

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1736/13-14

Ref : CB1/PL/HG

Report of the Panel on Housing for submission to the Legislative Council

Purpose

This paper gives an account of the work of the Panel on Housing ("the Panel") during the 2013-2014 Legislative Council session. It will be tabled at the meeting of the Council on 9 July 2014 in accordance with Rule 77(14) of the Rules of Procedure of the Council.

The Panel

2. The Panel was formed by a resolution passed by the Council on 8 July 1998 and as amended on 20 December 2000, 9 October 2002, 11 July 2007 and 2 July 2008 for the purpose of monitoring and examining Government policies and issues of public concern relating to private and public housing matters. The terms of reference of the Panel are in **Appendix I**.

3. The Panel comprises 25 members, with Hon WONG Kwok-hing and Hon WU Chi-wai elected as Chairman and Deputy Chairman respectively. The membership list of the Panel is in **Appendix II**.

Major work

Housing-related initiatives in the 2014 Policy Address and Policy Agenda

4. The Chief Executive ("CE") delivered his 2014 Policy Address on 15 January 2014. The Panel received a briefing on the new and ongoing housing-related initiatives as stated in the Policy Address and the Policy Agenda at its meeting on 28 January 2014.

Increasing housing supply

5. The Panel notes that the Government has decided to accept the recommendation of the Long Term Housing Strategy Steering Committee ("the

LTHS Steering Committee")¹ to adopt 470 000 units as the new public and private housing total supply target for the coming 10 years, with public housing accounting for 60% of the new production. In this connection, public housing comprises both public rental housing ("PRH") flats and subsidized sale flats (primarily Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") flats).

6. Members were concerned that the present term of Government might not be able to raise the supply of housing to a level that was sufficient to address the home ownership aspirations of the general public and improve the poor living environment of the grassroots, especially those living in subdivided units ("SDUs"). Pointing out that it was impossible even for middle-class families to buy homes amidst soaring property prices, some members urged the Administration to rebuild the housing ladder and relaunch the Sandwich Class Housing Scheme. Some other members also questioned the Administration's ability to fulfill its plan to provide some 280 000 public housing units in the next 10 years in view of the lack of concrete plans and measures to secure land supply, construction manpower and financial resources for the works.

7. Noting that developers' sentiments had subsided in recent land auctions, some members called on the Administration to re-assign those sites which were not sold for public housing development as they were disposed sites. Citing the inadequate capacity of train compartments of the West Rail Line as an example, some other members reminded the Administration to avoid repeating the mistake of providing transport infrastructure only after the provision of housing developments in new development areas.

8. Some members reflected the concerns of Government engineering professionals on the increase in workload in the absence of sufficient professional support in the related disciplines to take forward the new housing initiatives. The Panel was advised that the Government would ensure that the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") was given sufficient financial resources for implementing the various housing initiatives.

Reinstating rental control

9. Members expressed concern on the soaring rentals of SDUs which in their view were comparable to those of private flats in the higher end of the property market. They also pointed out that some applicants on the Waiting List ("WL") for PRH had to wait for more than a year to be assigned the second

¹ The LTHS Steering Committee was formed by the Government to take forward the LTHS review and make recommendations on Hong Kong's LTHS for the next 10 years. The LTHS Steering Committee is chaired by the Secretary for Transport and Housing and comprises 15 non-official and three official members, namely the Permanent Secretary for Transport and Housing (Housing), the Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands), and the Government Economist.

and subsequent flat offers if they did not accept the first offer even due to legitimate reasons. These applicants, mostly living in SDUs, would then have to continue to bear expensive rentals which were increased on a yearly basis. Members were disappointed at the absence of concrete measures in the Policy Address to bring immediate relief to the ever increased rental pressure faced by SDU tenants and urged the Administration to reinstate rental control.

10. With regard to CE's remarks made at his Question and Answer session on 16 January 2014 on the 2014 Policy Address that implementing rental control would result in a decrease in the supply of rental flats and an increase in rent, some members were not convinced and considered that it would be irrational for property owners to withhold their properties from letting even if rental control was introduced, as it would mean forgoing rental income.

11. The Administration advised that it was the Government's policy to eradicate SDUs in industrial buildings and step up enforcement actions against irregularities relating to building and fire safety for SDUs in residential and composite buildings. It would consider the proposal of rental control having regard to the report to be submitted by the LTHS Steering Committee on the LTHS public consultation in the first quarter of 2014. In order to have ample discussion on the subject of rental control, the Panel Chairman requested the Legislative Council Secretariat to provide assistance and prepare a research paper on "Tenancy control in selected places" for the Panel to serve as members' reference and for discussion with the Administration at the Panel meeting on 7 July 2014.

Reviewing the redevelopment potential of aged public rental housing estates

12. Members expressed support for redeveloping aged PRH estates to increase flat production and improve living environment. They were also of the view that HA and the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HS") should complement each other in taking forward redevelopment projects with a view to maximizing effectiveness and expediting the redevelopment process. Some members further suggested that consideration should be given to relaxing the plot ratio of non-domestic developments in HA's sites with a view to providing more community facilities. The Administration responded that a dedicated Redevelopment Potential Action Team had been formed in March 2013 to identify more suitable aged PRH estates for redevelopment to increase flat production. As for plot ratio, non-domestic developments in HA's sites were normally subject to a maximum plot ratio of 1.5 in urban areas. The Administration would take into consideration the needs of the local community and provide facilities and services that could best meet their needs.

13. On the proposal to redevelop Wah Fu Estate, members generally urged the Administration to announce the details of the redevelopment and the implementation timetable early and to engage the local community in

implementing the project to alleviate their concerns. The Administration was also requested to accede to the following requests made by tenants of Wah Fu Estate: to provide in-situ rehousing; to provide removal services in addition to removal allowance as the majority of the tenants were the elderly; to ensure that rentals would not increase substantially and that living space and quality would improve upon redevelopment; to avoid building screen-like buildings; to take forward the construction of the proposed South Island Line (West) in parallel with the redevelopment project to meet the increased transport demand; and to enhance the facility and service provision in the district taking into account the needs of a large aged population, including the provision of recreation and fitness facilities, medical clinics, day care centres and estates for the aged.

