

Panel on Housing

List of follow-up actions for the 2006-07 session (position as at 28 March 2007)

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
1. Sale arrangements for uncompleted first-hand residential units	4.12.2006	The Administration was requested to review the effectiveness of new measures proposed by the Real Estate Developers Association to strengthen the self-regulatory regime on the sale of uncompleted residential units after one year of implementation, and to submit the review report to the Panel.	Response awaited
2. Report on the outcome of comprehensive structural investigation on Choi Hung Estate and Model Housing Estate	4.1.2007	The Administration was requested to, after consulting tenants of Choi Hung Estate and Model Housing Estate on the recommended repair and improvement works, provide an information paper to the Panel covering the following aspects – (i) results of consultation with tenants with regard to the scope and timeframe of commencement and completion of works. In particular, the details of the recreational, leisure and supporting facilities	Response awaited

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>for enhancing the living environment and catering to the needs of the elderly tenants;</p> <p>(ii) rehousing arrangements for affected tenants; and</p> <p>(iii) measures to minimize possible negative impacts on the living environment of tenants and mitigate nuisances caused during implementation of the repair and improvement works.</p>	
<p>3. Allocation of public rental housing flats for the elderly to other applicants</p>	<p>5.2.2007</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to take the following actions:</p> <p>(a) To consider a member's suggestion of providing public lighting facilities for elderly tenants living in Housing for Senior Citizens (HSC) units to facilitate their activities;</p> <p>(b) Based on the supplementary information provided by the Administration on the distribution of the 9 820 existing HSC units in different estates (information for question 3 in LC Paper No.</p>	<p>Administration's response was circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(1) 1081/06-07 on 6 March 2007.</p> <p>Administration's response was circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(1) 1081/06-07 on 6 March 2007.</p>

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>CB(1)886/06-07(01)), to provide further breakdowns of the number of units by various versions of design (i.e. HS1 Design - units created by partitioning up of a normal domestic public rental housing flat into two or three small units and without independent kitchen and toilet facilities, HS 2 and 3 Design – units provided with independent toilets, but with shared kitchen facilities) and their irrespective vacancy rates; and</p> <p>(c) To assess the effectiveness of the various measures for improving the utilization of HSC and report the progress and results to the Panel in 2007-2008 session.</p>	<p>Response awaited</p>
<p>4. Progress of the Total Maintenance Scheme</p>	<p>5.2.2007</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to take the following actions:</p> <p>(a) Noting that the Housing Department (HD) had consulted social workers and occupational therapists for recommendations on special facilities to be</p>	<p>Administration's response was circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(1) 1080/06-07 on 6 March 2007.</p>

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>provided for disabled and elderly residents living in estates like Tseung Kwan O, the Administration was requested to provide the details of such consultations, including the number of cases and the follow-up actions taken by HD;</p> <p>(b) To consider members' suggestion of providing facilities under the Total Maintenance Scheme (TMS), including ramps for disabled residents to facilitate access to their flats, and railings in public areas where appropriate in old estates with high population of elderly residents; and</p> <p>(c) To provide the following information:</p> <p>(i) The details of the customer satisfaction survey conducted by the Administration for the first five estates covered in the TMS, including the following aspects –</p>	

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>(1) the timing for conducting the survey (whether it had been conducted before or after the inspection of flats, or before or after the completion of the repair works), details of the sampling method, the number of sample households taken, the means through which the households' views had been gauged, and a sample questionnaire used in the survey; and</p> <p>(2) the follow-up actions for households who had expressed dissatisfaction towards the repair or maintenance works taken in their flats.</p> <p>(ii) The details of asbestos in old public housing estates which might be affected by repair or maintenance works carried out under the</p>	

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>TMS, and measures to mitigate the possible impact on residents concerned;</p> <p>(iii) The comparison of the average cost of \$1,200 for each piece of works under the TMS with the price of comparable works in the private market;</p> <p>(iv) The measures to mitigate the impact of the repair or maintenance works carried out under the TMS, including nuisances caused during process of the works, disruption and inconvenience to residents with different types of works carried out by different contractors on different dates;</p> <p>(v) The temporary re-housing arrangements for affected residents to facilitate the carrying out of large scale in-flat repair or maintenance works; and</p>	

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>(vi) The measures for monitoring the performance of contractors engaged for works under the TMS to ensure quality of service and workmanship.</p>	
<p>5. Review of the Waiting List Income and Asset Limits for 2007-2008</p>	<p>5.3.2007</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to consider and reflect the major views, concerns and suggestions expressed by members at the meeting to the Subsidized Housing Committee of the Housing Authority (HA) for consideration as follows:</p> <p>(a) In the calculation of non-housing expenditure for working out the Waiting List (WL) income and asset limits, the Administration should consider increasing the contingency provision from the present 5% to 10% of the total expenditure of the households to take into account the hardships of households arising from rising costs on items including medical and travelling expenses, and</p>	<p>Administration's response was circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(1) 1170/06-07 on 16 March 2007.</p>

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>supporting parents;</p> <p>(b) In order to address the special circumstances of individual applicants, consideration should be given to apply the WL income and asset limits with flexibility so that families in genuine need but failed to meet the limits could be eligible for public rental housing (PRH);</p> <p>(c) Given that the Commission on Poverty (CP) had defined the "working poor" as a person with monthly income of \$5,600 or below, there was concern that a two-person household with a total monthly income of \$11,200 would exceed the proposed WL income limit of \$10,800 for 2007-2008 and hence would become ineligible for PRH. It would be unacceptable for the community at large that the "working poor" would be denied of PRH benefits;</p> <p>(d) In the light of the CP's recommendation of</p>	

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>implementing a pilot Transport Support Scheme (TSS) to provide a monthly \$600 transport allowance to the "working poor", there was concern that households, say a two-person household, which would be eligible for TSS would become ineligible for PRH if the transport allowance was to be regarded as household income. In this connection, the Administration was invited to consider the suggestion of excluding the transport allowance under the proposed TSS from the calculation of WL income limits;</p> <p>(e) Efforts should be made to address the following concerns expressed by a member-</p> <p>(i) That the review of the WL income and asset limits for 2007-2008 was based on data from the 2004-2005 Household Expenditure Survey. In the member's view, it was</p>	

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>unfair to WL applicants as adoption of the above outdated data might render some households ineligible for PRH;</p> <p>(ii) That the proposed WL income and asset limits for 2007-2008 were unacceptable and adjustments were inconsistent for households of different sizes. According to information given in Annex C to the Administration's paper (LC Paper No CB(1)1012/06-07(04)), only the WL income limit of the 2-Person household had been increased, whereas those for 1-Person, 3-Person and 4-Person households had seen no increase at all; and</p> <p>(iii) That proposed increases in the WL asset limits for 2007-2008 seemed both</p>	

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>haphazard and inconsistent across different household sizes; and</p> <p>(f) The stringent WL income and asset limits, coupled with HA's decision to cease the construction of Home Ownership Scheme flats, had inevitably rendered a certain number of persons unable to benefit from subsidized housing. The Administration should consider reviewing the policies concerned to address the housing needs of these persons.</p>	