設立後備持牌人，否則，可能出現一名後備持牌人管理多家酒吧的情況。
- (v) 酒牌無須分類，本港的情況不可與其他地方相提並論。
- (vi) 根據諮詢文件第 43 頁所載，樓上酒吧的數目雖然減少了，但罪案數目卻增加了，情況值得關注。
- (vii) 關於樓上酒吧的問題，業界與居民的分歧愈來愈大。業界未有聆聽居民的心聲，聲稱享有權益，但居民更享有權益，居民早在酒吧開業前已居於樓宇內，應受法例保障而不受酒吧滋擾。舉例來說，香港大球場曾舉辦音樂會，但因附近居民提出噪音投訴而遭政府發出禁令。長遠來說，支持業界爭取設立酒吧區。

20. 李碧儀議員提出以下意見和問題：

- (i) 不同意把酒牌的有效期限延長至最長兩年。
- (ii) 諮詢文件第 2.15 段第(b)(iv)項提及的“折扣系數”由何人釐定？理據為何？
- (iii) 關於監管問題，酒牌局致力在不同牌照上附加發牌條件，例如十一時後不得售酒、不得營業或須把場地“密封”等，以免擾民。政府如何針對這些附加條件執行監管措施？
- (iv) 很多地舖酒吧把桌椅擺放在街道上，大批顧客在街上談天喝酒，希望諮詢文件涵蓋這方面的問題。

21. 黃楚峰議員提出以下意見和問題：

- (i) 位於灣仔區商住大廈地舖的酒吧數目愈來愈多，諮詢文件亦有論及應否在人口密集的住宅區設定更嚴格的限制，不過，區議員提出的反對意見往往不被接納。
- (ii) 正如諮詢文件第 3.2 段所述，當局審批酒牌申請時，只會諮詢居民組織、區議員和酒吧所在樓宇的業主立案法團，但附近大廈的法團通常並不知情，要待酒吧開業才知悉此事。有些舊區的樓宇沒有設立業主立案法團，政府可否在申請開業的酒吧所在樓宇附近張貼建議的告示？
- (iii) 居民和區議員接受諮詢時對酒牌申請提出的反對意見，往往遭酒牌局漠視和否決。如何令居民的意見更受重視才是這次檢討工作的重點，現時的酒牌制度優待申請人和持牌人，並不重視居民的意見。

22. 李均願議員提出以下意見：

- (i) 不同意把酒牌批予不設獨立通道供商業處所使用的商住大廈，以免顧客滋擾居民。在這類多層大廈內領有酒牌的處所，佔大廈樓面總面積的百分比應為零。
- (ii) 根據去年的數字，領有酒牌處所的總數約為 5 800 個，其中

二十

433 個為樓上酒吧，佔總數百分之 7，但在樓上酒吧發生的罪案數字，則佔罪案總數百分之 11。可見樓上酒吧的罪案率較地舖酒吧為高，而且罪案涉及強姦、非禮和襲擊。因此，政府不應繼續向商住大廈的樓上酒吧批出酒牌。

- (iii) 同意酒牌的有效期不應延長至最長兩年，以免出現大量有關滋擾和噪音的投訴，為議員和地區工作者帶來巨大壓力。希望酒牌的有效期維持一年，與新加坡的做法一樣。

23. 伍婉婷議員提出以下意見和問題：

- (i) 同意樓上酒吧帶來的嚴重罪案和公眾滋擾問題，備受關注和重視。因此，制訂嚴謹的發牌制度十分重要。
- (ii) 把酒牌有效期延長至最長兩年的建議，為市民服務的人士大多不會接受。有些經營妥善的酒吧，在開業兩三年後便轉變經營模式，因此，酒牌的有效期必須嚴謹處理。
- (iii) 酒牌申請的諮詢工作應該更加多元化，讓更多市民參與。現時的酒牌申請諮詢期極短，往往只有一星期，議員即使要求延長一星期，以便向市民發出一人一信，市民仍難有足夠時間了解情況。日後可否由酒牌局向市民發信或進行網上諮詢？
- (iv) 持有酒牌的處所如位於住宅大廈羣中的商業大廈內，對附近的住宅大廈會造成極大滋擾，這類情況在銅鑼灣十分常見，但諮詢文件並無涵蓋這方面的問題。另一方面，諮詢文件未有詳細列明向同一幢商業大廈批出的酒牌數目，應否作出規限，以免大量顧客同一時間離開時爭用電梯等設施而發生衝突。
- (v) 同意酒牌的持牌人須為一名自然人，持有酒牌的處所不得設立多於一名後備持牌人，一名後備持牌人不得同時管理多於一個持有酒牌的處所，以確保處所的安全。

24. 鍾嘉敏議員提出以下意見和問題：

- (i) 不同意設立後備持牌人。
- (ii) 希望酒牌的有效期限為半年以內，然後再作諮詢。
- (iii) 同意保留在報章刊登申請公告的規定，亦可在網上同時上載公告，兩者並行。
- (iv) 對酒吧的監管宜嚴不宜鬆，因為酒吧的顧客大多受酒精影響，會造成的問題難以估計。
- (v) 樓上酒吧通常在未領有民政事務局發出的會所牌照前，便已申請酒牌，並獲酒牌局批出酒牌，情況令人擔心。政府應嚴格規定已領取民政事務局會所牌照的處所，才可申請酒牌，因為當局審批會所牌照時會考慮大廈的電梯、走火通道和出入口等問題。
- (vi) 現時的審批酒牌程序包括傳閱文件的方式，情況令人擔憂，因為酒牌局成員未必能充分表達意見。政府會否繼續使用傳閱文件的方式？

