

To: Tony Tse <info@tonytsewaichuen.com>, panel_dev@legco.gov.hk
From: Henry Tung [REDACTED]
Date: 09/07/2015 06:48PM
Cc: [REDACTED], CE O <ceo@ceo.gov.hk>
Subject: Comments on 重建意見書來自資深測量師 for hearing on 16th July
(See attached file: 立法會發展事務委員會_20150629 v1.pdf)

From: Henry Tung [REDACTED]
Subject: : 重建意見書來自資深測量師

Dear Legco Councillor Hon Tony TSE Wai Chuen,

We are thankful for Mr. Chan's genius analysis in his written presentation/opinion for the matter of Housing Schemes. As he is not the person/member of the housing scheme, there are some facts and the history of how the those schemes were set up he does not know. We are writing to supplement the following information for completion of his paper.

1. At present, there is very few serving Civil Servants in the Housing Schemes, all first decade members should have retired many years ago. They, including GBHS (another type of Scheme) members are in fact poor civil servants. They now only rely on limited monthly pension for their living. They are 人又老,钱又无 HK senior citizen. Furthermore, their flats are as old as them, the cost of maintenance is expensive which is a heavy burden to them. In addition, they are not allowed to sublet their premises and also to mortgage to find funds for the maintenance or emergency use. This harsh term should be abolished now, as the member of the schemes had paid off the loans for more than 20 years and are no longer in service and have no fresh income.

2. The arrear Land premium imposition is based on a CSR in 1985 signed by Wong Sing Wah which is 30 years after the first Coopts Society was formed and 17 years after the GBHS was constructed by Govt. for sale to the Local Civil Servants by instalment term The CSR is a top--down instruction and does not allow the staff to dispute or agrue. It is an Unconsciounable Contract in accordance to Cap 458. The Colonial Government does not observe the law stipulation at all.

3. The formulae stipulated in the 1985 CSR for Arrear Land Premium Payment does not show substantiation of how it is derived from, and its fairness too.

4. In late 70+, Govt. had initiated "new" housing benefit for the younger staff, i.e. the Home Purchase Scheme and Home Finance Scheme, in which the staff could get CASH subsistence for ten years for a total amount of \$2M to \$3M (depending on their grade) in ten years to purchase a home for their living, the subsistence amount does include an element for the payment of the land cost of the flats they purchase. When the staff sells the flat, they are Not required to pay back any subsistence allowance. While the old staff in the Housing Schemes, they are only benefited for several thousand in Land Cost initially, (while for the GBHS, it is none at all), such imposition put down in 1985 is very unfair.

5, It is understood that some purchasers purchasing the flats constructed by 华员会 in the middle of 70 (华员村 at Kwai Chung), they were allowed to use the Home Purchase or Home Finance Allowance to pay for the loan, while for the Housing Scheme Members, they were not allowed to enjoy this double benefit alleged by some of the now and then high rank Govt administrator.

Lung Cheung Court (Broadcast Drive) Incorporation Owners Association,