14. The Administration responded that HA would conduct a detailed analysis of the redevelopment case for Wah Fu Estate in accordance with the "Refined Policy on Redevelopment of Aged Public Rental Housing Estate". The redevelopment programme for Wah Fu Estate and related details would be announced upon completion of the relevant assessments and after endorsement by HA. The local community and the District Council ("DC") would be consulted in a timely manner once the development details were available.

Analysis of housing situation of Waiting List applicants

15. It is the Government's policy objective to provide PRH to low-income families who cannot afford private rental accommodation. Towards this end, HA maintains a WL of PRH applicants. HA's target is to maintain the Average Waiting Time ("AWT") at around three years for general applicants (i.e. family and elderly applicants). The AWT target of around three years is not applicable to non-elderly one-person applicants under the Quota and Points System ("QPS")².

16. HA has analysed the housing situation of WL applicants as at end-June 2013 based on the latest available data and the Panel was briefed on the findings. The Panel noted that only general applicants were covered in the analysis. The allocation of PRH units to non-elderly one-person applicants under QPS as well as other rehousing categories (e.g. transfer of existing tenants, compassionate rehousing and clearance for redevelopment) were not covered in the analysis as the AWT target of around three years is not applicable to them.

Average Waiting Time for general applicants

17. Members criticized that the AWT target of around three years was misleading as it was not applicable to the 115 600 non-elderly one-person

² QPS was introduced in September 2005 to rationalize and re-prioritize the allocation of PRH to non-elderly one-person applicants. Under QPS, the relative priorities for PRH allocation to applicants are determined by their points received, and the AWT target of around three years is not applicable to them.

applicants under QPS and these applicants would have to wait much longer than three years. The waiting time would only be counted from the date of the issuance of the acknowledgement letter bearing an application number instead of the time when an application was made, and the period in between could take up to half a year. Besides, the waiting time was counted up to the first flat offer only, while some WL applicants might refuse to accept the offer with legitimate reasons. Hence, there could be much difference between the AWT as publicized and the time taken for WL applicants to be actually housed from the date of application.

18. Members further pointed out that the AWT for general applicants at 2.7 years as advised by the Administration was in stark contrast to what they had been told by WL applicants who approached them for assistance, with some having waited for six years and were yet to receive an offer. They urged the Administration to actively follow up such cases.

19. Members were gravely concerned that the AWT target at around three years could not be attained given the current level of PRH production and the increasing number of WL applicants. The Administration responded that it was its stated target to produce about 20 000 PRH units per year for the five years starting from 2017-2018, plus other units recovered through various initiatives. It had already started planning for the production of around 28 000 public housing units per year in future. The Administration acknowledged the severe shortage in the supply of PRH and would strive to secure every piece of land appropriate for housing development, and to build as quickly as practicable.

20. Noting that the AWT was getting much longer especially for applicants opting for the Extended Urban District, and most WL applicants opting for the this district were willing to accept offers at the Urban District and the New Territories, some members requested the Administration to allow applicants to switch their district choices without lengthening their waiting time. The Administration advised that the allocation of PRH units in different districts was dependent on the locations where the new and recovered units were available. It would in any case consider the suggestion in future reviews.

21. Given that there were 19 200 applicants with a waiting time of three years or above and yet to receive a flat offer as at the end of June 2013, there was a suggestion for the Administration to consider providing these applicants with transitional housing or, if impossible, rent subsidy to address their housing need.

Long waiting time of larger households

22. Noting that most of the applicants on the WL with longer waiting time were three- to four-person households, members opined that the lack of sufficient units for larger households had lengthened the waiting time and was

unfair to such applicants. Moreover, this would in effect discourage the public from forming families and giving birth to babies, hence running against the Government's population policy. The Administration was requested to increase the production of larger units and allocate two units for each of such households as necessary. Members also urged the Administration to announce the types of units that would be available in each district under the Public Housing Construction Programme ("PHCP") for the next five years such that WL applicants could make the district and flat choices most appropriate to them.

23. The Administration responded that HA would review the flat mix for each public housing project. Two-bedroom units would be produced as appropriate to meet the demand of bigger families. It was also HA's current practice to offer two units for a household with eight persons or more. The Administration would consider providing more information on the upcoming PHCP.

Waiting time for non-elderly one-person applicants

24. Some members urged the Administration to address the imminent housing needs of the about 115 600 non-elderly one-person applicants under QPS. Pointing out that HA's Well-off Tenants Policies had caused young people to move out from their parents' PRH units and to register on the WL for PRH allocation, members urged the Administration to review the policies, with a view to relieving the stress on the WL.

Tackling abuse of public rental housing

25. In response to members' request for the Administration to ensure that measures would be in place to tackle the abuse of PRH resources, the Administration responded that various measures were currently in place to tackle the abuse of PRH resources. The Housing Department ("HD") had set up a special duties team and put in place a reporting system whereby tenants could report any suspected abuse cases, such as subletting, idling, and using a flat for commercial or other improper purposes. HD would also conduct a visit to each tenant once every two years to determine if a flat was occupied by the registered tenants.

Receiving public views

26. In view of the public's concern over the long waiting time of WL applicants, particularly in respect of applicants with a waiting time of more than three years, the Panel has held a meeting on 30 June 2014 to receive public views on the subject.

Public Housing Construction Programme

27. As the production of PRH involves a number of factors such as planning, construction and resource allocation, HA has put in place the PHCP, which rolls forward on a yearly basis. The Panel has continued to monitor the PHCP, and discussed the PHCP for 2013-2014 to 2017-2018 at the meeting on 2 December 2013.

Public rental housing

28. The Panel has been advised that for the first five-year period from 2012-2013 to 2016-2017, the total production of PRH is about 79 000 flats. For the second five-year period from 2017-2018 to 2021-2022, sufficient land has been identified to produce more than 100 000 flats. According to HA's five-year rolling PHCP, there will be a total PRH production of about 82 000 flats in the five-year period from 2013-2014 to 2017-2018. Most of these new PRH flats will be located in Urban (52%) and Extended Urban Areas (32%), with the remaining in the New Territories (16%). Among the new PRH production from 2013-2014 to 2016-2017, about 19% would be one/two-person units, 25% would be two/three-person units, 39% would be one-bedroom units (for three to four persons) and 16% would be two-bedroom units (for four persons or above).