25. 麥國風議員提出以下意見：

- (i) 政府應停止向樓上酒吧批出酒牌，灣仔和銅鑼灣區的樓宇大多只設一條樓梯，一旦發生意外，情況令人十分擔心。基於現時的高風險情況，不應再向樓上酒吧批出酒牌。
- (ii) 欣賞現時很多食肆設有衛生經理的制度，負責人的酒牌持牌人應恪守環境、衛生、安全和執法規定。政府應考慮對持牌人制訂更嚴格的要求，因為酒吧的顧客受酒精影響，一旦發生事故，後果堪虞。

26. 鄭其建議員提出以下意見和問題：

- (i) 贊成議員對管制售酒時間的建議。樓上酒吧的顧客大多為年青男女，如容許酒吧營業至深夜時分，亦即鼓勵年青人夜不歸家，流連街頭。政府應肩負保護青少年的社會責任。

負責人

- (ii) 酒吧附近如有民居，不管制售酒時間便會滋擾居民。酒吧如設在工廠大廈區和商業大廈區，即使通宵營業，亦不會遭人反對，但設在民居附近，則會造成極大滋擾，對居民十分不公平。
  - (iii) 關於維護業界權益的問題，敢問醉酒駕駛者的權益是否需要維護？醉酒鬧事者的權益是否需要維護？希望業界在爭取盈利之餘，也顧及社會良心。
27. 邱浩波議員申報他是酒牌局主席，並以灣仔區議員的身分提出以下意見：
- (i) 應維持整個發牌制度的精神，基本的原則是，持牌人須肩負法律責任，而社會治安亦不應受影響。
  - (ii) 現時的自然人制度有助政府在持牌處所有效執法和維持治安。
  - (iii) 樓上酒吧的情況令人擔憂，尤其是走火通道等問題。諮詢文件提及的折扣系數和安全限度，需要詳加考慮。至於酒牌處所的數目佔樓面總面積的百分比，則須由專家釐定，然後再作商討。
  - (iv) 贊成諮詢文件第 7.1 段(b)項所列有關樓上酒吧的管制措施。
  - (v) 實施室內禁煙條例導致很多顧客在酒吧外吸煙，喧嘩吵鬧。酒吧停止營業後仍有很多顧客聚集在酒吧外，對附近民居造成極大滋擾。如何加強執法和加以處理，的確是嚴重問題。
28. 黎大偉議員表示，諮詢文件提及的英國、美國加州和新加坡，皆沒有出現樓上酒吧的現象。美國的酒吧大多設有保安人員，負責驅逐滋事份子。不過，樓上酒吧的滋事顧客即使被驅趕，亦可能留在大廈走廊中繼續滋事，影響居民。因此，每幢大廈的酒牌處所數目佔樓面總面積的百分比，只可介乎 15 至 20%之間。如樓上酒吧位於商住大廈而附近有民居，則百分比應為零。他與所有議員的意見一致，贊成對

二十四

樓上酒吧嚴加管制。

29. 蕭志雄議員指出，醉酒者在街頭如不滋事，並不犯罪，但醉酒駕駛者如不能通過酒精測試，便會即時被補。本港最近發生多宗醉酒者毆打的士司機和途人的事件，如容許顧客喝酒至凌晨四、五時，可能發生更多類似事件。新加坡只容許酒吧營業至晚上十二時，本港很多酒吧申請營業至凌晨二時，甚至凌晨四時，情況十分奇特。希望政府管制售酒的時間。

30. 梁副局長的回應如下：

(i) 售酒時間

即使酒牌定有售酒時間，顧客仍可在售酒時間結束前大量點酒，留待其後飲用。因此，社會風氣和文化是重要因素，或須透過政府和民間團體長遠進行深化工作。政府推行的政策，均須獲不同羣組包括本地人士、外籍人士以致遊客的支持。

(ii) 酒牌申請的諮詢工作

就有議員擔心酒牌局在審批酒牌時有否採納諮詢所得的意見，酒牌局是法定的獨立機構，要依法行事，審批酒牌的工作不受任何人士干預但受法例所限。如要修改法例以改變酒牌局審批申請的準則，則必須平衡各方利益。

香港地少人多，要把酒吧滋擾居民的程度降低至零，並不可能，而要作出合理、合情、合法的取捨，亦不容易。較早前規劃署表示將來的新發展規劃會避免出現商住混合區，但有報章輿論、城市規劃團體和文化組織等表示，不贊成嚴格劃分商業和住宅區，以免失去城市生態。因此，局方明白，如有關問題進入立法層面，定必會有不同的意見。

(iii) 方便營商

方便營商並非要把香港變為“酒吧港”，但紐約、倫敦、香港等大城市必定有酒吧和多姿多采的夜生活。如何減少酒吧對居民的滋擾，才是問題所在。審批酒牌的諮詢架構必須穩健，程序公義必須清晰可見，亦即市民的意見必須能上達決策當

負責人

局，當局必須在平衡各方利益後制定最為人接受的方案。而法例亦清楚顯示，公眾利益凌駕其他方面的利益。

關於現時收集意見的渠道是否足夠、可否增設網上諮詢、當局收集意見後如何透過各區民政事務處轉交酒牌局等事宜，諮詢文件亦有論及，局方聽取議員的意見後，會加以改善。

有些商住樓宇礙於結構所限，無法為酒吧設置獨立出入口或避免酒吧顧客去到附近的地方造成滋擾。本港實施室內禁煙條例後，很多市民在街上吸煙，很多顧客亦在酒吧門外的街上吸煙。根據其他先進國家的經驗，開設吸煙室的做法並不可行。有些國家的法例規定，吸煙者不得在距離民居一定範圍內吸煙，是可行的辦法。這項措施可收一石二鳥之效，能同時解決酒吧衍生的問題和日間途人吸煙問題。希望支持這項措施的議員，積極提交意見，讓局方可提交立法會審議。

