

立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(1)1201/17-18

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 2017-2018 Legislative Council session. It will be tabled at the meeting of the Council on 11 July 2018 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 36 members, with Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen and Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin elected as Chairman and Deputy Chairman respectively. The membership list of the Panel is in **Appendix II**.

Major work

Housing-related initiatives in the 2017 Policy Address and Policy Agenda

4. The Panel received a briefing by the Secretary for Transport and Housing on the ongoing housing-related initiatives in Policy Address at its meeting on 30 October 2017.

Revising Well-off Tenants Policies

5. On the revised Well-off Tenants Policies ("WTP") which were to be implemented in October 2017, members opined that Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") should have conducted a comprehensive public consultation before implementing them. In their views, the revised WTP were not of much help in recovering public rental housing ("PRH") units for allocation to Waiting List ("WL") applicants, but would cause disturbances to PRH households. The revised WTP might prompt the affected households to delete family members from the tenancy, and might hence generate additional demand in the residential property market.

6. The Administration advised that the revisions to WTP concluded the relevant discussions over the past few years including those conducted in the Panel and the HA. As PRH units were precious public resources and well-off tenants should be able to take care of their own housing needs, it was appropriate for HA to recover the PRH units from them for allocation to those with more pressing housing needs.

Regularizing Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme

7. Noting that HA was going to regularize Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme ("GSH"), members expressed the concern that not all of the 200 000 PRH units being the target for the ten-year period from 2017-2018 to 2026-2027 were new PRH units. In effect, the proposal of regularizing GSH would reduce the number of new PRH units available for allocation to PRH applicants.

8. The Administration assured members that it had not changed the above target of providing PRH units, and to meet the target, HA would continue to build new PRH units. As PRH units surrendered by purchasers of GSH flats might be located at different regions throughout the territory, PRH applicants would enjoy greater choices of PRH units in terms of location.

Government's commitment to providing public rental housing

9. Members took the opportunity to seek clarification from the Administration about the basis of the Chief Executive ("CE")'s remark quoted saying in a press interview that she thought 800 000 PRH units might be sufficient to cater for the needs of grassroots families. Members expressed concern about the determination of the Government in building sufficient PRH units and objection to the setting of a ceiling on the overall number of PRH units.

10. The Administration reaffirmed that it was all along committed to providing adequate and affordable housing to families in need. As mentioned in the Policy Address, the Government would strive to shorten the waiting time for PRH and to help better-off PRH tenants move up the housing ladder. In taking forward this policy direction, the Administration would take into account relevant factors, including supply of public housing, the PRH tenants' aspirations for home ownership and their ability to afford, etc.

11. The Panel passed two motions with one requesting the Government to explain the basis for the figure of 800 000 in CE's remark and the other urging the Government to honour its pledge on the average waiting time ("AWT") of three years for WL applicants.

Long Term Housing Strategy

12. The Panel received a briefing by the Administration on Long Term Housing Strategy Annual Progress Report 2017 at the meeting on 9 January 2018.

Increasing housing supply

13. Members opined that since the formulation of Long Term Housing Strategy ("LTHS"), the projected public housing production had yet to meet the ten-year supply target, and the Administration should take more effective measures to make up the shortfall. They cast doubt on whether the Administration could identify sufficient housing sites for making up the shortfall. Noting that the number of newly completed private flats projected by the Administration was often higher than that actually provided by private developers, but private flats were mostly unaffordable to ordinary Hong Kong people, some members called on the Administration to increase the supply of public housing units and designate more land plots originally earmarked for private housing developments for HA to provide public housing.

Sites for public housing

14. Members made various suggestions to the Administration to increase housing supply, including identifying more spade ready sites for HA to provide public housing, expediting the development process of non-spade ready sites, converting the agricultural land currently owned by private developers into residential use through public-private collaboration, and relaxing the development restrictions, such as plot ratio and building height, in an appropriate scale for public housing sites. There was also the suggestion for a review of the policy on private recreational leases ("PRLs") in view that golf

courses and other facilities on large pieces of land leased under PRLs were open for use to a limited number of people only.

