



Re: Opinions on 344 Consultation Paper
 Sandy Lo
 to:
 ftsang
 27/04/2017 09:02
 Hide Details
 From: Sandy Lo <>

立法會 CB(2)1291/16-17(27)號文件
LC Paper No. CB(2)1291/16-17(27)

To: ftsang@legco.gov.hk

Dear Sir/ Madam,

On top of the opinions voiced two days ago, I'd like to know more about the following,

1. Concerning 4.8 (a), **why is there a need to set a minimum % for the MR after 5 years??**

Why does the government need to protect the interest of the property management businesses, which is well -known for making long-term huge profit from residents living at private buildings?? Why not let the parties involved negotiate by themselves? Why not let the free market decide the amount of MR?

What the government need to do is to protect the interest of owners / consumers who are always too busy to fight for a fair deal. Also, many of us have no idea at all about the DMC and it's a long hard fight to lower the unreasonable charge of the MR, Headquarters fee and other services charge! **What the government need to do is to set the maximum MR %, but not the minimum!**

2. The MR should be given according to **the continuous on-job training and support provided** by the Headquarters to the management team. The management team of my estate has no support and on-job training for long. The services it provides has been unsatisfactory. The Headquarters staff who are responsible for our estate show no initiative/ no plan in improving the management services. Our OC team works very hard to follow different problems and issues in the estate. It is the OC team that deserves the MR, not the headquarters!

So there should be an "evaluation scheme/ form/ standard" when considering the amount of MR.

I hope my opinions would be seriously discussed and considered before the final draft of the amendment is made.

Thank you for your attention.

Regards,
 Mrs. Cheng

On Tue, Apr 25, 2017 at 10:02 PM, Sandy Lo [wrote](#):

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I am writing to voice my opinions about the 344 Consultation Paper with the focus on chapter 4 : appointment of DMCs and managerial remuneration (MR).

My opinions are as follows:

1. With reference to 4.4(a) and (b), I do agree that 30% is an appropriate percentage to terminate the appointment of DMCs and its appointment period should not exceed 5 years. **But such amendments should be applied to ALL residential estates, not only to the new ones .**

2. Concerning 4.8 (a), I don't understand why in the first year, the MR % is set at 10, and after 5 years, it is set at 8%? Why not 5 %? **What is the rationale behind such a suggestion?**

Actually, it is absolutely absurd to calculate the MR based on the total expenditure of the estate!! Why not a fixed amount?

3. For 4.8 (c), **it is without doubt that all the expenses on electricity, water, rates, etc. should be excluded** if the MR is based on the total expenditure of the estate as the manager provides NO services at all in these areas.

4. For 4.8 (d), I totally agree that owners should have the right to ask for the details of the charge of the services like accounting fee provided by the headquarters.

Besides, I don't understand why we (about 1700 households) have to pay **Headquarters administration fee** which accounts for over **\$650,000** annually even though we have paid the MR and the services provided by the headquarters! When we asked for the details of such charge, the headquarters just refused and said it is their commercial secret !!!???

We have been exploited by the DMCs manager for long and there is no way for us to fight for a reasonable charge as many Hong Kong people are frightened by the corruption cases of Owners' Corporations, and the Owners Committee has no bargaining power over the MR or other unreasonable charge! It is high time for the government to amend the regulations to protect our interest.

We look forward to the fair amendment of 344.

Thank you for your attention.

Regards,
Mrs. Cheng