(iv) 牌照有效期

把酒牌有效期延長至最長兩年的建議，目的是向酒牌局提供彈性，並非必然發出兩年的酒牌。這項措施可獎勵妥善經營者，使他們因獲批較長有效期的酒牌而擁有經營優勢(例如業主較樂意把地方租予獲批較長酒牌者)，並讓市場淘汰管理不善的處所。

(v) 折扣系數

諮詢文件的建議，旨在引發討論，凝聚共識，如有足夠的民意支持，則可基於公眾利益實施有關建議，減低日後遭司法覆核的機會。希望議員轉達更多民意，並提出針對不同情況的建議折扣系數，以便局方推行進一步工作。

31. 主席補充說，上次諮詢工作極有成效，諮詢文件反映了不少議員提出的意見。相信議員在會議席上提出的意見和其後的書面意見，皆有助是次酒牌檢討工作。

32. 主席多謝梁副局長出席會議。



**2008 至 2011 年度油尖旺區議會  
食物及環境衛生委員會  
第二十一次會議記錄**

---

日期：2011 年 7 月 21 日(星期四)

時間：下午 2 時 30 分

地點：九龍旺角聯運街 30 號  
旺角政府合署 4 樓  
油尖旺區議會會議室

**出席者：**

主席

楊子熙先生

副主席

陳偉強先生

區議員

鍾港武先生, JP

林浩揚先生

陳文佑先生

陳少棠先生, MH

黃舒明女士

仇振輝先生, BBS, JP

許德亮先生

侯永昌先生, MH

孔昭華先生

葉傲冬先生

關秀玲女士

羅永祥博士

蔡少峰先生

梁偉權先生, JP

莊永燦先生

吳萬強先生, BBS, MH

增選委員

徐偉雄先生

林惠龍女士

劉廣海先生

劉柏祺先生

吳湛森先生

曾 生先生

王華斌先生

朱潔嫻女士

吳錦芳先生

政府部門代表

陳漢光先生 旺角區環境衛生總監

龐國基先生 油尖區環境衛生總監

食物環境衛生署

食物環境衛生署

陸國寶先生	總產業主任/九龍	地政總署
黎家賢先生	油尖旺區副康樂事務經理	康樂及文化事務署
楊泉清先生	高級環境保護主任(區域東)1	環境保護署
莫文威先生	旺角警區行動組警長	香港警務處
黃耀先生	油尖區警民關係組警長	香港警務處
廖淑華女士	油尖旺民政事務處 高級行政主任(地區管理)	民政事務總署

#### 秘書

吳思冲先生	油尖旺民政事務處 行政主任(區議會)3	民政事務總署
-------	------------------------	--------

#### **列席者：**

梁卓偉教授, JP	食物及衛生局副局長	食物及衛生局
楊潤雄先生	首席助理秘書長(食物)1	食物及衛生局
陳智遠先生	食物及衛生局局長政治助理	食物及衛生局
林永康先生	高級總監(牌照)	食物環境衛生署
劉敏華先生	一級海事督察	海事處
黎志遠先生	高級產業主任/土地管制/ 九龍中	地政總署
黃國進先生	九龍城及油尖旺區 助理福利專員 2	社會福利署
趙文軒先生	署理油尖旺民政事務專員	民政事務總署

#### **缺席者：**

高寶齡女士, BBS, MH, JP      區議員

#### 開會詞

楊子熙主席歡迎各委員和政府部門代表出席會議。他報告：

- (i) 警務處油尖區警民關係主任簡慕恒先生因事缺席，由油尖區警民關係組警長黃耀先生代替參與會議。

- (ii) 警務處旺角區高級督察(行動)陳金平先生因事缺席，由旺角警區行動組警長莫文威先生代為參加會議。
- (iii) 高寶齡議員因事請假。

#### **議程一：通過第二十次會議記錄**

2. 第二十次會議記錄擬稿發出後，並無收到任何修訂建議，上次會議記錄獲得通過。

#### **議程二：關注油尖旺區樓上酒吧問題 (油尖旺食物及環境衛生委員會 32/2011 號文件)**

3. 楊子熙主席介紹參與討論的代表：
- (i) 食物及衛生局(“食衛局”)副局長梁卓偉教授；
  - (ii) 食衛局首席助理秘書長(食物)I 楊潤雄先生；
  - (iii) 食衛局局長政治助理陳智遠先生；
  - (iv) 食物環境衛生署(“食環署”)高級總監(牌照)林永康先生；
  - (v) 署理油尖旺民政事務專員趙文軒先生；
  - (vi) 警務處旺角警區行動組警長莫文威先生；以及
  - (vii) 警務處油尖警區警民關係組警長黃耀先生。

----- 他表示酒牌局及市政服務上訴委員會的書面回覆(附件一及二)已傳真給各委員備閱。

4. 梁卓偉教授感謝提呈文件的委員關注酒牌制度，他就文件中的提問及酒牌制度檢討公眾諮詢文件的內容提出下列各點：

- (i) 油尖旺區為本港的酒吧集中地，故他非常重視委員對於樓上酒吧(“樓上吧”)的意見。
- (ii) 商住大廈內的酒吧或會對居民造成滋擾，油尖旺區人煙稠密，樓上吧縱然在商業大廈內營運，仍可能對附近居民構成不便。

