

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1)798/18-19  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/HG/1

**Panel on Housing**

**Minutes of policy briefing**  
**held on Monday, 29 October 2018, at 10:45 am**  
**in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH (Chairman)  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, 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 YUNG Hoi-yan  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu

Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai  
Hon AU Nok-hin  
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

**Members absent** : Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP

**Public Officers attending** : Agenda Item I

Mr Frank CHAN, JP  
Secretary for Transport and Housing

Mr Stanley YING, JP  
Permanent Secretary for Transport and Housing (Housing)

Dr Raymond SO, BBS, JP  
Under Secretary for Transport and Housing

Ms Esther LEUNG, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Housing)

Ms Connie YEUNG, JP  
Deputy Director of Housing  
(Development & Construction)

Miss Rosaline WONG  
Deputy Director of Housing  
(Estate Management)

**Clerk in attendance** : Mr Derek LO  
Chief Council Secretary (1)5

**Staff in attendance** : Mr Fred PANG  
Senior Council Secretary (1)5

Ms Michelle NIEN  
Legislative Assistant (1)5

---

Action

**I. Briefing by the Secretary for Transport and Housing on the Chief Executive's 2018 Policy Address**

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)14/18-19(01) — Administration's paper on housing-related initiatives in the Chief Executive's 2018 Policy Address and Policy Agenda
- The Chief Executive's 2018 Policy Address
  - The Chief Executive's 2018 Policy Agenda)

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Secretary for Transport and Housing ("STH") briefed members on the Administration's ongoing housing-related initiatives as stated in the 2018 Policy Address and Policy Agenda.

*[At 11:56 am, the Chairman advised that he had received five motions from members and would deal with them at the meeting after members' deliberations on the item.]*

Supply of public housing

2. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung noted that the 2018 Policy Address had committed to allocating 70% of housing units on the Government's newly developed land to public housing development, and enquired about the percentage split between rental and sale units. Mr Andrew WAN and Mr Abraham SHEK raised similar enquiries. Mr Andrew WAN opined that the Administration should ensure that the flats provided on its newly developed land would be mainly for rental in order to address the housing needs of the most needy households. He suggested that to meet home ownership aspirations, the Administration should launch a scheme similar to the Tenants Purchase Scheme and impose stringent resale restrictions to prevent speculative trading of subsidized sale flats ("SSFs"). Mr SHIU Ka-chun expressed concern about the shift in the Government's policy focus from

Action

providing low-income households with public rental housing ("PRH") to encouraging home ownership. He asked about the proportion among different categories of housing to be provided on the newly developed land and expressed concern that grassroots families could not afford Starter Homes ("SH") units and SSFs.

3. STH replied that public housing comprised rental and sale flats. There were currently about 800 000 PRH units and about 400 000 SSFs with premium unpaid. The housing units to be provided under the SH pilot project would be counted towards private housing under the supply target of the Long Term Housing Strategy ("LTHS"), and the project would assist households who would be ineligible for the Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") and yet could not afford private housing to buy a home. The Administration would announce the public/private split for the supply of new housing units for the ten-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029 under the LTHS in late 2018. As regards the public housing to be provided on newly developed land, the Administration would consider the appropriate proportion between rental and sale flats taking into account public views and responses. In planning the production of PRH and SSFs, the Administration would strike a balance among the housing needs of different categories of households. STH further advised that PRH was a safety net for the grassroots and low-income families, and providing PRH units for needy families who could not afford private rental accommodation was a cornerstone of the Government's housing policy. Without affecting PRH production in meeting the demand of needy families, the Administration/Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") would continue to provide SSFs if they were well received by the target applicants.