15. On these suggestions by members, the Administration advised that the Task Force on Land Supply would engage the public in early 2018 in thorough discussions on the pros and cons of different land supply options and try to build a consensus on the preferred options and their priorities. It should be noted that the suitability of a land site for housing development depended on a host of factors, including its size, the availability of supporting infrastructure, etc.

Public Housing Construction Programme

16. As the production of PRH involves a number of factors such as planning, construction and resource allocation, HA has put in place a Public Housing Construction Programme ("PHCP") which rolls forward on a yearly basis. The Panel monitors the progress of PHCP each year and discussed the programme for 2017-2018 to 2021-2022 in December 2017.

Waiting time for public rental housing

17. Members were concerned whether the Administration/HA would lag behind its target of providing the first flat offer to general PRH applicants at about three years on average. Some members cast doubt on whether there would be adequate supply of PRH units to cater for applicants for PRH units in urban/extended urban districts, as the applicants might have waited for PRH for more than five years.

18. The Administration advised that the Government would strive to shorten the waiting time for PRH. As the number of new PRH applications varied every year and the pace of PRH production was not totally under HA's control, it was difficult for HA to provide an accurate estimate of AWT.

Land supply for public housing

19. Members in general were concerned that the Development Bureau ("DEVB") would continue to allocate fragmented land parcels to HA for providing public housing. They cast doubt on the determination of the Transport and Housing Bureau to take a more proactive role in liaising with DEVB to designate more suitable land plots for HA to provide public housing. Some members urged the Administration to consider the feasibility of designating for HA to provide public housing part of the land plots that had originally been earmarked for private housing developments.

20. The Administration advised that since 2011, over 10 sites originally earmarked for private housing developments had been re-allocated for public housing use. In considering the suggestion of adjusting the public/private split of 60:40 in new housing production, the Administration also had to pay due regard to the stable development of private residential market. While it would take time to avert the housing demand-supply imbalance, the Administration assured members that it would continue to secure adequate housing sites to achieve the public housing supply target under LTHS.

21. The Panel passed a motion requesting the Administration to consider allocating some of the sites which have been planned or will be planned for building private residential units to the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HS") or the HA for public housing developments.

Public housing development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long

22. The Panel discussed the Public Works Programme ("PWP") project for the site formation and infrastructure works for the public housing development Phase 1 at Wang Chau, Yuen Long on 6 November 2017.

Compensation and rehousing arrangements

23. Some members expressed concern that the Administration's decision to proceed first with Phase 1 development at Wang Chau and resume the land inhabited by villagers had disregarded the latter's needs and concerns. The members considered it unfair to require villagers to move out from their homes to make way for the development project. Members noted that by the end of October 2017, only 8% of the 150 households affected by land clearance at Wang Chau were vetted to be eligible for rehousing.

24. Members urged the Administration to relax the eligibility criteria for rehousing households affected by the proposed project. Members considered that the prevailing policy on rehousing of occupants of squatter structures affected by Government's clearance operations could not cater for the aspirations of households affected by land clearance exercises, and should be reviewed so that better arrangements could be provided to residents.

25. The Panel passed three motions regarding the proposed project with the first one urging the Administration to resolve the issues relating to the relocation, rehousing and compensation arrangements for all Wang Chau residents before commencing the project; the second one urging the Government to revise the compensation mechanism so that residents living in non-domestic structures could also be compensated and rehoused; and the third one calling for a review the existing compensation and rehousing mechanism. The subcommittee set

up under the Panel to follow up the issues related to the Wang Chau Development Project received an update on the public housing development at Wang Chau on 25 April 2018.

26. On 10 May 2018, the Government announced proposed enhancements to the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for eligible domestic occupants in squatters affected by Government's development clearance exercises. To follow up the matter, the Panel held joint meetings with the Panel on Development on 26 and 29 June 2018 to receive public views on the proposed enhancements.

