

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)2060/13-14
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/HG/1

Panel on Housing

**Minutes of special meeting
held on Tuesday, 17 June 2014, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

Members present : Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH (Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon WONG Yuk-man
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen

Members absent : Hon WU Chi-wai, MH (Deputy Chairman)
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip

Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP

**Public Officers
attending : For item I**

Mr Albert LEE, JP
Deputy Director (Estate Management)
Housing Department

Mr LEUNG Sai-chi
Assistant Director (Estate Management)¹
Housing Department

Mr Virgil HSU
Chief Manager/Management (Support Services 2)
Housing Department

Mr LUI Kwong-fai
Chief Manager/Management (Kowloon West & Hong
Kong)
Housing Department

**Attendance by : Session 1
invitation**

Individual

Mr Jacky LIM

Youth Civics

Miss Bonnie LEUNG Wing-man
Chairman

Federation of Public Housing Estates

Mr WOO Kin-man
Executive Committee Member

Liberal Party

Mr Michael LEE
Member

Civil Force

Mr LAW Kin-kan
Community Officer

The Hong Kong Institute of Housing

Mr Terrence TANG Chi-sum
Council Member

Hong Kong People's Council on Housing Policy

Ms FOK Hoi-ying
Organizer

梨木樹邨鹹水樓再被迫遷關注組

Miss CHAN Kwei-wing
Representative

梨木樹邨被迫遷戶關注組

Mr CHAN Yat-tung
Member

秀茂坪被迫遷戶關注組

Miss CHEUNG Lai-chun
Member

葵芳村被迫遷關注組

Ms YUEN Sui-lin
Member

葵盛東邨重建戶受害人關注組

Mr CHUI Tong-kit
Member

屯門被迫遷戶關注組

Miss Pauline Jessica Hillary TJHAN
Member

Age of Resistance

Mr LO Ngai-yin
Member

天水圍關注組

Mr LEE Yuk-ting
Member

鯉魚門邨民生關注組

Ms Rida CHEUNG
Member

藍田咸水樓

Mr TSUI Wai-piu
Member

Session 2

荃葵青區被迫遷戶關注組

Miss CHU Moon-chun
Member

石籬邨被迫遷戶關注組

Miss WONG Lai-ming
Member

安蔭邨公屋被迫遷戶關注組

Miss MAI Chung-ping
Representative

秀茂坪邨被迫遷戶關注組

Miss WONG Lai-wan
Member

Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and
Progress of Hong Kong

Mr NGAN Man-yu
Representative

青衣公社房屋關注組

Miss WONG Ho-man
Representative

葵青房屋關注小組

Mr CHAN Chun-laam
Representative

公屋被迫遷戶關注組

Mr LAI Chi-po
義務幹事

Individual

Mr LAM Yiu-ming

Community Development Institute

Mr LOONG Tsz-wai
Representative

Individual

Mr CHENG Chun

Alliance for Defending Grassroots Housing Rights

Ms YIM Pik-fan
Convenor

已被迫遷的寬敞戶

Mr CHEUNG Tak-kwong

Individual

Miss Anna CHEUNG Yim-hing

Live Alone in Southern Concern Group

Miss LI Shee-lin
Convenor

葵聯邨關注組

Mr CHOW Kam-wah

油尖旺公屋迫遷組

Ms YEUNG Wing-chi
Representative

Neighbourhood and Worker's Service Centre

Ms WONG Hiu-kwan
幹事

葵芳工友組

Mr AU Lap-hang
Representative

Lacking in Lid Concern Group

Miss CHAO Suet-ying
Convenor

No flat slaves

Mr CHENG Ka-wing
Member

Clerk in attendance : Ms Miranda HON
Chief Council Secretary (1)1

Staff in attendance : Mr Ken WOO
Senior Council Secretary (1)5

Miss Mandy POON
Legislative Assistant (1)1

Action

I. Receiving public views on "Measures to tackle under-occupation in public rental housing estates"

Relevant papers

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1324/13-14(02) — Administration's paper on "Measures to tackle under-occupation in public rental housing estates"

LC Paper No. CB(1)1324/13-14(03) — Updated background brief on "Measures to tackle under-occupation in public rental housing estates" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

At the Chairman's invitation, 38 deputations/individuals expressed their views on measures to tackle under-occupation in public rental housing ("PRH") estates. A summary of the views of the deputations/individuals is in the **Appendix**.