4. Dr Fernando CHEUNG questioned why public housing supply continued to fall behind the LTHS target since its announcement in 2014 whereas private housing supply did not. He expressed concern that in 2026, there would be a shortfall of 60 000 public housing units against the LTHS target announced in 2014. STH replied that according to the latest projections under LTHS, the respective supply targets for PRH units and SSFs for the ten-year period from 2018-2019 to 2027-2028 were 200 000 and 80 000 units respectively. In the past few rounds of annual update under LTHS, the estimated ten-year public housing production was not sufficient to meet the respective supply target because of limited land supply. To help address the issue, the Administration had rezoned potential housing sites, and re-allocated private housing sites for public housing development. He explained that unlike public housing, the sources of private housing supply included not only the land in the Land Sale Programme, but also the land owned by private developers.

Action

5. Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that increasing housing land supply could not address the shortfall in public housing supply if the Administration continued to accord higher priority to private housing over public housing in the allocation of housing sites. Mr Jeremy TAM said that to facilitate members of the public to make their own plans for housing over the long term, the Administration should make clear as early as possible the proportion of PRH units, HOS flats and other SSFs to be provided at each of these nine sites at Kai Tak and Anderson Road Quarry which were originally private housing sites and had been re-allocated for public housing development in June 2018.

6. Mr KWOK Wai-keung enquired whether the suggestion of adjusting the public/private split of the new housing supply from 60:40 to 70:30 could address the shortfall of PRH units to meet the demand. STH replied that the feasibility of increasing the proportion of public housing in the new housing supply was subject to land supply. The 2018 Policy Address had mentioned that 70% of housing units on the Government's newly developed land would be allocated to public housing development.

Land supply for housing

7. Mr LAU Kwok-fan opined that if the Administration could not identify and allocate adequate land for public housing development, the ten-year public housing supply target under the LTHS and any undertaking to increase the proportion of public housing in the new housing supply would turn out to be an empty promise. Given the limited housing land available, increasing public housing supply might inevitably reduce the supply of private housing and exert pressure on prices in the private residential market. STH acknowledged the importance of identifying more land in order to increase the supply of public and private housing. To this end, the 2018 Policy Address had introduced various initiatives to further increase land supply, such as the Lantau Tomorrow Vision, Land Sharing Pilot Scheme, etc.

8. Mrs Regina IP enquired whether the Administration would require developers to provide public housing for rental under the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme to meet the demand of grassroots and low-income households. STH replied that the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme was under the Development Bureau's purview. Developers who submitted applications under the scheme would have to specify how the development proposals on the private land they hold could bring about increase in public and private housing, and the proposals would be put before the Land and Development Advisory Committee for consideration. From a public housing policy point of view,

Action

the Administration was open to Mrs IP's suggestion. In considering the types of housing that should be provided, the Administration would take into account the social, economic and market changes over time and public aspirations. Mrs Regina IP opined that the Administration should play a leading role in planning the types of housing to be provided on developers' land under the scheme, instead of considering the matter based on developers' proposals. STH undertook to relay Mrs IP's views to the relevant bureau.

9. Mr Tony TSE expressed support for increasing land supply through the Lantau Tomorrow Vision, Land Sharing Pilot Scheme and developing brownfield sites in the New Territories, etc. to address the housing problems. Mr KWOK Wai-keung opined that the Lantau Tomorrow Vision was an investment for the future and would bring benefits to society. Mr Abraham SHEK said that reclamation was a long term solution to the housing problems. He did not subscribe to the view that developers would dominate the decision-making process under the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme, given that their proposals would be subject to relevant lease conditions and ordinances, such as the Town Planning Ordinance, etc.

10. Dr CHENG Chung-tai opined that the long-term land supply initiatives in the 2018 Policy Address could not address the imminent problems of long PRH waiting time and a large number of applicants awaiting PRH residing in sub-divided units ("SDUs"). Owners of residential properties under mortgage, including HOS and Tenant Purchase Scheme flat owners, might worry that there would be a drop in the price of their flat caused by the recent drop in residential property prices and the potential impacts of the Lantau Tomorrow Vision on the property market. Dr CHENG enquired about the statistics to be taken into account by the Administration when considering the adjustments to the public/private split of new housing supply under the LTHS and working out the details of the Lantau Tomorrow Vision. He further enquired whether the statistics included the proportion of private flats with no outstanding mortgage loans, total liability of private flat owners, the loan-to-value ratio of new mortgages, and situation regarding default on mortgage repayments. STH replied that there was a consensus in society that the Administration should identify more land to cater for Hong Kong's long term development. The primary consideration in housing supply was to meet the housing needs of the public, and the Administration/HA would continue providing PRH to meet the demand of needy families.