Review of the Interim Scheme to Extend the Home Ownership Scheme Secondary Market to White Form Buyers

27. At the meeting on 9 January 2018, the Panel received briefing by the Administration on the outcome of the review conducted by HA on the Interim Scheme to Extend the Home Ownership Scheme Secondary Market to White Form Buyers ("Interim Scheme"), which were regularized by HA as the White Form Secondary Market Scheme ("WSM").

Impact on housing supply and prices

28. Some members opined that WSM could not help increase the supply of flats if Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") flat owners who sold their flats in the Secondary Market needed to purchase another residential property. WSM would drive up HOS flat prices to levels unaffordable to applicants, making it ineffective in helping families achieve home ownership. As the number of Green Form ("GF") applicants who wished to purchase HOS units might reduce if HA decided to provide more units under the GSH in future, HA should consider allocating more quota to White Form ("WF") applicants for new HOS flats.

29. The Administration considered regularizing the Interim Scheme one of the many factors that might bring about fluctuations in prices of flats in the Secondary Market and a longer period of observation was indeed required to ascertain its impact. Apart from WSM, the Administration would continue to provide other subsidized sale housing schemes to help low to middle-income households meet their home ownership aspirations.

Resale restrictions

30. Some members opined that HA should not allow HOS flat owners who were receiving subsidized housing benefits to sell their flats to make profit, and enquired whether HA would restrict HOS flat owners to sell their flats to the Government/HA only.

31. The Administration advised that HOS flats had been subject to resale restrictions that had not included a requirement for the flats to be sold only to the Government/HA. The HOS Secondary Market Scheme was to allow owners of subsidized sale flats to sell their flats with premium unpaid to households with GF status in the Secondary Market, and with the implementation of the Interim Scheme, WF buyers were also allowed to purchase HOS flats with premium unpaid in the Secondary Market.

Review of the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme Pilot Project

32. At the meeting on 5 March 2018, the Panel discussed the GSH regularized by HA.

Impact on public rental housing

33. Some members expressed concern that regularizing GSH would reduce the PRH supply and urged HA/the Administration not to use PRH developments for implementing new GSH projects. They considered that the land earmarked for PRH developments should not be used for providing GSH. Some other members criticized the Administration for trying to shift public attention from inadequate supply of PRH units by regularizing GSH, and urged HA/the Administration to accord priority to the PRH supply over the provision of other housing units for meeting home ownership aspirations.

Price setting for Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme flats

34. Some members opined that the prices of GSH flats should not be linked to the market price. They asked whether HA would set the prices of new GSH flats at levels affordable to target applicants, including tenants who were required to move out from PRH under the HA's revised WTP. Some members opined that given the assumptions under the price setting mechanism, such as the mortgage-to-income ratio of 40%, based on which the discount would be set, the prices of GSH flats to be determined under the price setting mechanism might be higher than the price levels that GF applicants could afford.

35. The Administration advised that GSH flats would be sold at a discount, at 10% more than that for the latest HOS sale exercise, to the assessed market values. This would ensure that GSH flats will be more affordable to GF buyers than HOS flats offered for sale to GF (and WF) buyers around the same time. The Administration advised that the selling prices and sales arrangements for each GSH project would have to be approved by HA before inviting applications. After completing the first regularized GSH sale exercise in around the end of 2018, HA would look into the implementation arrangements of the scheme again in 2019, including the price setting mechanism.

36. The Panel passed a motion requesting HA to comprehensively review the selling prices of subsidized sale housing, which the Panel considered should be delinked from market prices as well as set on the basis of construction costs and the ability of the public to afford.

Implementation of the revised Well-off Tenants Policies of the Hong Kong Housing Authority

37. At the meeting on 10 April 2018, the Administration briefed members on the implementation of the revised WTP of HA and the measures to further enhance the implementation arrangements of the revised WTP. Prior to that, on 5 February 2018, the Panel held a hearing to receive public views on the matter.

Effectiveness and impact of the revised policies

38. Members expressed doubts about the effectiveness of WTP in recovering PRH units for re-allocation to PRH applicants. Some members expressed concern that the revised WTP would force PRH households to apply for deletion of their younger working members from the tenancy, hence rendering them being unable to live with their senior household members. Some members urged the Administration/HA to put in place incentives for well-off households to purchase subsidized sale flats using GF status.