- (iii) 當局十分關注樓上吧的走火安全。現時屋宇署計算樓上吧可容納人數上限時，並沒有特別考慮顧客在酒精影響下的逃生風險。他請委員考慮提供意見，是否需為樓上吧可容納人數上限訂定劃一的折扣系數，或根據不同樓宇的走火風險就可容納人數訂立不同的折扣系數。
- (iv) 樓上吧涉及的罪案及執法問題相對較多。諮詢文件第四章探討可就風險不同的持牌處所設不同的酒牌有效期，特別是考慮給予記錄良好的處所最長有效期兩年的酒牌，讓它們在市場競爭上有優勢。
- (v) 請委員表達是否贊成維持酒牌持牌人必須為自然人的規定，並容許有後備持牌人的機制。
- (vi) 請委員就刊登酒牌申請公告及酒牌局收集地區人士意見的方法，提出意見。
- (vii) 當局初步認為把酒牌或持牌處所分類的做法不太可行，但仍會繼續聽取委員的意見。

(陳偉強議員於下午 2 時 38 分到席。)

(孔昭華議員於下午 2 時 39 分到席。)

(仇振輝議員於下午 2 時 42 分到席。)

(關秀玲議員及葉傲冬議員於下午 2 時 46 分到席。)

(仇振輝議員於下午 2 時 47 分到席。)

5. 黃耀先生表示，酒牌局每當收到新的酒牌申請，均會請警方從治安角度提供意見。警方會就公共安全(即同一樓宇內的樓上吧不應超出合理的數目)、公眾利益(附近涉及酒吧罪案的數量和嚴重性)及對附近社區的影響三方面，給予酒牌局意見。在過去 12 個月，油尖區共發生 169 宗涉及樓上吧的罪案，八成以上為傷人、毒品和盜竊案。鑑於油尖區有不少樓上吧，油尖警區特設巡查機制，按每間酒吧過去發生罪案的次數、頻率和嚴重性，把酒牌場所分成數個等級，按不同等級，調派不同警力進行巡查。在長假期時，警方亦會在油尖區內進行反罪案宣傳活動，以減少罪案發生。

(莊永燦議員、吳湛森先生及劉柏祺先生於下午 2 時 49 分到席。)

6. 莫文威先生表示，旺角警區針對樓上吧的巡查工作，與油尖警區大致相同。根據截至今年 6 月 30 日的數字，旺角區有 21 間樓上吧。由去年 6 月至今年 6 月，旺角警區接獲舉報而處理的酒吧事件 66 宗，其中 17 宗的個案需由刑事偵緝調查組跟進調查，包括 9 宗盜竊案及 7 宗毆打案。旺角警區會因應需要，針對不同酒吧進行不同程度的巡查。在上述期內，警方對旺角區內的 21 間樓上吧進行了超過 400 次巡查，以防罪案發生。

7. 侯永昌議員贊同向表現較好的酒吧發出有效期較長的酒牌；容許酒吧有後備持牌人；以及酒吧及酒牌不作分類。他並希望當局能簡化酒牌申請程序。

8. 關秀玲議員提出一個案例，指某大廈 1 至 15 樓的商戶都能成功申請酒牌，但隨後 16 樓的商戶申請酒牌被拒，反而之後申請的 17 樓商戶卻獲發酒牌。就此，她希望酒牌局檢討發牌機制。她另外建議酒牌局在發牌時，應規定酒吧須設有阻隔噪音的設備。

9. 吳萬強議員表示，保護社區利益較締造良好的營商環境更為重要。他認為酒吧所在的處所，是發牌時需考慮的一個重要因素。他並且指出除了互聯網，亦可以傳統的方式刊登酒牌申請公告，讓公眾備悉有關申請。他又認為把酒牌有效期延長至兩年屬可行建議，但須設中期檢討機制。此外，他贊同限制持牌人為自然人，並建議把酒牌分為兩類，一類只限供應啤酒、紅酒或餐酒，另一類可供應烈酒。

10. 梁偉權議員表示，很多樓上吧違反大廈公契或佔用公共空間營業。此外，樓上吧的顧客年紀有下降趨勢，故樓上吧的青少年罪案問題亦值得關注。

11. 陳少棠議員希望當局規定酒牌局在審批酒牌申請時，能參照屋宇署和消防處的意見，並切實考慮地區人士的看法。他另建議當局對酒牌持牌人實行記分制，在記滿一定分數後，即行吊銷酒牌。

(陳文佑議員於下午 3 時 07 分到席。)

12. 葉傲冬議員促請當局在審批酒牌申請時，重視當區人士的意見。此外，他讚揚警方在巡查和監管酒吧方面的工作表現。

13. 許德亮議員認為酒牌局在發牌時，未有理會當區人士的意見。他建議酒牌局必須在屋宇署和消防處對樓宇的結構和走火安全作出評估後，才批出酒牌。

14. 梁卓偉教授表示，酒牌局是獨立的法定機構，並不隸屬食衛局，若委員對酒牌局有意見，相信可透過區議會秘書處反映。

15. 羅永祥博士表示，酒牌局雖是獨立組織，但仍須根據食衛局訂下的條件發牌。他對於諮詢文件沒有提出方法解決酒吧滋擾民居問題感到失望，並認為不應向民居附近的店鋪批出酒牌，以免擾民。