29. Members were generally concerned that the current PRH production rate at about 16 000 units per year could not match the housing supply target of 470 000 units for the next 10 years as proposed by the LTHS Steering Committee. There would still be a shortage of about 13 000 units per year even if the supply of private housing was increased to 18 000 units per year. They requested the Administration to introduce short to medium term measures to address the shortage, such as using PRH estates decanted for redevelopment for providing temporary housing as these estates could be left idle for years.

30. The Administration responded that it was undesirable to require the temporary tenants to move again within a short time when the estates were due for demolition. Moreover, as such proposal could only provide a small number of units for time-limited accommodation, it would be more practical to complete the redevelopment projects as soon as possible as this could provide much more units for permanent accommodation.

31. Noting that the Administration had identified sufficient land for PRH production for the second five-year period from 2017-2018 to 2021-2022, members asked if it was possible to advance the production schedule. Members further enquired whether the construction time of PRH under the PHCP could be shortened. The Administration explained that in order to fast track the construction of public housing, works at the planning and design stage, which would normally require three years to complete in the past, were

compressed to one year. As a result, the total construction time which generally took seven years in the past were reduced to about five years where possible. It was impossible to further compress the construction time.

32. Some members commented that the problem with the supply of PRH was caused by erroneous planning in respect of PRH provision in the previous years as evident by a higher percentage of PRH to be provided in the Urban District in the coming years. They asked about the Administration's plan to increase the provision of PRH in the Extended Urban District and the New Territories in the coming years. They were concerned that the supply of two-bedroom flats was on the low side as compared to other flat types under the current five-year rolling PHCP, and there was a shortage of such flats for allocation to bigger households with four or five persons.

33. The Administration responded that the Transport and Housing Bureau had joined hands with the Development Bureau, Planning Department and Lands Department to identify sites throughout the territory for PRH development. Regarding the supply of two-bedroom flats, given the lead time for planning and construction, the flat mix for new PRH flats in any particular year would normally be determined five years ahead. HA would regularly assess and update the flat mix for new PRH production taking into account the latest distribution of household size among WL applicants, the standard for allocating different sizes of PRH flats, etc.

34. In addition, members were of the view that apart from implementing the PHCP, the Administration should also increase public housing supply through redevelopment projects. They suggested using the sites of the Urban Renewal Authority for public housing production, and speeding up the demolition of the Long Bin Interim Housing which, upon redevelopment, would provide a large number of PRH units.

Home Ownership Scheme

35. Noting that the Government was committed to producing about 17 000 HOS units from 2016-2017 to 2019-2020, members were concerned that the production of about 3 150 HOS units in 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 on average was falling behind the expected target of about 5 000 units per year. In response to the enquiry about the progress made in respect of securing sites for HOS development in 2018-2019 and 2019-2020, the Administration reiterated that HA had identified suitable sites in different areas of the territory to ensure that a total of about 17 000 HOS units would be completed from 2016-2017 to 2019-2020 in accordance with the Government's commitment.

Work of the Sales of First-hand Residential Properties Authority

36. The Residential Properties (First-hand Sales) Ordinance ("the Ordinance") was enacted in June 2012, and came into full implementation on 29 April 2013. The Ordinance sets out detailed requirements in relation to sales brochures, price lists, show flats, disclosure of transaction information, advertisements, sales arrangements, and the mandatory provisions for the Preliminary Agreement for Sale and Purchase and Agreement for Sale and Purchase for the sale of first-hand residential properties. It also provides for prohibitions against misrepresentation and the dissemination of false or misleading information. To ensure that the Ordinance is implemented efficiently, the Sales of First-hand Residential Properties Authority ("SRPA") was established. The Panel has been monitoring the work of SRPA since its establishment and the Panel received a briefing on the SRPA's latest work progress in January 2014.

37. The Panel was informed that as at 9 December 2013, SRPA examined 153 sales brochures (including the revised sales brochures), 267 price lists, 176 documents containing the sales arrangements, and 1 309 printed advertisements. SRPA also conducted 457 inspections on registers of transactions and 484 inspections on sales offices and show flats.

38. In response to members' enquiries, SPRA explained the current progress of its investigation into the cases of non-compliance concerning the sales arrangements of some new residential developments, including the Providence Bay, a development in West Kowloon and The Long Beach.

39. Members requested for an explanation of SRPA's view that most of the contraventions found during the compliance checks were technical and minor in nature and might be committed out of carelessness. SRPA advised that there were some contraventions of the requirements of the Ordinance in almost all of the first versions of the sales brochure of the residential developments which were made available after the implementation of the Ordinance. Most of such contraventions were omissions of some dimensions of the residential properties in the floor plans of those residential properties in the sales brochure, whereas the rest of the contraventions related to different aspects, such as textual mistakes. All those contraventions did not appear to have undermined the interest of purchasers. For the few suspected cases of contravention which SRPA considered to be of a more serious nature, investigation was being carried out.

40. Noting that there were contraventions of the requirements of the Ordinance relating to price lists, the documents containing the sales arrangements, the register of transactions, printed advertisements and even show flats, members were concerned about SRPA's promotion and education efforts, and urged SRPA to disclose details of the complaint cases and suspected cases of

contravention for reference of the trade to avoid similar contraventions.

41. Members further enquired whether SRPA had been in contact with the trade in identifying problems and solutions in implementing the Ordinance and whether there had been problems that affected the supply of first-hand residential properties in the market. SRPA responded that it had maintained contact with the trade, including the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong and understood that the trade had not encountered any insurmountable difficulties in operating under the new legislative framework. The supply of first-hand residential properties was unaffected by the new legislative requirements as evident by the offer of some 8 300 first-hand residential properties in 57 residential developments since the full implementation of the Ordinance eight months ago.

42. Members were concerned about possible confusions caused to the property market with two separate systems in place for the sales of first-hand residential properties and those in the secondary market, and the Administration was urged to extend the Ordinance to cover the sales of second-hand residential properties. The Administration responded that since the implementation of the Ordinance, the Estate Agents Authority had taken parallel action to ensure that estate agents would provide saleable area in the sales of residential properties in the secondary market. Purchasers of second-hand residential properties were on a more equal footing with the vendors, and the need to subject the sales of second-hand residential properties to a regulatory regime similar to that for the sales of first-hand residential properties was not that strong. Besides, vendors of second-hand residential properties would have practical difficulties and resource problems to comply with all the requirements governing the sale of first-hand residential properties, including the requirements on sales brochure.