39. The Administration advised that HA had regularised GSH with a view to providing an additional avenue for GF applicants to purchase subsidised sale flats. Before each sale exercise of new HOS flats, HA would decide the allocation of quota between GF and WF applicants. There were currently about 19% of the PRH households where all household members were elderly, and this might be attributed to the fact that in line with the Government policy of promoting "ageing in place", HA had adopted measures to offer elderly applicants a higher priority for allocation of PRH. HA did not notice any significant increase in the number of HA's approved applications for deletion of

individual household members from the tenancy since the implementation of the revised WTP in October 2017.

Compulsory moving out of well-off tenants

40. Members noted that under the revised WTP, PRH tenants were required to vacate their units if their household incomes exceeded five times of the PRH income limits ("PRHILs") or their assets exceeded 100 times of PRHILs. In view of the shortfall in subsidized sale flats and high rentals of private flats, some members called on HA to suspend the decision of requiring PRH residents to move out of their flats on a compulsory basis under the revised WTP.

41. The Administration advised that since the promulgation of LTHS in 2014, the Government had adopted a supply-led strategy to increase housing supply. Furthermore, HA had previously considered the suggestion of postponing the implementation of the revised WTP, and in light of public views and concerns on the revised WTP, HA had endorsed enhancement measures on the implementation of WTP.

42. However, some other members opined that public housing resources were limited and the current PRH waiting time was long. PRH tenants which were required to vacate their units under the revised WTP were those financially better able than low income families to take care of their housing needs and thus they should return their PRH units to HA for re-allocation to families more in need.

43. The Panel passed a motion urging HA to expeditiously provide relevant statistics, including the respective numbers of cases of flat recovery and deletion of family members from the PRH tenancy, etc., for discussion by the Panel, and to suspend the implementation of the decision of requiring residents to move out of their flats under the new WTP prior to the completion of the assessment and review of the impact of the new WTP on residents and the vacation of flats.

Review of income and asset limits for public rental housing

44. Under the existing policy, eligibility of PRH applicants is determined by way of income and asset limits which are reviewed annually. The Panel examined the results of the Administration's annual review of the income and asset limits for PRH for 2018-2019 at its meeting on 5 March 2018.

Mechanism for adjusting the income and asset limits

45. Members expressed concern that the mechanism for adjusting the income limits had not taken into account the PRH demand of those households with working members earning statutory minimum wage ("SMW"). They opined that HA should consider providing bigger buffers in the income limits concerned to cope with possible changes arising from the implementation of a new SMW rate in future. They also considered that low income limits might induce young PRH applicants to give up opportunities for jobs, pay rise or promotion, and this was not conducive to the talent development in Hong Kong. Some members pointed out that increasing the income limits might increase the number of eligible PRH applicants and lengthen the waiting time amidst the shortfall in PRH supply. Some members pointed out the public had an impression that the Administration proposed only a small increase in the income limits in order to minimize growth in the number of PRH applicants.

46. The Administration advised that the review of the income and asset limits based on objective data was a long-established mechanism adopted by HA. The inadequacy of PRH supply was not a factor for determining the proposed limits. HA reviewed the mechanism from time to time in light of prevailing circumstances. In particular, HA refined the mechanism for adjusting the income limits in 2013 to cope with the possible changes arising from the implementation of SMW. The Administration undertook to relay members' suggestion for conducting a review on the adjustment mechanism for income and asset limits to HA for consideration.

47. The Panel passed two motions; one expressed disappointment at the failure of the latest Budget to propose measures to ease the rental pressure faced by PRH applicants and urged the Administration to convert those lands for private residential developments into lands for public housing developments, and the other called for a review of the mechanism for determining the income and asset limits for PRH applications.

Rent adjustment mechanism for rental units and rent relief measures of the Hong Kong Housing Society

48. The Panel held a public hearing on 6 November 2017 to receive public views on the rent adjustment mechanism for rental units and rent relief measures of HS.