Action

Households waiting for public rental housing

11. Mr CHU Hoi-dick opined that home ownership was only one of the options for addressing the housing needs of Hong Kong people. To cater for the needs of grassroots families who could not afford to buy a flat, the Administration should build a "housing protection ladder" instead of a housing ladder targeted at ownership of flats provided by private developers. He and Mr SHIU Ka-chun said that the Administration should not shift the responsibilities for providing transitional housing to other organizations, such as non-government organizations, developers, etc. Mr CHU Hoi-dick suggested that the Administration should provide land and fund for developing about 50 000 transitional housing units on its own in order to help the households on the PRH waiting list get out of the plight of living in SDUs. Mr SHIU Ka-chun asked whether the subject of providing transitional community housing would fall within the Government's policy area and whether the Administration would take a leading role and make financial commitment in developing such housing.

12. STH replied that the current-term Government's policies to enrich the housing ladder aimed at providing more avenues for members of the public, who aspired to become home owners but could not afford the high private flat prices to fulfill their home ownership aspirations. The Administration had also reiterated on different occasions its commitment to provide PRH for needy families. Furthermore, there were various approaches to provide transitional housing, such as use of temporarily idle sites, and conversion of vacant premises, including some PRH units. These short term initiatives might make use of the resources in the community outside the Government. In view that there should be adequate social services support to facilitate new residents to adapt to the new living environment of transitional housing, the Administration would continue to actively support non-profit-making organizations to take forward the short term initiatives of providing transitional housing. The task force under the Transport and Housing Bureau ("THB") would provide co-ordinated support to facilitate the implementation of more community initiatives on transitional housing.

13. Mr Vincent CHENG opined that apart from providing more transitional housing, the Administration should introduce short-term measures including tenancy control on SDUs and providing rent subsidy in order to alleviate the housing difficulties faced by the SDU households on the PRH waiting list, including unreasonable rent increases and frequent evictions of tenants by landlords, absence of written tenancy agreements, etc. STH replied that the Administration had made clear to members of the Panel

Action

on Housing at several previous meetings its stances regarding the suggestions of introducing tenancy control on SDUs and providing rent subsidy for SDU tenants. Mr Vincent CHENG expressed disappointment that the Administration did not re-consider taking forward the suggestions.

14. Mr Abraham SHEK opined that the Administration had not put in place clear policies to address the housing difficulties of inadequately housed households and elderly people on the PRH waiting list and there was a lack of progress in shortening their waiting time. The current-term Government should think out of the box in formulating measures to resolve the housing problems and take timely actions to implement them. STH replied that the fundamental solution to the housing problems was to increase housing land. To alleviate the housing difficulties faced by households waiting for PRH allocation, the Administration had introduced certain measures to facilitate more efficient use of public housing resources.

15. Dr KWOK Ka-ki opined that the Administration should make clear to the public that the Lantau Tomorrow Vision would take more than a decade to implement and was not a solution to the imminent difficulties faced by PRH waitlistees. Dr KWOK criticized the Administration for its failure to honour the pledge of providing the first flat offer to general PRH applicants at about three years on average ("three-year pledge"). STH replied that the Administration would continue to support HA in meeting the three-year pledge, and spare no efforts in identifying adequate housing land, enlisting the local communities' support for the proposed public housing projects, and expediting the project delivery. The Administration believed that the Lantau Tomorrow Vision would help provide land for meeting the Hong Kong's long term development needs, and would follow up the Task Force on Land Supply's recommendations when available.