Implementation arrangement for the clearance of Long Bin Interim Housing

43. It is the Government's policy to ensure that no people will be rendered homeless as a result of natural disasters, fire, emergencies, as well as the Government's clearance and enforcement actions. At present, HD provides temporary accommodation to those in need in the Po Tin Transit Centre at Tuen Mun through the referral of the Buildings Department or the Lands Department. Those who have lived in the transit centre for three months, passed the "homeless" test, and fulfilled the eligibility criteria for PRH can be rehoused to Interim Housing ("IH") while awaiting PRH allocation through the WL system. Currently, the three IH estates in Long Bin, Shek Lei and Po Tin of HA provide a total of about 4 600 flats.

44. Long Bin IH, situated in Yuen Long, occupies an area of 3.07 hectare and consists of eight low-rise blocks with 840 units built by proprietary prefabricated building system in 1999. At present, there are 510 households housed on the site as well as two welfare premises and a plant nursery. HA has

decided to clear the Long Bin IH to make way for public housing development and the target clearance date is January 2016. Panel members had expressed concern on the poor living conditions of Long Bin IH on various occasions in the past, and the Panel discussed the implementation arrangement for the clearance of Long Bin IH in February 2014.

45. Members supported the clearance programme on account of the highly undesirable hygiene condition of Long Bin IH and the provision of about 2 300 PRH units upon redevelopment.

46. On the rehousing arrangements for affected households, the Panel noted that there were 62 households whose WL applications were frozen. They might be offered PRH if their WL applications were defrozed before the due day of clearance. Members were concerned about those households whose applications would likely remain frozen at the target clearance date and asked whether special arrangements would be made to house the tenants concerned. The Administration advised that for those tenants whose applications were nearly due for defreezing by the clearance date, departmental directorate officers at Chief Housing Manager level had delegated authority to approve justified cases for rehousing to PRH on individual merits.

47. The Panel noted that about 63 households with immature WL applications would be rehoused to Po Tin IH in Tuen Mun. There were also 34 households without WL applications which were allowed to stay in IH for a maximum of one year, mainly due to failure to meet the Comprehensive Means Test ("CMT"). In this connection, members considered the present arrangement of rehousing IH households affected by the clearance to another IH highly undesirable, and urged HA to offer PRH to all affected households. The Administration responded that in line with other WL applications, the 63 households had to go through the same detailed vetting process and wait for their application to be due for allocation within a year before a flat could be allocated to them through the Anticipatory Housing Scheme. HA would strive to confirm their eligibility for PRH before the target clearance date.

48. Members were also concerned that the 34 households without WL applications might end up homeless if they were not rehoused. The Administration was urged to rehouse them to the IH in Po Tin Estate, or at least allow them to be temporarily rehoused to the IH in Po Tin Estate while their appeal case was being handled. The Administration responded that HD would further assess these 34 households nearer the end of the allowed stay period and they would be rehoused to the IH in Po Tin Estate if they met the CMT by then. Those households with medical or social considerations and recommended by the Social Welfare Department ("SWD") for compassionate rehousing would be rehoused directly to PRH.

49. Members expressed concern about the Government's IH policy. Noting the poor living condition of temporary shelters and transit centres, some members urged the Administration to clear these centres and house victims of natural disasters and emergencies to IH directly. Some other members criticized the Administration for clearing a number of IH estates since 2000 and centralizing the provision of IH in Po Tin Estate, as the policy was grossly unfair to victims who lived in other districts. These members requested the Administration to provide IH in the Urban District, Extended Urban District and the New Territories to enable prompt response to be made in case of emergencies.

50. The Administration responded that as it would need to respond quickly in case of emergencies and the number of victims could not be anticipated, the most appropriate emergency accommodation would be the one with simple design and multiple functions so that assessments for rehousing and social services could be made speedily. The Administration also stressed that while it would endeavour to provide victims with better accommodation as soon as possible depending on individual circumstances, not all victims required or were eligible for public housing.

Review of Waiting List income and asset limits

51. The eligibility of PRH applicants is determined by way of the WL income and asset limits, which measure the total household income required to rent private accommodation comparable to PRH while also meeting other non-housing expenditure. The limits are assessed annually to keep abreast with the prevailing socio-economic circumstances. The WL income limits are derived using a household expenditure approach, which consists of housing and non-housing costs, plus a 5% contingency provision. Housing costs measure the cost of renting a private flat comparable to PRH. The non-housing cost is determined with reference to the latest Household Expenditure Survey ("HES") conducted by the Census and Statistics Department ("C&SD"), with adjustments according to the latest movement in Consumer Price Index ("CPI")(A) (excluding housing costs), or the change in the nominal wage index obtained through the Labour Earnings Survey ("LES") conducted by C&SD as the income factor, whichever is higher.

52. The Administration regularly briefs the Panel on the results of its annual review of the WL income and asset limits. On 3 March 2014, the Panel discussed the outcome of the review for 2014-2015. The Panel was advised that overall, the proposed income and asset limits for 2014-2015 would increase by an average of 8.4% and 4.4% respectively over those for 2013-2014.

53. Members generally requested for raising the WL income limits for 1- and 2-person households. Members considered the proposed WL income limit for 2-person households at \$14,970 contrary to the policy of encouraging

births, as the household income of a 2-person household with two income earners would easily exceed that limit. They requested that the mechanism for reviewing the WL income and asset limits be reviewed and that special consideration be given to households whose income was marginally above the proposed limits. Some members further suggested adding weighting to the WL income limits of both 1- and 2-person households in view of the relatively higher expenditure of 1-person households compared with those of more persons.

54. Some other members opined that households who met the WL income and asset limits were in fact living close to the poverty line. In view of the limited housing supply accompanied by soaring rentals, they called on HA to review the mechanism for reviewing the WL income and asset limits, and to consider setting a higher income limit for households opting for PRH in the Urban District in view of the relatively higher housing costs envisaged. There was also the request for HA to set out separate housing costs according to districts because such costs were relatively higher in the Urban District.

55. Some members commented that the proposed WL asset limit for 1-person households at \$221,000 was too low and such a low level would effectively deter WL applicants from making savings and improving their financial position, thus going against the wider policy objective of promoting savings and acquiring wealth. Elderly applicants, who had made savings from years of work, would also fall into the category of well-off tenants easily. Members therefore urged HA to conduct a comprehensive review on the existing mechanism for reviewing the WL income and asset limits which was considered very outdated.