2. Members also noted the following submissions from deputations/individuals not attending the meeting –

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/13-14(01) — Submission from College of Law Ltd (English version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/13-14(02) — Submission from Society for Community Organization (Chinese version only)

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)1586/13-14(03) — Submission from Mr TSUI Wai-piu (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1614/13-14(01) — Submission from Mr SIU Kin-man (English version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1614/13-14(06) — Submission from 安蔭村被迫遷戶關注組 (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1614/13-14(07) — Submission from 翠屏邨迫遷長者關注組 (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1614/13-14(08) — Submission from Mr YEUNG Wai-sing, member of the Eastern District Council (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1618/13-14(02) — Submission from 葵盛邨居民 (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1618/13-14(03) — Submission from 石蔭東村被迫遷戶關注組 (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1639/13-14(02) — Submission from 照顧者被迫遷戶關注組 (Chinese version only))

Discussion

Session 1

3. The Deputy Director of Housing (Estate Management) ("DDH(EM)"), the Assistant Director of Housing (Estate Management)1 ("ADH(EM)1"), and the Chief Manager/Management (Support Services 2) ("CM/M(SS2)"), Housing Department ("HD"), gave a consolidated response to the views and concerns raised by deputations/individuals as follows –

- (a) there had been no change to the under-occupation standard since its introduction in 1992, with an Internal Floor Area ("IFA") exceeding 25 square metres ("m²") for one-person households being regarded as under-occupied ("UO");

Action

- (b) the under-occupation cases had been handled with a phased approach under which priority was given to handling the most serious UO households. Since the majority of the prioritized under-occupied ("PUO") households with living density exceeding 35 m² and 34 m² had already been dealt with, the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") conducted a further review on the policy in 2013 and further adjusted the prioritized under-occupation threshold to 30 m² for one-person households;
- (c) in 2013, there were 54 500 under-occupation cases and over 120 000 general applicants for PRH. There were in fact a large number of one-person households living in one-to-two-bedroom units, which could be more rationally utilized for re-allocation to three-to-four-person and four-person-or-above households respectively. The under-occupation policy was necessary to rationalize the utilization of precious public housing resources;
- (d) compared with the under-occupation threshold for one-person households at a living space exceeding the prescribed IFA at 25 m², one-person households would not be allocated a living space exceeding an IFA of 19.8 m² currently;
- (e) HA had all along adopted a reasonable and considerate approach in implementing the under-occupation policy. For PUO households which encountered family changes due to death or marriage of family member(s), awaited family members to come to Hong Kong for re-union in the near future, encountered financial difficulty, or needed to stay in their existing units on medical or social grounds, HA would exercise discretion based on individual merits subject to the provision of supporting documents;
- (f) households with elderly member(s) aged 60 or above had all along been classified as non-PUO households and were placed at the end of the under-occupation transfer list. Upon the review of the policy in 2013, HA endorsed to exclude UO households with elderly member(s) aged 70 or above from the under-occupation transfer list. Since about 1 000 PUO cases were handled yearly and there were about 7 600 PUO cases in 2013, UO households with elderly member(s) aged between 60 and 69 would continue to be placed at the end of the under-occupation transfer list and they could stay in their existing units until the next policy review. HD would convey to HA the motion passed by the Panel at the meeting on 5 May 2014 which requested HA to expeditiously

Action

exclude households with member(s) aged 60 or above from the under-occupation transfer list for HA's consideration; and

- (g) households were defined as overcrowded with an IFA less than 5.5 m² per person. Those households with an IFA below 7 m² per person could apply for the Living Space Improvement Transfer Scheme to improve their living conditions. With HA's continued efforts in recent years, the number of overcrowded PRH households had dropped from over 10 000 to about 3 000 in 2013. It should be noted that the majority of such households had expressed wish to continue to stay in their existing units due to individual reasons.