Housing needs of young people

16. Ms YUNG Hoi-yan expressed concern about the lack of initiatives in the 2018 Policy Address to assist young people in fulfilling their home ownership aspirations, and young singletons had to wait for a very long time before they could own HOS flats or move to PRH. She asked how the Administration would address the issues and honour the three-year pledge. STH replied that apart from the HA's Quota and Points System ("QPS") for allocating PRH units to non-elderly singletons, the Home Affairs Bureau ("HAB") had put in place the Youth Hostel Scheme to meet working youths' aspirations in having their own living space. THB would follow up with HAB regarding the implementation of the scheme.



Action

17. Ms YUNG Hoi-yan opined that the Administration should consider providing rent subsidy and tax deductions for rent payment to assist young people who wished to have their own living space. HA should improve QPS to better meet the aspirations of non-elderly singletons, including those living in SDUs, for PRH allocation. STH replied that the Administration took note of Ms YUNG's views. As previously explained on different occasions, empirical findings suggested that measures such as rent subsidy and tenancy control might lead to an array of unintended consequences, including those detrimental to the tenants whom the measures sought to assist. The Administration would continue to listen to views and suggestions regarding these measures and consider the matters in light of the latest developments in society. He explained that given the limited PRH resources, it was the policy of the Government and HA to accord priority to family and elderly one-person applicants over non-elderly one-person applicants in PRH allocation. The allocation of PRH units to QPS applicants was subject to an annual quota. The Administration hoped that when PRH supply continued to increase in future, the time taken to provide PRH to QPS applicants could be shortened.

Redevelopment of aged estates

18. Mr Vincent CHENG enquired about the details of the Administration's support for the Hong Kong Settlers Housing Corporation Limited ("HKSHCL") to redevelop the Tai Hang Sai Estate as mentioned in the 2018 Policy Address, and the plan and progress of redeveloping HA's Shek Kip Mei Estate and its other old PRH estates. Mr Andrew WAN queried why the 2018 Policy Address did not mention any new projects to redevelop HA's aged estates to increase the PRH supply over the long term. Mr KWOK Wai-keung said that the Administration and HA should have sufficient resources to take forward projects to redevelop aged PRH estates, and should formulate the plans in this regard in a timely manner.

19. STH replied that redevelopment of PRH estates might in short term reduce PRH stock available for allocation. The Administration/HA would continue to carefully consider whether to redevelop individual aged PRH estates with reference to four principles including structural conditions of buildings, cost-effectiveness of repair works, availability of suitable rehousing resources in the vicinity of the estates to be redeveloped, and build back potential upon redevelopment. As regards the redevelopment of Tai Hang Sai Estate, HKSHCL had been consulting the affected households and undertaking co-ordination work. On the premise that HKSHCL would make proper rehousing arrangements for its tenants, the Administration would firmly support the company in taking forward the redevelopment project and provide the necessary assistance.

Action

20. Mr Vincent CHENG opined that the Administration/HA should seriously consider the redevelopment of Shek Kip Mei Estate and Ma Tau Wai Estate. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok opined that certain aged PRH estates, such as Shek Kip Mei Estate, were in compliance with the four principles mentioned by STH, and the Administration/HA should consider redeveloping such estates to supply more public housing units. In response to Mr KWOK Wai-keung's enquiry on whether the Administration/HA would not redevelop an aged estate if the redevelopment proposal did not meet the four principles, STH advised that the Administration/HA adopted an open attitude towards the redevelopment of aged PRH estates. As the PRH supply still fell short of demand and the PRH waiting time was long, it was important to take forward new PRH development projects as quickly as possible.

Income and asset limits for public rental housing

21. Mr Andrew WAN opined that the Administration/HA should address the concern that low-income families might fall outside the eligibility net of PRH as a result of applying for Working Family Allowance. Mr LAU Kwok-fan opined that the low PRH income limit for two-person households might discourage one of the household members from joining the workforce in order to be eligible for applying PRH. The Administration/HA should consider revising the income limit so that young couples who could not afford private flats would not fall outside the PRH eligibility net. STH replied that HA would continue to review the PRH income and asset limits on an annual basis in light of the latest social developments.