16. 陳偉強議員憂慮當局收緊酒牌發牌條件，會迫令部分經營者轉為無牌賣酒。他又擔心當局未有措施和足夠資源監管無牌酒吧。

17. 林惠龍女士認為酒牌局在審批酒牌申請時，應考慮大廈法團的意見。

18. 鍾港武議員認為酒牌的發牌條件宜緊不宜鬆，對於商住大廈，發牌條件更應收緊。他又表示，不宜就單梯樓宇批出酒牌，而在審核發牌申請時，亦需重點考慮樓宇的走火措施是否足夠。此外，治安問題同樣重要。

19. 陳文佑議員表示，很多樓上食肆只領有一般會所牌照，未受嚴格法例監管。他亦不滿即使公契列明不能在大廈內經營酒吧，當局依然向樓上吧發出酒牌。

20. 楊子熙主席認為當局不應就設於商住樓宇及鄰近民居或安老院的大廈的店鋪發出酒牌。

21. 梁卓偉教授回應如下：

(i) 重申酒牌局是法定的獨立機構，食衛局不能和

不應該以政策或行政手段干預酒牌局的獨立運作和決策。如酒牌局按現行法例運作仍有不善之處，考慮修訂法例才是正確的解決辦法，而非由政策局以行政手段干預。

- (ii) 當局十分關注走火安全問題。此所以即使消防處在這方面已擔當把關的角色並有非常嚴格的走火要求，食衛局仍在諮詢文件中提出為樓上吧訂立「安全限度」，減低現時處所可容納的人數，以提高走火安全。如有足夠的民意支持，政府可就此措施提供指引予酒牌局考慮，但發牌事宜最終仍屬酒牌局的決定。
- (iii) 大廈公契是同一大廈業主之間訂立的合約。公契是否容許在大廈內經營酒吧，是酒牌局考慮的因素之一。
- (iv) 有關個別個案，委員可把細節告知食環署或酒牌局，以待直接跟進。

(林浩揚議員於下午 3 時 31 分到席。)

22. 莫文威先生澄清會所亦須申領酒牌，方可售賣酒精類飲品。

23. 莊永燦議員認為政府應嚴格規管商住樓宇內的樓上吧。他認為如公契不容許在大廈內經營酒吧，酒牌局便不應向樓上吧發牌。

24. 楊子熙主席表示，委員希望當局能在簽發酒牌方面設立新的條款或指引，以改善發牌情況。

25. 孔昭華議員請當局對露天餐飲區的酒吧亦作出監管。他另詢問當局在簽發酒牌時，會否考慮酒吧的經營狀況，並建議當局靈活制訂規則，禁止在某些地方經營酒吧。

26. 羅永祥議員認為食衛局並非不能影響酒牌局的運作，局方大可透過修法，促使酒牌局更認真審批酒牌申請。

27. 葉傲冬議員希望食衛局能為酒牌局訂出更仔細的指引，以便酒牌局在處理酒吧續牌申請，或在諮詢中遇到反對意見時，能按指引決定是否批出酒牌。

28. 林浩揚議員認為酒牌局應要求酒吧符合所有發牌條件，才批出牌照，而不是在遇到反對意見時，才拒絕發牌。

29. 劉廣海先生認為應針對酒吧加強巡查和訂立記分制度，而食衛局亦應向酒牌局發出更仔細的發牌指引。此外，政府亦應檢討處理酒牌續牌申請的考慮因素。

30. 陳文佑議員提出警方無法進入無牌酒吧巡查的問題。他又指出市政服務上訴委員會在處理續領酒牌個案時，判決過於寬鬆，建議民政事務處（“民政處”）考慮協助大廈法團提出上訴。

31. 楊子熙主席希望食衛局能聽取委員的意見，為酒牌局訂立新的發牌指引。他又呼籲酒牌局及市政服務上訴委員會加倍重視警方提出的意見，並建議酒牌局把投訴酒吧的人士或大廈法團的資料保密，以保障私隱。此外，某酒吧如過往曾涉及罪案，便不應再獲續牌。在刊登酒牌申請公告方面，他認為申請人亦應以通告或信函方式通知附近大廈業戶。

（蔡少峰議員於下午 3 時 55 分到席。）

32. 梁卓偉教授回應如下：

- (i) 政府在修訂法例以列明處理個別酒牌申請的細節之前，必須先得到社會的共識。酒牌局會視乎每宗個案的情況審批酒牌申請。
- (ii) 回應有委員關於巡查無牌酒吧的要求，政府必須考慮社會的整體意見，不宜賦予警方過度權力搜查任何場所。
- (iii) 認同可向酒牌局提供更仔細的指引參考，並會與有關部門商討加強執法。
- (iv) 會考慮向酒牌局投訴持牌處所者的私隱保障問題。

---

**議程三：再次關注西九文化區海傍躉船轉運站的運作**  
**（油尖旺食物及環境衛生委員會第 33/2011 號文件）**

---



中西區區議會  
第二十一次會議紀錄

日期：二〇一一年七月二十八日(星期四)

時間：下午十二時四十五分

地點：香港中環統一碼頭道 38 號

海港政府大樓 14 樓

中西區區議會會議室

出席者：

主席

陳特楚議員,BBS,MH,JP (下午 12 時 45 分至下午 3 時 06 分)

副主席

陳捷貴議員,JP\*

議員

陳財喜議員\*

陳學鋒議員\*

陳淑莊議員 (下午 12 時 50 分至下午 1 時 56 分、  
下午 3 時 04 分至下午 5 時 46 分及  
下午 6 時 51 分至下午 7 時 57 分 )