4. The Chairman sought the Administration's response to some deputations' concern that some households which had been rehoused to larger units due to special circumstances, in particular the previous tenants of PRH estates alleged to be built using seawater and tenants affected by redevelopment and who were rehoused to units in harmony blocks, would become UO households under the under-occupation policy and be requested to transfer again. He asked whether consideration would be given to exempt such households from the policy on compassionate ground. CM/M(SS2) explained that to meet the request of some households affected by redevelopment projects for rehousing within the same district, some degree of flexibility had been exercised to rehouse some households to larger units given the shortage in small units. ADH(EM)1 added that while exceptional rehousing arrangements would be made should circumstances warrant, all PRH households should be subject to the same under-occupation standard to ensure fairness in implementation. HD would convey deputations' suggestions on encouraging UO households to transfer to smaller flats such as enhancing the Domestic Removal Allowance and providing a subsidy on renovation to HA for its consideration.

5. Noting that flexibility had been exercised in rehousing households affected by redevelopment projects to larger units in early years, Miss Alice MAK asked why flexibility could not likewise be exercised nowadays to exempt those households that had been rehoused to larger units due to their living in PRH estates alleged to be built using seawater from the under-occupation policy. She held the view that it was unfair to require these affected households to move again now due to poor planning of public housing production previously.

6. Pointing out that many PUO households had in fact lived in their existing units for a long time and had established strong attachment to the neighbourhood and the local community, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung was concerned that requesting these PUO households to transfer would break the

Action

social ties that they had established and cause them anxiety. They might even be unable to adapt to the new living environment upon transfer and this might induce further social problems. He therefore requested HA to consider removing households with member(s) aged 60 or above and those who had been rehoused to larger units, such as those encouraged to move to Tin Shui Wai new town in early years to make way for urban redevelopment, from the under-occupation transfer list.

7. Mr WONG Yuk-man criticized HA for adopting the under-occupation policy to tackle the problem of shortage of larger PRH units rather than building sufficient PRH units to meet the demand of applicants for PRH. He stressed the importance of humanity and flexibility in implementing the policy to cater for justifiable cases, such as those in which the units had just been renovated, those in which the tenants needed to take care of their elderly family member(s) living in the vicinity, and those in which the tenants had chronic illness and hence the need for a larger unit to accommodate the caretaker and equipment.

8. DDH(EM) responded that PRH had all along been allocated based on the resources available, and some degree of flexibility would be necessary to cater for actual circumstances. However, such flexibility should not jeopardize the fairness in implementing the under-occupation policy, which might otherwise confuse the public and attract criticism.

Session 2

9. In response to the views and concerns raised by deputations/individuals, DDH(EM) and ADH(EM)¹ reiterated the Administration's responses given in Session 1. DDH(EM) also advised that the Administration was proceeding in full swing the identification of suitable land resources for public housing development.

10. Mr Alan LEONG expressed concern on cases in which PUO households awaiting family member(s) to come to Hong Kong for reunion in the near future were requested to transfer to a small unit first and re-apply for a larger one upon arrival of the family member(s). He also noted with concern cases where households that had become PUO due to the death of family member(s) were requested to transfer shortly. Noting that HA had in fact exercised discretion in some of such cases and allowed the tenants concerned to stay in their existing flats, he asked if HA would consider standardizing its practice in handling similar cases. Mr Paul TSE echoed Mr LEONG's views. He pointed out that the discretion to be exercised, if made more transparent, would enhance PRH households' understanding of HA's policies and practices. The Chairman also asked about how long households that had become PUO due to the death of family member(s) would be allowed to stay in their existing flats.