56. Members also held the view that the WL asset limits should be adjusted with reference to other more relevant indicator(s) other than CPI(A), such as an index on asset growth of low-income families. Besides, CPI(A) was considered too broad an indicator to accurately reflect the financial position of the sector of the population eligible for PRH. Instead of relying on a set of indicators, members supported that a more people-oriented approach be adopted in the review of WL income and asset limits.

57. Some members criticized HA's practice of rejecting applications and even making prosecutions against those applicants with inadvertent omissions although the omission would not cause the income to exceed the prescribed limits. They urged HA to review its current practice in handling cases of inadvertent omissions. The Administration responded that HA would need to be vigilant in dealing with applications with omissions where discretions should be avoided. However, it undertook to look into the current practice and see if the handling of such cases could be further optimized.

Maintenance and management of public housing estates

Subsidy Scheme for the replacement of laundry pole holders by laundry racks in public rental flats

58. The Panel was consulted on HA's proposed Subsidy Scheme to replace laundry pole holders with laundry racks in public rental flats. On the laundry facility design of PRH estates, the Panel notes that most estates completed before 2005 adopted the pole holders design. Laundry hangers are provided on the balcony ceiling of the flats in most of the standard type blocks as an extra clothes drying facility.

59. According to the Administration, with a view to enhancing building sustainability and addressing the safety concern of tenants, HD conducted a review on laundry pole holder clothes drying facilities and proposed to launch a Subsidy Scheme to replace the pole holders with laundry racks on a need basis. Under the proposal, HD will conduct a survey on the intention of tenants with regard to the replacement of a new rack. Installation works are expected to be completed in around two years. The Scheme will be applicable to all public rental flats with pole holders installed. The estimated cost to replace a pole holder facility with a stainless steel laundry rack is about \$1,800 per flat. HA would bear about \$1,500 for each rack while tenants would have to pay \$300 for the replacement.

60. Members were of the strong view that it was the defective design of laundry pole holders which had resulted in repeated fatalities involving tenants falling from height when using the facility. They demanded the Administration to make it a mandatory measure to replace all pole holders by safer laundry racks and install the laundry racks free of charge across the board to avoid the recurrence of similar incidents. Members also emphasized that as the replacement exercise aimed to address the tenants' safety concern, HA had an absolute responsibility to replace all pole holders with laundry racks and to provide the subsequent repair and maintenance services free of charge.

61. In response, the Administration advised that pole holders were very safe if used properly. Attributing the cause of the falling incidents to the use of pole holders was unsubstantiated as such incidents happened even for flats without pole holders. The Subsidy Scheme as proposed allowed the Administration to address the safety concern by identifying those in genuine need of the replacement.

62. Members doubted the Administration's view that the pole holder design was up to the required safety standard and were dissatisfied with the Administration's shirking of responsibility for the falling incidents. They urged the Administration to take all practicable measures to replace all pole holders to remove the risk associated with their use and enjoy the economy of scale in

conducting the replacement exercise in one go. Members further objected to the Administration's correlating the need for the replacement works with tenants' willingness to pay. They requested the Administration to withdraw its suggestion of assessing tenants' need for the replacement works based on their willingness to share the installation cost in submitting the proposed Subsidy Scheme to the Subsidized Housing Committee ("SHC") under HA for consideration. The Administration undertook to reflect members' views to SHC.

63. The Panel passed a motion urging HD to carry out installation works and provide repair and maintenance services free of charge in the future for tenants participating in the Subsidy Scheme.

64. The Panel subsequently noted that SHC accepted members' views and decided to replace the laundry pole holders with laundry racks free of charge. HA would also take care of the necessary future maintenance works of the new racks under the enhancement programme.

Proposed bathroom improvement in Po Tin Estate

65. The issues relating to the living environment of Po Tin Estate was previously discussed by the Panel at its meeting on 3 June 2013 in the last session. At that meeting, members criticized that the small bathrooms in the units of Po Tin Estate were substandard and should be improved. The Panel also passed two motions requesting the Administration to conduct a feasibility study on the different ways for enlarging the bathrooms and the alternative of redeveloping the entire estate, and report the outcome to the Panel.

66. According to HD, in response to the request made by the Panel at the meeting on 3 June 2013, it had carried out a study on various possible options to improve and enlarge the bathrooms. Several factors including technical implications, nuisance, cost-effectiveness and impact on flat supply associated with these options had been taken into consideration. On 14 January 2014, HD arranged a site visit to Po Tin Estate to brief members on the findings of the feasibility study and the recommended improvement works. The Panel then discussed the proposed improvement works and the implementation plan at its meeting on 10 February 2014.

67. Some members commended HD for its efficiency in putting up a proposal to improve the bathroom in Po Tin Estate which was well-received by the residents. On the other hand, they reflected that residents were disappointed at the proposed programme of works and requested HD to reserve more vacant flats for use as temporary accommodation for tenants opting for the works so that modification works could be conducted in about 480 flats per month, making it possible to complete the improvement programme in about a year. HD was further urged to arrange visits to the mock-up flats for the sitting

tenants.

68. The Administration responded that as tenants would be affected by the modification works, HD would conduct the improvement programme by modifying the existing vacant flats so that these flats could be used as temporary accommodation if necessary. Visits to the mock-up flats would then be arranged prior to the invitation of applications.

69. In response to the concern that space-saving sliding doors currently in use for the bathrooms could no longer be used after the modification works, the Administration explained that the choice of doors for the bathrooms was very limited due to the need to prevent water seepage. HD would however further explore the choices of appropriate doors to be used.

70. Nevertheless, some members criticized that the current improvement proposal was only superficial, and would only enlarge bathroom space at the expense of kitchen space or that of the living room. They called on HD to tackle the problem at source by combining smaller units to provide a more reasonable living environment. They opined that the technical constraints associated with the repartition options would be resolved with advanced technology.

71. The Administration explained that HD had studied the option of repartitioning two flats confined within the structural walls but found that there were several technical constraints to such conversion given the existing building configuration. On the proposal to redevelop the estate, the Administration responded that for redevelopment proposals to be justified, there should be a reasonable increase in the number of housing units upon redevelopment. Due to the need to enlarge the bathroom size, there might not be an increase in the number of units upon redeveloping Po Tin Estate.