鄭麗琼議員\*

張翼雄議員 (下午 1 時 12 分至下午 7 時 11 分)

鍾蔭祥議員,MH,JP (下午 12 時 45 分至下午 4 時正及  
下午 6 時 08 分至下午 7 時 57 分 )

何俊麒議員 (下午 2 時 28 分至下午 7 時 57 分)

葉國謙議員,GBS,JP (下午 2 時 20 分至下午 5 時 11 分及  
下午 6 時 15 分至下午 7 時 57 分 )

甘乃威議員,MH (下午 12 時 46 分至下午 7 時 57 分)

李志恒議員 (下午 1 時 08 分至下午 7 時 57 分)

李應生議員,BBS,MH,JP (下午 1 時 05 分至下午 7 時 57 分)

盧懿杏議員 (下午 12 時 45 分至下午 5 時及  
下午 6 時 25 分至下午 7 時 57 分 )

文志華議員,MH\*

黃堅成議員\*

楊浩然議員 (下午 12 時 45 分至下午 3 時 03 分及  
下午 4 時 25 分至下午 7 時 25 分 )

葉永成議員,BBS,MH,JP\*

阮品強議員 (下午 1 時 52 分至下午 7 時 57 分)

註： \* 出席整個會議的議員

### 第 2 項

曾偉雄先生	香港警務處 處長
朱明寶總警司	香港警務處 西區指揮官
黃宏業總督察	香港警務處 西區警民關係主任
羅卓洪署理總警司	香港警務處 中區指揮官
賴孝光總督察	香港警務處 中區警民關係主任

### 第 3 項

梁卓偉教授,JP	食物及衛生局 副局長
楊潤雄先生	食物及衛生局 首席助理秘書長(食物)1
陳智遠先生	食物及衛生局 局長政治助理
林永康先生	食物環境衛生署 高級總監(牌照)

### 第 4 項

區載佳先生,JP	屋宇署 署長
陳慧明女士	屋宇署 總屋宇測量師
麥苑媚女士	屋宇署 署長行政助理

### 第 7 項

梁焯輝先生,JP	規劃署 署長
區潔英女士	規劃署 港島區規劃專員

### 第 8(i)項

王協力先生	運輸及房屋局 助理秘書長(運輸)7B
梁家華先生	港鐵公司 高級統籌工程師
胡美鳳女士	港鐵公司 助理公共關係經理—工程項目及物業
麥錦垣先生	港鐵公司 高級設計管理工程師
李大鈞先生	路政署 鐵路拓展處總工程師/鐵路拓展 2-1
陳展榮先生	運輸署 高級工程師/優先鐵路發展 3
黃佩儀女士	康樂及文化事務署 高級行政主任(策劃事務)4
梁景法先生	康樂及文化事務署 中西區康樂事務經理

### 第 8(ii)項

曾立權先生	路政署 高級工程師/香港 3
黎富強先生	路政署 工程師(香港)3-1
李浩天先生	運輸署 工程師/特別職務

以提升整體效率。警方今年會繼續以道路安全為首要工作之一。

9. 主席多謝警務處處長在百忙中抽空出席會議，並詳盡回應議員的意見。

### 第 3 項：酒牌制度檢討公眾諮詢

(中西區區議會文件第 117/2011 號)

(下午 1 時 50 分至 3 時 05 分)

10. 主席歡迎食物及衛生局及食物環境衛生署的代表，尤其是副局長梁卓偉教授，出席會議。

11. 食物及衛生局副局長梁卓偉教授向議員簡介諮詢文件的內容。當局現正就樓上酒吧的規管、刊登酒牌申請公告的方法、牌照有效期、酒牌持牌人身分及後備持牌人制度，以及牌照分類徵詢各界意見。

12. 主席請議員留意區議會轄下食物環境衛生及工務委員會非正式會議討論關注蘇豪區酒吧食肆對居民的滋擾的會議記錄及副主席在會上提交的文件，並請議員發表意見。各議員的發言重點如下：

- (a) 阮品強議員指蘇豪區的長者因酒吧噪吵而無法入睡。不少酒吧違反六點後關門等發牌條件，噪音延至午夜不止，周五至周日晚尤為嚴重。警方執法無效。他希望警方加強對住宅區的酒吧執法。
- (b) 陳財喜議員認為當局必須限制樓上酒吧的人數及派人巡查酒吧。他指蘇豪區的酒吧問題失控，酒牌局的制度失效。他認為酒牌局應派遣督察執法、建立巡區制度以掌握民情，以及徹底改革現行制度和相關法例。
- (c) 張翼雄議員指伊利近街萬城閣設有樓上酒吧，以往酒客與住客因共用升降機而構成保安問題，及後住戶在消防樓梯加鐵門讓酒客上落，卻被消防處指不符合消防規定。他認為當局可停止向須與住戶共用通道的樓上酒吧發牌，或要求消防處放寬防火規定。此外，他以半山太子臺和列拿土地臺地下的酒牌申請為例，要求當局就住宅區的酒吧設立限制，例如禁止放置戶外枱椅或在室外飲酒。此外，他建議設立扣分制度，以及要求酒牌局必須執行“六點關門，十一點前點酒”的區議會要求。
- (d) 黃堅成議員指諮詢文件根本不能針對住宅區酒吧的問題。由於制度