Action

11. DDH(EM) responded that HD had issued internal guidelines on handling possible scenarios including the above. However, given the unique circumstances of each case, it was necessary for HA to exercise discretion based on individual merits subject to the provision of supporting documents. In general, justified cases would be withheld from transfer for a period of six months. The Chairman and Mr Paul TSE shared the view that the six-month period currently allowed for households that had become PUO due to the death of family member(s) to continue to stay in their existing flats was too short.

12. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that he was given to understand that HA's internal guidelines were sometimes not followed by individual estates the management of which had been outsourced. DDH(EM) responded that all HA's estates, be they managed by HA or outsourced companies, should follow the same policies and guidelines promulgated by HA. HA would look into non-compliant cases individually.

13. Mr Alan LEONG sought clarification on whether the waiting time for non-elderly one-person applicants for PRH would be further lengthened due to the under-occupation policy. Pointing out that half of the applicants for PRH were non-elderly one-person applicants to which the three-year waiting time target did not apply, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung criticized the under-occupation policy for reducing the number of small units suitable for allocation to these applicants and hence further aggravating their waiting time for PRH.

14. DDH(EM) explained that there was an annual allocation quota for non-elderly one-person applicants under the Quota and Points System. The waiting time for such applicants was not only affected by the under-occupation policy, but also other flat allocation programmes.

Concluding remarks

Admin

15. In the light of the views and concerns of deputations and members, the Chairman requested the Administration to reflect to HA that it should conduct the following reviews and inform the Panel of the review outcome –

- (a) to review the under-occupation policy with a view to exempting those households which had been rehoused to larger units due to special circumstances, in particular the previous tenants of PRH estates alleged to be built using seawater and tenants affected by redevelopment and who were rehoused to units in harmony blocks; and

Action

- (b) for households that had become PUO as a result of the death of their family member(s), to review whether the six-month period currently allowed for such households to continue to stay in their existing units was too short.

II. Any other business

- 16. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:45 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
6 October 2014

Panel on Housing

Special meeting on Tuesday, 17 June 2014, at 2:30 pm

Meeting to receive public views on "Measures to tackle under-occupation in public rental housing estates"

Summary of views and concerns expressed by deputations/individuals

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
Session 1		
1.	Mr Jacky LIM	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1586/13-14(01))
2.	Youth Civics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requiring under-occupied ("UO") households to move to smaller units would reduce the number of such units for allocation to non-elderly one-person applicants for public rental housing ("PRH") on the Waiting List ("WL"); • the Administration should handle UO cases with humanity, such as those involving family member(s) coming Hong Kong for re-union in the near future, those expecting new member(s) shortly by birth, those whose flat had just been renovated, those whose family member(s) had just passed away, and those who had previously been rehoused to larger units due to special circumstances such as redevelopment and development of new areas; and • the fundamental solution to the housing problem was to increase housing supply
3.	Federation of Public Housing Estates	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/13-14(03))
4.	Liberal Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the under-occupation standard for one- and two-person households at an Internal Floor Area exceeding 25 square metres ("m²") and 35 m² respectively were higher than the average per capita living space in Hong Kong at 14.8 m² and should thus be reduced by 10%; • the number of maximum housing offers for prioritized under-occupied ("PUO") households should be reduced from three to two to speed up the transfer; • a subsidy on renovation on top of the Domestic Removal Allowance ("DRA") should be provided as an incentive to encourage transfer; and • UO households with elderly member(s) aged 65 or above (as opposed to 70 or above endorsed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA")) should be excluded from the under-occupation transfer list

