

**LegCo Panel on Housing
Meeting on 5 June 2000
Follow-up on Agenda Item III**

**Supplementary Information on
Policy on Splitting of Tenancy upon Redevelopment**

Purpose

This paper provides Members with further information on the policy of splitting of domestic tenancy during redevelopment of public housing estates.

Existing Policy

2. Under existing policy, splitting of tenancy is normally not allowed, whether or not during the redevelopment of a public housing estate. We accord priority to satisfying the housing need of applicants on the Waiting List at the time of application. It would be difficult for us to entertain subsequent requests for additional housing units due to family growth. Doing so would also be unfair to those applicants still on the Waiting List.

3. Nevertheless, we adopt a flexible approach in dealing with requests for splitting of tenancy from sharers. Sharers are persons who possessed individual screening numbers or separate application numbers but were subsequently arranged by our Department to share a public housing flat with others. We take into account individual merits (e.g. the need to resolve disputes among sharers living in the same housing unit) in considering their requests. Groups of individuals formed on a voluntary basis and apply for public housing under one single application/screening form (i.e. sharing with prior consent) are regarded as ordinary households. Requests from such households for splitting of tenancy are normally rejected to prevent queue jumping. Notwithstanding this, we often respond positively to cases that warrant special consideration.

Splitting Cases

4. To enable Members to understand our policy better, the following successful cases of applying for splitting of tenancy on redevelopment of the public housing estate are quoted for illustration purpose:

(a) **Shared tenancy**

The sharers were from different families and with separate application/screening numbers when the public housing unit was allocated to them. According to the normal practice as explained in paragraph 3 above, separate housing was arranged for the sharing families upon redevelopment of their housing estate.

(b) **Household with odd members**

A tenant initially shared his flat under a single tenancy with unrelated persons of the same sex. After marriage, his spouse and children also lived in the same flat. This caused embarrassment and conflicts among co-tenants. Their request for splitting was thus approved.

(c) **Loosely related singletons of opposite sex**

A singleton male lived with his brother and sister-in-law (his brother's wife) as an ordinary household. Upon the death of his brother, the singleton male was left residing with only his sister-in-law. As inconvenience and embarrassment would arise should they continue to live under the same roof, their request for splitting of tenancy was approved on redevelopment of their housing estate.

(d) **Separate nucleus families with different living pattern**

Due to its large size, an extended family comprising two nucleus families was arranged to live in two separate units under a single tenancy with different living patterns for a long time. The two nucleus families gradually developed very different living patterns (e.g. different cooking arrangements). Their request for splitting of tenancy upon redevelopment of their housing estate was approved as placing them in one housing unit would result in unavoidable conflicts.

(e) **Medical and compassionate grounds**

A member of the household suffered from schizoaffective disorder, which led to conflicts with other members of the same household. The psychiatrist and the medical social worker concerned recommended the allocation of a separate housing unit for this person. His request for splitting of tenancy was thus approved on an exceptional basis.

(f) **Divorce parties with split custody of children**

Upon divorce, the custody of children was split between the tenant and his wife. Separate housing units were provided on request when the housing estate was redeveloped to avoid creating undue hardship to the parties involved.

Housing Department
May 2000