欠完善、酒吧有法不依及警方執法無效，當局根本無法控制蘇豪酒吧區的擴展。他建議當局按照區情，為商業區和住宅區訂立不同的發牌準則。

- (c) 鍾蔭祥議員認為當局在改革酒牌制度時，應仿效限制的士牌數目及樓宇高度的做法，以羣體利益著眼。當局應限制個別地區的酒牌數目，以保障整體住戶的權益。
- (f) 陳學鋒議員認為諮詢文件未能回應區內的問題。他指酒牌局發牌給住宅大廈的酒吧，明顯違反大廈公契，而其發牌條件也只能規管持牌處所內的活動。他指伊利近街某酒吧的室內空間根本不足以容納顧客，酒牌局不應向這類酒吧發牌。此外，他指荷李活道的畫廊不時舉行有酒供應的包場私人派對，明顯存在法律漏洞。他建議設立扣分制度，以撤銷牌照或暫時封鎖作為阻嚇，並增加在中環新海濱填海區發牌以吸引酒吧經營者離開住宅區。酒牌局並應把噪音較低的餐廳作另類處理。他表示環工會稍後會去信酒牌局表達意見，副本分送食物及衛生局。
- (g) 李志恒議員指不少酒吧在申請酒牌時聲稱是食肆，當局應把牌照分類以堵塞漏洞。他建議同時把處所和自然人註冊，違規的處所須禁止營業一段時間，以鼓勵行業自律。
- (h) 鄭麗琼議員不接納諮詢文件。她指酒牌局形同發牌機器，全不考慮消防和噪音等現況和公契。屋宇署、環保署、消防處、民政事務總署和警方均遇到執法困難。她指必列者士街 33 號的酒吧申請酒牌，當局居然沒有諮詢對面和兩旁住宅大廈的意見。她要求規劃署確保住宅的生活環境，並促請局方重新擬備諮詢文件。
- (i) 甘乃威議員批評諮詢文件偏袒酒吧，而對住宅區酒吧的滋擾隻字不提，完全漠視市民和議員多年提出的關注。警方在酒吧區只能打擊罪行，難以杜絕滋擾。局方應就如何收集民意和設立扣分制度提出方案。
- (j) 葉國謙議員指民居樓下的酒吧已困擾本區多年，當局應從整體規劃及加強檢控入手解決問題。
- (k) 副主席認為當局在處理酒牌問題時須維護香港國際大都會的形象。他以前酒牌局成員的身分表示，該局須按制度辦事，當局應檢討現行制度的問題所在。他支持向持牌人發牌的建議，並認為應設立扣分制以提高透明度，以及按區情規劃大廈的用途以控制酒吧的

數量。由於本區情況特殊，須繼續執行六點關門等規限。

- (1) 何俊麒議員表示，居民對本區酒吧的經營手法，以及警方和政府部門執法不力，已到忍無可忍的地步。諮詢文件只提出方便營商的方案，而不能促進社區和諧，所以他不接受諮詢文件。

13. 主席指酒吧在中西區的住宅區不斷擴展，程度令人擔心，而發牌制度能否助政府部門有效執法，也令人懷疑。

14. 梁卓偉教授回應，當局的諮詢工作是以公眾利益為首要考慮因素，務求對症下藥解決酒牌問題，並保留香港多元化和包容的都市特色，而非成為一個過度潔癖的城市。當局了解議員關注的事宜，會向酒牌局反映，但酒牌局本身有其法定權限。就議員發表的意見，當局會從公眾利益出發，研究扣分制度是否可行以及是否需要為持牌處所註冊。至於有建議容許在大廈走火通道加設鐵閘防止酒吧顧客到達住宅樓層，由於消防安全至為重要，當局難以放寬有關限制。此外，大廈公契屬業主間的私人協約而不是法例，但酒牌局可視之為公眾利益因素考慮。最後，相關的政府部門會繼續採取聯合行動以加強執法成效。

15. 主席建議議員在九月十四日之前把書面意見提交局方考慮。最後他多謝副局長和他的同事撥冗出席會議。

## **第 6 項：主席報告**

（下午 3 時 05 分至 3 時 06 分）

16. 主席表示，秘書處已於七月二十一日把土木工程拓展署的中環 4、5 及 6 號碼頭加建方案郵寄給議員。議員可在七月二十九日前把意見傳真至秘書處。

17. 主席表示，本會將聯同康樂及文化事務署與港鐵公司於本年八月二十日(星期六)下午十二時在新堅尼地城游泳池舉辦“重置堅尼地城游泳池首階段開放暨第十一屆中西區體育節-水上嘉年華”活動。港鐵公司將贊助活動的所有開支。文康會主席鄭麗琼議員和地管會主席李志恒議員將代表本會與部門及港鐵公司商討活動細節。

18. 主席表示，中西區各大社團將於本年八月三十日在金鐘名都酒樓舉行聯歡晚宴，祝賀本年度獲授勳、嘉獎及委任為太平紳士的人士。

**Public Consultation on Review of Liquor Licensing**  
**List of Written Submissions Received during Consultation Period**

	<b>Name</b>
1	潘兆文
2	民主黨
3	F Fong
4	民建聯中西區支部
5	陳捷貴
6	Sideways Driving Club
7	(Respondent requested anonymity)
8	(Respondent with no name provided)
9	楊位醒
10	The Central Wine Club
11	Ocean Fame Investment Limited
12	(Respondent with unrecognisable name)
13	香港餐務管理協會
14	aqua restaurant group
15	中西區區議會食物環境衛生及工務委員會
16	李
17	(Respondent with unrecognisable name)
18	(Respondent with no name provided)
19	Joe Lee
20	陳太
21	Alex Au
22	WANG MING YEE
23	蘇顯球
24	李小姐
25	妹記佩蘭鹵水鴨餐廳
26	<i>(Respondent requested keeping name and views confidential)</i>
27	Ngan Lung Catering (Holdings) Limited
28	Rebecca Leung
29	香港餐飲業聯合總會
30	Harcap Ltd. & Yau Fook Hong Co. Ltd. / Dan Form (Hong Kong) Limited
31	新星飲食集團
32	稻苗學會