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
5.	Civil Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> close to 90% of one- and two-person UO households were currently occupying units ranged from 25 m² to 84 m², and such units could be re-allocated to two- to four-person households to meet the great demand; the existing DRA should be raised to encourage transfer; UO households with elderly member(s) aged 60 or above (as opposed to 70 or above) should be excluded from the under-occupation transfer list; and exemption from the transfer should be granted for PUO households awaiting family members to come to Hong Kong for re-union provided that supporting documents could be presented to prove that the family member(s) concerned would arrive within two years
6.	The Hong Kong Institute of Housing	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1624/13-14(01))
7.	Hong Kong People's Council on Housing Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the under-occupation policy would not result in an increase in housing supply as UO households just moved from a larger unit to a smaller one; and as UO households with a non-elderly singleton might become overcrowded upon marriage and giving birth to children after the transfer, and UO households with an elderly singleton might need to be transferred back to a larger unit for reason of accessibility and accommodating special equipment, HA should consider the age of UO households in implementing the policy to avoid repeated transfers
8.	梨木樹邨鹹水樓再被迫遷關注組	Presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1632/13-14(01))
9.	梨木樹邨被迫遷戶關注組	Presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1618/13-14(01))
10.	秀茂坪被迫遷戶關注組	Presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1632/13-14(02))
11.	葵芳村被迫遷關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HA should consider the age of UO households to avoid repeated transfers and hence the expenses incurred for such households; and requested HA to shelve the under-occupation policy
12.	葵盛東邨重建戶受害人關注組	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1614/13-14(02))

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
13.	屯門被迫遷戶關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the units to be vacated under the under-occupation policy were far from adequate to satisfy the housing demand of some 250 000 applicants on the WL. The Administration should make good use of the abundant land resources in the urban district for providing public housing; and the under-occupation policy was unjustified and disturbing as all households would become UO some day due to the passing away of the aged/spouse and the moving away of the children as they formed their own family
14.	Age of Resistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the need of the under-occupation policy stemmed from an injustice in the provision of land resources for public housing development, resulting in an acute shortage in public housing supply; the units to be vacated from the under-occupation policy were far from adequate to satisfy the housing demand of some 250 000 applicants on the WL; and the under-occupation policy had created conflicts between UO households and applicants on the WL for PRH
15.	天水圍關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> it was unfair to regard PRH households that had been offered a larger unit as an incentive to move to the Tin Shui Wai new town in early years as UO households now with the deletion of their family member(s); and the under-occupation policy was unjustified and disturbing. The Administration should tackle the housing problem at source by increasing land supply for housing production
16.	鯉魚門邨民生關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the units to be vacated from the under-occupation policy were far from adequate to satisfy the housing demand of some 250 000 applicants on the WL; and opposed the lowering of the age for exclusion from the under-occupation transfer list from 60 or above to 70 or above
17.	藍田咸水樓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> it was unfair to require the previous tenants of PRH estates built using seawater who were now rehoused to units in harmony blocks to move again; and the under-occupation policy was unjustified and disturbing and should be shelved
Session 2		
18.	荃葵青區被迫遷戶關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the fundamental solution to the housing problem was to increase housing supply. The under-occupation policy would not address the problem; HA should not have tightened the prioritized under-occupation