72. In reply to members' enquiry as to whether the proposed improvement programme would be extended to the some 3 600 units in Tin Yan Estate which faced the same problem of small bathroom, the Administration replied in the affirmative, saying that mock-up flats would likewise be provided in Tin Yan Estate approximately three months after the works in Po Tin Estate had run smoothly.

Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in Public Housing Estates

73. To strengthen enforcement measures against hygiene-related offences in PRH estates, HA implemented the Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in Public Housing Estates ("the Marking Scheme") in 2003. The Marking Scheme currently covers 28 misdeeds, categorized by severity of their impact on environmental hygiene or estate management. Tenants who are found to have committed misdeeds in the estate in which they live will be

allotted points which will be valid for two years. An accumulation of 16 points within two years will trigger action for termination of tenancy by means of a Notice-to-quit issued by HA. The Panel has continued to monitor the implementation of the Marking Scheme. In March 2014, the Panel received an update on the progress of the Marking Scheme as well as the impact of measures taken to tackle the misdeeds over which the public had grave concern, such as smoking, unauthorized dog keeping and throwing objects from a height.

74. Members generally considered it unfair to hold the entire household liable for the misdeed committed by an individual family member, except in cases where the misdeed was related to using the premises for illegal purpose. They were of the view that the individual who committed the misdeed should be held liable and be punished accordingly but this should not affect the rights of other family members to continue to live in the PRH unit. Some members even pointed out as the tenancy was signed with the principal tenant, they did not see the rationale for terminating the tenancy of the entire household as a result of a misdeed committed by a child of the principal tenant, even if it was related to using the premises for illegal purpose. On the suggestion of removing just the individual who committed a misdeed from the tenancy, the Administration responded that the purpose of the Marking Scheme was not to terminate tenancies but to change the behavior of the tenants who committed the misdeeds, and family pressure would be a more effective way to deal with the issue.

75. On the handling of cases involving nuisances caused by households with autistic or mentally incapacitated family members, the Panel considered it inappropriate to allot points to such households as this would not address the root cause of the misconducts. Members opined that HD should engage social workers to handle the relevant cases or refer such cases to the Integrated Family Service Centres ("IFSCs") of SWD for follow up. Assistance from SWD should also be sought for cases involving repeated misdeeds.

76. Noting that HD had made 24 referrals to IFSCs in 2013, some members considered the number of referrals on the low side as compared with the 1 350 households which had accrued 10 points or above as at December 2013. They requested HD to put in place clear criteria and guidelines for making referrals to IFSCs and set up a social worker team to more effectively handle cases that warranted intervention and professional assistance. The Administration explained that it was inappropriate for HD to set up a dedicated social worker team of its own in view of the wide range of social welfare needs of those who committed misdeeds. HD would thus need to draw on the expertise and resources readily available from SWD. HD would raise the issue again at its regular meetings with SWD to work out better ways to render assistance to those in needs.

77. Some members pointed out that they had received an increased number of complaints from residents of PRH regarding the nuisance of cigarette smoke in the corridor caused by neighbours smoking in their unit with door open wide, and they were concerned about the difficulty in taking enforcement action on account of the need to gather evidence as the smoke might have dissipated when the housing staff arrived at the scene. The Administration responded that it would continue to inculcate behavioral change through publicity and educational programmes, and would strictly enforce the Marking Scheme to tackle smoking nuisance.

Addition of lifts and escalators to existing public rental housing estates

78. HA has put in place the Lift Addition Programme ("LAP") to enhance the pedestrian access in identified PRH estates to respond to the need of tenants (the elderly and the disabled in particular) for barrier-free access. The enhancement works include the provision of new lifts, escalators and footbridges in external areas within PRH estate boundaries to connect elevated platforms with large-level differences and, where technically feasible, addition of lift towers to PRH blocks built without lift services. In addition, HA implements the lift modernization programme ("LMP") in all existing PRH estates. LMP is an on-going programme and implemented on a rolling basis. Modernization of lifts will generally take place when lifts reach their service life of over 25 years. The Panel receives updates on the progress of LAP and LMP regularly.

79. The Administration briefed the Panel on the latest progress in April 2014. The Panel was informed that with the completion of all projects under Stage 1 of LAP, HA had basically accomplished the works to add lifts to existing PRH blocks without lift services where technically feasible and cost-effective. Stage 2 of LAP was launched by HA in early 2013. It was expected to be completed in 2016, with a total estimated construction cost of \$290 million.

80. Noting that the scale of Stage 2 LAP was smaller than that of Stage 1, some members expressed concern about the timing of adding lifts to the remaining existing PRH blocks without lift services and shopping centres. In response to members' request for adding lifts to the Siu Hong Commercial Complex in Siu Hong Court to facilitate the residents, the Administration responded that under the existing mechanism, HA would enhance the accessibility of two shopping malls in aged PRH estates per year. As for LAP, aged PRH estates that were most in need of lifts had been included in Stage 1. Stage 2 was launched in 2013 to add lifts to connect elevated platforms in external areas and existing footbridges within PRH estates. While Stage 2 was expected to be completed in 2016, preparatory work for Stage 3 would soon commence in the second half of 2014. HA would continue to invite views from the public for further planning.

81. Some other members pointed out that it was difficult for wheel-chair users to commute between housing blocks and the estate shopping centre and other public facilities via escalators. In this connection, they urged the Administration to provide lifts in Cheung Ching Estate and Kwai Shing East Estate where there was a large-level difference between the estate shopping centre and the housing blocks uphill.

82. Noting that HA had recently completed a review of the redevelopment potential of 22 aged PRH estates, members urged the Administration to avoid the recurrence of the Pak Tin case in which lifts had to be demolished shortly after they were installed due to redevelopment. The Administration responded that HA would ensure that where lifts were provided at PRH estates, they would be used for at least six years.

83. Citing the inconvenience caused to residents of Lai Kok Estate due to the suspension of lift services for modernization works as an example, members emphasized the need to shorten the time required for the works. The Administration advised that to minimize the inconvenience caused by lift enhancement works, only one lift would be closed while the rest would remain in service. HA would look for ways to shorten the time required for the works, which was about nine to 10.5 months at present, with more experience gained.