	Name
33	娛樂界權益關注組
34	太平洋酒吧
35	酒牌局
36	利寶閣
37	利寶閣 (THE ONE)
38	利寶閣 (I-square)
39	利寶閣 (THE ONE)
40	利寶閣
41	順德經典 (福苑集團)
42	順德經典 (福苑集團)
43	金都國宴 (福苑集團)
44	福苑漁港 (福苑集團)
45	金都海鮮酒家 (福苑集團)
46	金都海鮮酒家 (福苑集團)
47	福苑海鮮酒家 (福苑集團)
48	福苑火鍋海鮮酒家 (福苑集團)
49	董家牛肉麵
50	黃大仙新光宴會廳
51	廣發餐廳
52	Sea King Restaurant
53	安利魚蛋粉
54	Bakery 28
55	川居
56	金飯碗餐廳
57	龍騰海鮮酒家
58	鐵板超日本料理
59	小肥牛火鍋活魚專門店
60	得龍大飯店
61	銀龍粉麵茶餐廳
62	嚴順菊
63	老趙越南餐廳
64	新大壽日本料理
65	Turyst
66	過橋麵檔
67	馬慶澤
68	劉森記麵家

	Name
69	百利海鮮酒家(飲食集團)
70	牡丹庭粵菜食府
71	馬宇航
72	八王子拉麵館
73	珍香園餐廳小廚
74	阿詩瑪雲南風味軒
75	肇順河鮮名匯河鮮專門店
76	夏麵館
77	牛涮鍋
78	牛角日本燒肉專門店
79	正村壽司
80	金福酒家
81	敘福樓海鮮酒家
82	敘福小館
83	煲仔王
84	御苑酒家
85	御苑皇宴
86	小杭公菜館
87	Singer Café
88	Marco Bistro & Marco's
89	Concerto Inn
90	魚子飯館
91	肇順名匯河鮮專門店
92	百樂門宴會廳
93	太平館餐廳
94	Dr Lee
95	Dr Lee
96	Ma Kam Wah Timothy
97	Ma Kam Wah Timothy
98	Ma Kam Wah Timothy
99	Ma Kam Wah Timothy
100	Ma Kam Wah Timothy
101	Ma Kam Wah Timothy
102	Lam Pak Yan
103	Chow Wai Yee
104	Wong Kim Man
105	Chang Fat Chun Parlett
106	Cheung Wah Keung



	Name
107	Lam Wai Leung
108	Bradley Mark John
109	Hung Chung Hing Mason
110	娛樂界權益關注組, 香港酒吧及卡拉 OK 業權促進組, 酒吧業聯社會(香港), 港九舞廳夜總會聯合總商會
111	港九舞廳夜總會聯合總商會
112	CLUB LUSITANO
113	葉偉文
114	基督教中國佈道會香港迦南堂
115	TREND TEAM LIMITED
116	The Hong Kong Food, Drink and Grocery Association
117	黃家和
118	Eric Ching
119	F6C students of Maryknoll Convent School (Secondary Section)
120	Maryknoll Convent School 6E
121	Creator Asia Limited
122	Maryknoll Convent School F.6B
123	Back to Front Restaurant Consultants
124	旺角區居民協會
125	劉俊業
126	<i>(Respondent requested keeping name and views confidential)</i>
127	Perfect Galaxy Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
128	Century Advance Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
129	晉逸精品酒店 尖沙咀
130	Winflow Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
131	康業物業管理有限公司
132	Song Advance Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
133	創興廣場管理處
134	Multiprize Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
135	Protech Property Management Ltd.
136	Hundred Art Investments Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
137	Shui Hing Investment Company Limited and Yick Fung Estates Limited
138	Easway Development Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
139	仲量聯行物業管理有限公司
140	Jadeway Corporation Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
141	Hing Yip Management Ltd.
142	Comegreat Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
143	Cheerway Limited (Neway Karaoke Box)

	Name
144	Sunway Creation Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
145	Autoflow Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
146	Follow Hong Kong Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
147	Star Business Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
148	Wonderful Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
149	永達利物業管理有限公司
150	樂聲大廈業主立案法團
151	CRE Property (Lok Sing Centre) Limited
152	Growson Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
153	康業服務有限公司
154	<i>(Respondent requested keeping name and views confidential)</i>
155	Enrich Universal Ltd. (御家集團)
156	Powerful Regent Ltd. (御家集團)
157	Superfeel Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
158	永達利物業管理有限公司
159	Neway.com Technology Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
160	永達利物業管理有限公司
161	CRE Property (Argyle Centre) Limited
162	Silver Benefit Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
163	新昌管理服務有限公司
164	Modernline Limited (Neway Karaoke Box)
165	(Company without name)
166	Well Power Pacific Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
167	Happy Show Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
168	Capital More Company Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
169	Well Dragon Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
170	Supreme Cycle Inc.
171	元朗合益商業中心及合益樓業主立案法團
172	Legend Supreme Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
173	Art Inspiration Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
174	Profit Chart Development Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
175	Lionway Corporation Ltd. (Neway Karaoke Box)
176	中西區區議員
177	Club Managers' Association of Hong Kong
178	油尖旺區一群關注酒牌處所問題的居民
179	香港餐飲聯業協會
180	方便營商諮詢委員會食物業工作小組
181	香港蓮香樓