49. Members took the opportunity to seek an update from HS on how it responded to the Panel's consensus on the issue by way of a motion passed at the Panel meeting on 3 July 2017 in which it had urged HS to contain the rate of rent adjustment for its rental units in the coming year to below the inflation rate.

They also enquired whether HS would take into account its tenants' income when considering the rent adjustment, if tenants were willing to provide their household income information to HS. Some members opined that HS's tenants were originally registered on the WL for HA's PRH and those who moved to HS's rental units in early years had an expectation that HS had put in place similar rent policies adopted by HA, including rent assistance measures. As such, HS should introduce rent assistance comparable to the one adopted by HA.

50. HS replied that salary index was one of the factors for determining the rent adjustment for HS's rental estates. As some HS's tenants were retirees, HS also took into account tenants' ability to afford. Tenants might make a statutory declarations their income and assets if necessary. HS would conduct the rent review exercise for the rental estates by the end of 2017 with the new rent to take effect on 1 April 2018. HS had been actively communicating with relevant parties to listen to their opinions on rent adjustment and rent assistance. HS would consider the request for establishing a rent assistance scheme when carrying out the rent review in end 2017. In considering the design of the scheme, HS would make reference to the rent assistance measures adopted by HA and take into account the HS's operating circumstances and its tenants' needs.

51. The Panel passed a motion urging HS to take into consideration the tenants' ability to afford rents in determining the rate of rent adjustment for its rental estates and to put in place rent relief measures to provide direct assistance to tenants with financial difficulties.

Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in Public Housing Estates

52. The Panel discusses with the Administration HA's implementation of the Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in Public Housing Estates ("the Marking Scheme") regularly. At the meeting on 7 May 2018, the Panel received an update on the latest position of the implementation of the Marking Scheme.

Throwing objects from height

53. Members were concerned about the impact of the Marking Scheme misdeed of "throwing objects from height" on public safety and enquired whether HA had other effective measures combating the misdeed. The Administration advised that HA had adopted various measures to tackle the misdeed, including deployment of Mobile Digital Closed Circuit Television sets, Mobile Surveillance System sets and Special Operation Teams to detect suspected offenders; intensified patrols and inspections by estate staff at regional level;

and promoting the message against throwing objects from height through the Housing Channel, posters and partnering functions by Estate Management Advisory Committees ("EMACs") and non-government organizations.

Keeping guide dog puppies

54. The Panel noted that to assist guide dog puppies under training to adapt to the living environment PRH estates so as to facilitate their future matching with users in PRH estates, HD had launched a trial scheme for keeping guide dog puppies in early 2018 in some of the PRH estates. Members enquired whether and when HA would review/evaluate the scheme with a view to extending it to all public housing estates.

55. The Administration advised that two guide dog organizations had preliminarily recommended eight PRH estates suitable for the implementation of the trial scheme. After consulting the views of the relevant EMACs, the two organizations would select two tenants from the eight estates as voluntary guide dog puppy foster families. HD was expected to give permission to the selected foster families for keeping guide dog puppies under training in their PRH units for around one year in mid-2018, and would review the trial scheme upon its completion.

Quota and Points System of the Hong Kong Housing Authority

56. HA introduced the Quota and Points System ("QPS") in September 2005 to rationalize and to re-prioritize the allocation of PRH to non-elderly one-person applicants. QPS was refined in February 2015 to give priority to applicants reaching the age of 45, who were considered having relatively limited upward mobility. At the meeting on 7 May 2018, the Administration briefed the Panel on the implementation of the refined QPS.

57. Some members expressed concern about the impact of the refinement on the waiting time for non-elderly one-person applicants aged below 45. They questioned whether HA accorded lower priority to these applicants because of the shortfall in PRH supply, and whether HA would increase the annual PRH quota for QPS in view of the large number of applicants under QPS (which were about 119 000 as at end-March 2018) and young singletons' difficulties in meeting their housing need amidst the high flat prices and rentals. The Panel passed a motion urging the authorities to consider afresh setting a target PRH waiting time for non-elderly one-person applicants, and ultimately bring the target waiting time in line with that of general PRH applicants.