Under-occupation in public rental housing estates

84. The Panel discussed HA's measures to tackle under-occupation cases in PRH estates. Members noted that HA had put in place the under-occupation policy to require those households with deletion of family member(s), which resulted in their living space exceeding the prescribed under-occupation standards³, to move to another PRH flat of appropriate size. HA endorsed a phased approach to handle under-occupation cases in 2007. Priority was given to handling those Prioritized Under-occupied ("PUO") households (previously known as "Most-serious Under-occupied ("UO") households") with living density exceeding 35 square meters ("m²") per person and without elderly or disabled family members. They would be given a maximum of four housing offers in the residing estate or an estate within the same DC constituency. If the households refused all the four housing offers without justified reasons, they would be subject to termination of tenancy.

85. HA reviewed the under-occupation policy in 2010, and the prioritized under-occupation threshold was adjusted to include households with living

³ Existing under-occupation standards are as follows –

Family Size (Person)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Internal Floor Area exceeding (m ²)	25	35	44	56	62	71

density exceeding 34 m² per person and without elderly or disabled family members.

86. The under-occupation policy was further reviewed in June 2013 and the PUO household threshold was further revised. Besides, the PUO households would be provided a maximum of three, instead of four, housing offers in the residing estate or an estate within the same DC constituency. The revised prioritized under-occupation threshold for different family size with effect from 1 October 2013 is as follows –

Family Size (Person)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Prioritized under-occupation Threshold (Internal Floor Area in m ²)	> 30	> 42	> 53	> 67	> 74	> 85

87. In addition, upon the review of the under-occupation policy in June 2013, HA endorsed the exclusion of UO households with disabled members or elderly members aged 70 or above from the under-occupation list. HA also endorsed that UO households with elderly aged between 60 and 69 would continue to be placed at the end of the under-occupation transfer list and they could continue to reside in their existing PRH flats until the next policy review.

88. Members generally were dissatisfied that HA had been tightening the prioritized under-occupation threshold over the years, from 35 m² per person, 34 m² to 30 m², and that the number of housing offers for PUO households had been reduced from four to three. They considered the under-occupation policy to be disturbing and causing undue pressure on those tenants who were identified as UO households, in particular the elderly. Members opined that instead of placing UO households with elderly aged between 60 and 69 at the end of the under-occupation transfer list and allowing them to continue to reside in their existing PRH flats until the next policy review, HA should exclude such households from the under-occupation list altogether.

89. Members also criticized HA for adopting the under-occupation policy to tackle the problem of shortage of larger PRH units rather than building sufficient public housing units to meet the demand of WL applicants. Some members urged HA to provide more attractive incentives to encourage UO households to transfer, such as increasing the amount of Domestic Removal Allowance. Noting from the Administration's discussion paper that HA had all along adopted a reasonable and considerate approach in implementing the under-occupation policy, members requested for an elaboration on the approach, including the relevant circumstances and criteria that would be taken into consideration.

90. A few other members, however, supported the implementation of the under-occupation policy to ensure rational utilization of the precious public

housing resources for allocation to eligible families with genuine housing needs.

91. The Panel subsequently passed a motion requesting HA to expeditiously exclude households with members aged 60 or above from the under-occupation list.

92. The Panel also held a meeting on 17 June 2014 to receive public views on the subject. The majority of the deputations/individuals attending the meeting objected to the under-occupation policy. They pointed out that the root of Hong Kong's housing problem was inadequate supply of housing land and PRH. They opined that the Administration was using this policy to divert the public's attention away from the shortage of PRH. Requiring the PUO households to transfer to smaller flats would not increase the supply of PRH, but would create disturbance and undue pressure on the tenants, in particular the UO households aged between 60 and 69. They requested the Administration to exclude households in this age group from the under-occupation list. Besides, they considered it unfair to require those UO households which had been rehoused to larger PRH units due to special circumstances to transfer, e.g. previous tenants of PRH estates built using seawater and tenants affected by redevelopment and who were rehoused to units in harmony blocks.

93. A few deputations/individuals, however, held the view that the under-occupation policy was necessary to ensure rational allocation of the precious public housing resources. They urged the Administration to adopt a more flexible approach in implementing the policy to cater for the special circumstances of individual cases. They also called on the Administration to provide more incentives to encourage UO households to transfer, such as raising the amount of Domestic Removal Allowance and providing subsidy for renovation.

94. Having regard to the deputations' views, the Panel requested HA to review its 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 built using seawater and tenants affected by redevelopment and who were rehoused to units in harmony blocks. Besides, noting that HD normally allowed those households which had become PUO households due to the death of their family members to continue to stay in their existing flats for six months, the Panel requested HA to review whether this period was too short.

Rental increase by the Hong Kong Housing Society in 2014

95. In view of the public concern about the high level of rent increase (i.e. 8%) to be implemented by HS from 1 April 2014, the Panel discussed the issues related to this subject at its meeting on 5 May 2014.

96. According to HS, the domestic rents of HS's rental units are reviewed every two years. The rent adjustment is mainly dependent upon the operating costs to account for three factors, viz. (a) the rental income must be sufficient to cover the recurrent management expenditures, tenancy administration costs, Rates (if this is inclusive in rent) and Government Rents; (b) provision for major improvements, repair and maintenance; and (c) contribution to development sinking fund to cater for redevelopment of estates in future. At the same time, the market condition such as inflation rate, salary index and affordability of the tenants will also be taken into consideration. Making reference to the inflation in the past two years, the HS Executive Committee approved an increase of rent by 8% commencing 1 April 2014.

97. While members showed understanding about HS's need to increase the rents of its rental units, they were concerned that the level of increase at 8% was way too high and would adversely affect the livelihood of the grassroots. Noting that one of the reasons for increasing rents was that HS had earmarked a funding of \$900 million for major improvement works in its aged estates, members considered it unfair for HS to require its sitting tenants to contribute to the funding for carrying out the improvement works. They were also dissatisfied that tenants' affordability was not given due weighting by HS in deciding rent increase. They called on HS to lower the level of increase.

98. Regarding those tenants who had financial difficulties in paying rents, HS advised that it would refer such cases to SWD for assistance. The tenant could also apply to transfer to other estates with cheaper rent. For senior tenants, they had one more alternative of transferring to Elderly Persons Flats at concessionary rent. Members commented that from their experience, SWD could not offer useful assistance to tenants who could not afford to pay rents. They requested HS to study the feasibility of providing needy tenants of its rental estates with rental assistance and inform the Panel of the study outcome. They further requested for detailed information on HS's financial situation, including its fiscal reserve and daily operation costs, to justify the need for rental increase.