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<p>threshold progressively; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> since many private residential properties had been hoarded for speculation, the Administration should introduce a vacancy tax on residential properties and a tax on idling of land by developers who did not proceed to develop their land to increase housing supply
19.	石籬邨被迫遷戶關注組	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1614/13-14(03))
20.	安蔭邨公屋被迫遷戶關注組	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1614/13-14(04))
21.	秀茂坪邨被迫遷戶關注組	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1614/13-14(05))
22.	Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> supported the under-occupation policy to ensure rational utilization of the precious public housing resources for allocation to eligible households with genuine housing needs; and to minimize the impact of the policy, HA should exclude UO households with elderly member(s) aged 60 or above from the under-occupation transfer list, offer rehousing within the residing estate or an estate within the same District Council constituency, and consider the possible short-term changes to UO households to avoid repeated transfers
23.	青衣公社房屋關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the under-occupation policy would not result in an increase in housing supply, but cause anxiety and create conflicts between UO households and applicants on the WL for PRH
24.	葵青房屋關注小組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> it was unfair to regard PRH households who had been offered larger units as an incentive to move to the Tin Shui Wai and Tung Chung new towns in early years as UO households now with the deletion of their family member(s); and the under-occupation policy would not result in an increase in housing supply, but cause anxiety and create conflicts between UO households and applicants on the WL for PRH
25.	公屋被迫遷戶關注組	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1632/13-14(03))
26.	Mr LAM Yiu-ming	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1624/13-14(02))
27.	Community Development Institute	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1586/13-14(02))

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
28.	Mr CHENG Chun	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> quoted his personal experience that he was removed from the PUO list upon marriage after 2007, but became PUO again in 2013 when the under-occupation threshold was further tightened
29.	Alliance for Defending Grassroots Housing Rights	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1639/13-14(01))
30.	已被迫遷的寬敞戶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the under-occupation policy was unjustified and disturbing. UO households with a non-elderly singleton might become overcrowded upon marriage and giving birth to children after the transfer; and it was inhumane to request households that had become PUO as a result of the death of their family member(s) to move immediately
31.	Miss Anna CHEUNG Yim-hing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the under-occupation policy would not result in an increase in housing supply, but cause anxiety and create conflicts between UO households and applicants on the WL for PRH; and requested HA to evaluate its "reasonable and considerate approach" in implementing the under-occupation policy with reference to the experience of the United Kingdom
32.	Live Alone in Southern Concern Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> there was a lack of one-person units in the Southern District for transfer purpose; and questioned whether HA was vested with the power conferred by section 19 of the Housing Ordinance (Cap. 283) to evict households
33.	葵聯邨關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the under-occupation policy was unjustified and disturbing as all households would become UO some day due to family changes; and HA should not have misled members by concealing the negative impact of the under-occupation policy and should not tighten the prioritized under-occupation threshold progressively
34.	油尖旺公屋迫遷組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the need of the under-occupation policy stemmed from an injustice in the provision of land resources for public housing development, resulting in an acute shortage in public housing supply and hence the conflicts between UO households and applicants on the WL for PRH; and requested HA to shelve the under-occupation policy
35.	Neighbourhood and Worker's Service Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> previous faulty housing policies had resulted in an acute shortage in public housing supply. UO households should not take the blame of occupying PRH resources unreasonably; many UO households had in fact lived in their existing units for a

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Major views and concerns
		<p>long time and had established strong attachment to the neighbourhood and the local community. They were bound to oppose the under-occupation policy;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it was inhumane to request households that had become PUO as a result of the death of their family member(s) to move immediately; and • requested for shelving the under-occupation policy
36.	葵芳工友組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the under-occupation policy would not result in an increase in housing supply, but cause anxiety and create conflicts between UO households and applicants on the WL for PRH; • the fundamental solution to the housing problem was to increase housing supply. The Administration should make good use of the abundant land resources in the urban district to provide public housing; and • requested HA to shelve the under-occupation policy
37.	Lacking in Lid Concern Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • queried HA's "reasonable and considerate approach" in implementing the under-occupation policy by citing a case in which a household that had become PUO as a result of the death of family member(s) was requested to transfer immediately despite the proof of financial difficulty; • questioned whether HA was vested with the power conferred by section 19 of the Housing Ordinance to evict households; • the under-occupation policy would not result in an increase in housing supply, but cause anxiety and create conflicts between UO households and applicants on the WL for PRH. The Administration should make good use of the abundant land resources in the urban district to provide public housing; and • requested HA to shelve the under-occupation policy
38.	No flat slaves	presentation of views as set out in submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1639/13-14(03))