58. The Administration advised that the QPS refinement was introduced after considering views gathered during the public consultation on LTHS in 2013. While after the refinement the priority of applicants under the age of 45 would inevitably be relatively lower, the actual priority of individual applicants was determined by their points under the refined system, and was ultimately subject to the supply of PRH and the circumstances of other applicants.

Work of the Sales of First-hand Residential Properties Authority

59. The Residential Properties (First-hand Sales) Ordinance ("the Ordinance") came into full implementation on 29 April 2013 with the establishment of the Sales of First-hand Residential Properties Authority ("SRPA") to implement the Ordinance. The Panel was briefed on the latest work of SRPA at the meeting on 10 April 2018.

60. In view of the variety of mortgage plans and incentives launched by developers to attract buyers of first-hand residential properties, members opined that SRPA should remind prospective buyers of the risks associated with such mortgage plans by way of easy-to-understand reminder messages. There was also the concern that prospective buyers of first-hand residential developments who wished to know whether dogs were allowed to be kept in the first-hand residential development concerned might not know that they might check the information from the deed of mutual covenant concerned. The Panel passed a motion requesting that such information be set out in sales brochures.

61. SRPA advised that to deliver the messages about the matters a buyer needed to know when purchasing a first-hand residential property in a simple and user-friendly manner, SRPA had published a comic booklet titled "Everything You Need to Know When Purchasing a First-hand Residential Property". SRPA also distributed the "Notes to Purchasers of First-hand Residential Properties", promotional pamphlets and other publicity materials in sales offices and show flats of first-hand residential developments/phases to draw prospective buyers' attention to the things they needed to consider when purchasing first-hand residential properties. SRPA would continue to send reminder messages to prospective buyers through different channels, including television Announcement in the Public Interest.

Other issues

62. In the session, the Panel also deliberated various other public housing issues such as measures to facilitate the mobility needs of elderly residents in PRH estates, quality management of products used in public housing developments, and testing of drinking water of PRH estates under the Enhanced Water Quality Monitoring Programme. In July 2018, the Panel will discuss the 2018 rent review of PRH, use of non-domestic premises of HA and review of HD's role in outsourcing of government services, and continue to receive public views on tenancy control (jointly with the Panel on Welfare Services).

63. During the session, apart from the PWP project for site formation and infrastructure works public housing development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long, the Panel was consulted on the following PWP items and staffing proposals –

- (a) extension of footbridge and cycle parking area at Choi Yuen Road, Sheung Shui;
- (b) district open space adjoining San Po Kong public housing development; and
- (c) creation of one permanent Government Engineer post and one permanent Chief Engineer post in Civil Engineering and Development Department.

Meetings

64. From October 2017 to June 2018, the Panel held a total of 13 meetings, including two joint meetings with the Panel on Development and a joint meeting with the Panel on Welfare Services. In addition, the Panel has scheduled two meetings for July 2018.

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.

Panel on Housing

Membership list for 2017-2018 session *

Chairman	Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Deputy Chairman	Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Members	Hon James TO Kun-sun Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP Hon WU Chi-wai, MH Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP Hon CHAN Chi-chuen Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP Hon CHU Hoi-dick Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP Hon HO Kai-ming Hon SHIU Ka-fai Hon SHIU Ka-chun Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH Hon YUNG Hoi-yan Hon Tanya CHAN Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH

Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
Hon AU Nok-hin
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

(Total : 36 members)

Clerk Mr Derek LO

Legal Adviser Mr Cliff IP

* Changes in membership are shown in Annex.

Annex to Appendix II

Panel on Housing

Changes in membership

Member	Relevant date
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP	Up to 23 October 2017
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP	Up to 24 October 2017
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP	Up to 24 October 2017
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS	Up to 24 October 2017
Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP	Up to 24 October 2017
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH	Up to 24 October 2017
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP	Up to 26 October 2017
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS	since 21 March 2018
Hon AU Nok-hin	since 22 March 2018
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH	since 23 March 2018