99. A motion was passed by the Panel requesting HS to shelve the adjustment of rent for its rental housing units.

Disposal of properties by The Link Management Limited

100. The Panel noted with grave concern the announcement made by The Link Management Limited ("the Link") on 12 May 2014 that it had put up for private tender the following properties: (a) the Hing Tin Commercial Centre, (b) the Kwai Hing Shopping Centre, (c) the Po Hei Court Commercial Centre, (d) the Retail and Car Park within Tung Hei Court, and (e) the Wah Kwai Shopping Centre ("the properties"). The tender was closed on 15 May 2014 and the Link announced on 20 May 2014 that it had accepted tenders to dispose of the

properties except the Po Hei Court Commercial Centre. It was stated by the Link that, as the owner-manager of The Link REIT's portfolios, the Link was committed to reviewing the performance of its portfolio mix from time to time with the view to further enhancing operational efficiency. The Panel decided to invite representatives of the Administration and the Link to attend its meeting on 3 June 2014 to discuss the matter.

101. Despite the Panel's invitation, the Link refused to send representatives to attend the meeting. In the circumstances, the Panel condemned the Link for not respecting the Legislative Council and refusing to attend the meeting. The Panel proceeded to discuss the subject with the Administration.

102. Members were gravely concerned that the disposal of the properties by the Link was the beginning of its actions to get rid of those shopping centres that were not so profitable. After procuring the properties, the new property owners might increase the rents of the retail and carparking facilities and this in turn would lead to increased prices of goods and rents of carparking spaces, thereby adding to the financial burden on the residents of the public housing concerned. There was also the concern that the properties might be converted to other uses, hence depriving the residents of convenient retail facilities.

103. Members considered that the Administration had the responsibility to ensure that public housing residents were provided with retail facilities which provided goods at reasonable price levels. They criticized the Administration for not preventing the Link from disposing of its properties. Some members called on the Administration to buy back the properties.

104. The Administration advised that as a private entity, the Link was entitled to rights over its properties just like other private property owners, and had to comply with the relevant law and the conditions of government leases (commonly known as "land leases"). The assignment deeds between HA and the Link also contained certain restrictive covenants. Generally speaking, the commercial and carparking facilities should not be disposed except as a whole. As for the suggestion of buying back the Link's properties, the Administration responded that the main objective of HA in divesting its retail and carparking facilities was to enable HA to focus its resources on discharging its function of providing PRH. The buyback proposal was not in line with the Government's policy objective, and was incompatible with public interests and the principle of prudent financial management.

105. Members doubted how the Administration could ensure that a third party who had purchased a shopping centre from the Link would comply with the restrictive covenants and would not dispose of the shops in the shopping centre individually. They requested the Administration to provide supplementary information in this regard as well as information concerning the 180 divested properties to explain how the land lease conditions could ensure

that the residents of the relevant estate or court would be given priority in using the carparking spaces in the properties. In addition, the Panel urged the Administration to consider conducting a comprehensive assessment on the provision of retail and carparking facilities in the estates/courts involving divested properties (for example, the change in the rental levels of these properties), and the need for taking remedial actions.

Subcommittee on the Long Term Housing Strategy

106. The Panel appointed the Subcommittee on the LTHS ("the Subcommittee") in the last session to follow up the review of the LTHS by the LTHS Steering Committee. The Subcommittee had held 11 meetings to discuss the various issues covered in the LTHS review, including the housing needs of specific groups in the community and the priorities in addressing those needs; position of the WL, review of QPS and the Well-off Tenants Policies; measures to maximize/rationalize the use of public housing resources; projection on housing demand for both public and private housing; and housing supply issues and recommendations on existing policies and practices. The Subcommittee would report its work to the Panel in July 2014.

Other issues

107. Other issues deliberated by the Panel included the Administration's measures to increase housing land supply to meet the new housing supply target for the next 10 years as well as in the long term at the joint meeting held with the Panel on Development on 29 January 2014, and the one-off measure of paying one month's rent for tenants living in PRH units of HA and HS as proposed in the 2014-2015 Budget. The Panel also received an update on the performance of HA in respect of its environmental targets and initiative in 2013-2014 and the progress of the Total Maintenance Scheme for PRH estates implemented by HA.

108. The Panel has scheduled another meeting on 7 July 2014 to discuss issues related to tenancy control and a further meeting on 24 July 2014 to receive deputation's views on this subject.

109. During the session, the Panel was consulted on the following Public Works Programme items and staffing proposals –

- (a) main engineering infrastructure in association with the proposed public housing developments at Area 56 in Tung Chung;
- (b) the Community Hall at Sau Ming Road, Kwun Tong;

- (c) the reprovisioning of Pak Tin Community Hall and special child care centre-cum-early education and training centre in Pak Tin Estate redevelopment site, and construction of footbridge link at Nam Cheong Street, Sham Shui Po;
- (d) proposed creation of one supernumerary post of Administrative Officer Staff Grade C in HD for the implementation of the initiatives under the LTHS review; and
- (e) proposed creation of three permanent directorate posts in HD for coping with the additional workload arising from the new public housing production targets.

Meetings and visit

110. From October 2013 to June 2014, the Panel held a total of 13 meetings, including a joint meeting with the Panel on Development, and discussed a total of 22 subjects. The Panel also paid a visit to Po Tin Estate, Tuen Mun, on 14 January 2014 to receive a briefing on the findings of the study conducted by HD and the recommended improvement works to alleviate the problem of small bathroom.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
3 July 2014

Legislative Council

Panel on Housing

Terms of Reference

1. To monitor and examine Government policies and issues of public concern relating to private and public housing.
2. To provide a forum for the exchange and dissemination of views on the above policy matters.
3. To receive briefings and to formulate views on any major legislative or financial proposals in respect of the above policy areas prior to their formal introduction to the Council or Finance Committee.
4. To monitor and examine, to the extent it considers necessary, the above policy matters referred to it by a member of the Panel or by the House Committee.
5. To make reports to the Council or to the House Committee as required by the Rules of Procedure.

**Legislative Council
Panel on Housing**

Membership list for 2013-2014 session

Chairman Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH

Deputy Chairman Hon WU Chi-wai, MH

Members
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
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
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon WONG Yuk-man
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
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-kiwok, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

(Total : 25 Members)

Clerk Ms Miranda HON

Legal Adviser Miss Winnie LO