Subsidized housing

22. Mr Gary FAN opined that after HA had put in place a revised pricing mechanism for its SSFs, such as the flats in HOS sale exercise in 2018 ("HOS 2018"), property speculators were still attracted to purchase such flats, hoping to resell them for the pursuit of profits after several years. To prevent these flats from becoming speculative tools for making profits, the Administration should consider separating the public and private housing markets. He enquired whether the Administration/HA would broaden resale restrictions on new HOS and GSH flats by imposing a longer restriction period and requiring that owners might resell such flats to Green Form applicants or applicants of the White Form Secondary Market Scheme only.

Action

23. STH replied that the Administration/HA had all along been allocating the precious public housing resources in a prudent manner. New alienation restrictions for HOS 2018 had been recently endorsed by HA, which in effect prevented owners from re-selling their flats in the open market upon payment of premium within five years from first assignment from HA. In considering the appropriate alienation restrictions that should be imposed on newly sold SSFs in future, the Administration/HA would continue to take into account the public views, including concerns on the impact of alienation restrictions on the circulation of such flats.

Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid

24. Mr Jeremy TAM enquired about the number of owners' applications for the Letting Scheme for Subsidised Sale Developments with Premium Unpaid ("the Letting Scheme") since its launch by the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HS") in September 2018. Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Housing) replied that according to HS, seven owners' applications had then been received.

25. Mr KWONG Chun-yu enquired whether the Administration had explored the reasons for the few owners' applications for the Letting Scheme, and whether the Administration was satisfied with the response to the scheme. He cast doubt on the scheme's effectiveness given that its target tenants were limited to family and elderly applicants who had waited for PRH for more than three years and non-elderly one-person applicants who had waited for more than six years. STH replied that the Letting Scheme was launched by HS for the purpose of helping target tenants to improve their living environment before PRH allocation. As the scheme was new to members of the public and had been implemented for only a short period, it would be more prudent to keep in view the response to the scheme for a longer period before assessing its effectiveness.

26. Mr Abraham SHEK commented that the Letting Scheme might not improve the target tenants' living environment, as the living space of the families sharing the same housing unit would be small. Mr Jeremy TAM asked whether the few applications for the Letting Scheme was attributed to owners' unwillingness to sublet part of their flats to other families because of privacy consideration. Noting that the 2018 Policy Address had mentioned that HA might join the scheme to allow owners of its SSFs with premium unpaid to rent out part of their flats to other families, he enquired whether HA should consider the matter only after HS had implemented the Letting Scheme for a longer period, say six months. Permanent Secretary for

Action

Transport and Housing (Housing) ("PS(H)") replied that the 2018 Policy Address had mentioned that HS would review the Letting Scheme after its implementation and fine-tune it as necessary, and HA might consider joining the scheme in the light of the operational experience of HS. THB would continue to liaise with HS on the implementation progress of the scheme, and would facilitate HA to consider the matter in due course.

Flat-for-Flat Pilot Scheme for Elderly Owners

27. Mr Tony TSE noted that the HS's Flat-for-Flat Pilot Scheme for Elderly Owners allowed owners aged 60 or above who had owned their Flat-for-Sale Scheme flats for at least ten years to sell their original flats and then buy a smaller one in the Secondary Market without payment of premium, and enquired whether the Administration/HS would also allow owners of small flats to sell their original one and buy a larger one. STH replied that in considering the arrangement mentioned by Mr TSE, the Administration had to assess whether it would be a deviation from the relevant housing subsidy policies. In response to Mr TSE's enquiry on whether the Administration would invite HA to implement a scheme similar to the HS's Flat-for-Flat Pilot Scheme for Elderly Owners, STH advised that HA might consider the matter in the light of the HS's operational experience of the scheme.

28. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen opined that the Administration should provide more information to the public about the implementation details of the Flat-for-Flat Pilot Scheme for Elderly Owners, such as the requirements that had to be met by the applicant if the flat was jointly owned with other family member(s) with age below 60, the support to assist elderly owners to acquire a smaller flat closer to where their children lived, etc. In view that an elderly owning a large flat might wish to keep it for their children's future use, he asked about the Administration/HS's estimated number of larger flats that would be vacated by owners within five years after the launch of the scheme, and whether the Administration/HS had set a target in this regard. PS(H) replied that as mentioned in the 2018 Policy Address, the Government had accepted HS's recommendation to launch the scheme on a trial basis. The pilot scheme was voluntary in nature, and aimed at enabling eligible elderly owners to move into flats which suit their needs better while vacating larger flats for eligible families in need of more living space. HS would formulate implementation details of the scheme, and the Administration would relay members' views on the scheme to HS.

Action

Facilities for elderly in public rental housing estates

29. Mr Tony TSE commended the HA's plans to provide more recreational facilities in about 100 existing PRH estates with a higher proportion of elderly residents. He enquired about the provision of elderly-friendly facilities in HA's newly completed estates. STH replied that in light of the experience of providing diversified recreational facilities for elderly residents in the about 100 existing estates, HA would continue to explore the provision of facilities to cater for elderly needs in other PRH estates. Apart from ensuring that facilities in estates' common area were convenient for the elderly to use, HA would also continue to cater for the needs of elderly residents, including those with impaired mobility, inside their domestic units.

Modular integrated construction

30. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok opined that the trade welcomed the establishment of a \$1 billion Construction Innovation and Technology Fund to encourage wider adoption of innovative methods and technology in the construction industry. He enquired how the Administration/HA would promote the adoption of modular integrated construction ("MiC") in their projects, including public housing projects. PS(H) replied that government departments had been adopting, as a pilot, MiC in some projects. In examining whether an innovative construction method should be adopted in its housing projects, HA would consider how the method could enhance the efficiency of producing public housing. As pre-fabricated building components had been adopted in public housing projects, HA's Building Committee was studying the additional benefits that MiC would bring if it was adopted in HA's projects, and had commissioned a consultancy study in this regard. HA had also sent staff members to Singapore to study the experience in using MiC.

Motions

31. The Chairman referred members to the following motions, which he considered relevant to the agenda item –

*Motion moved by Mr SHIU Ka-chun:*

"鑒於現有21萬人住在不適切住房，及接近28萬宗輪候公屋數字，為了優先解決基層市民的住屋需要，本委員會促請政府應以房屋比例523，5成出租公屋，2成資助出售房屋，3成私人住宅，以優先興建出租公屋，解基層市民所急。"

Action

(Translation)

"Given that currently there are 210 000 people living in inadequate housing and almost 280 000 cases on the waiting list for public rental housing ("PRH"), in order to accord priority to addressing the housing needs of the grassroots, this Panel urges the Government to adopt a "523" percentage split among different types of housing, i.e. 50% for PRH, 20% for subsidized sale housing and 30% for private housing, such that priority will be accorded to building PRH and the pressing needs of the grassroots will be addressed."

32. The Chairman put to vote the motion moved by Mr SHIU Ka-chun. 10 members voted in favour of the motion, no members voted against the motion, and no members abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

*Motion moved by Mr Andrew WAN:*

"本委員會促請政府與房委會檢討公屋入息申報及審查安排，將在職家庭津貼的津貼金額豁免計算公屋入息之內，以免低收入家庭因申請在職家庭津貼而喪失申請公屋資格。"

(Translation)

"This Panel urges the Government, in collaboration with the Hong Kong Housing Authority, to review the income declaration and income test arrangements with respect to public rental housing ("PRH") application by excluding the Working Family Allowance ("WFA") from the calculation of PRH applicants' income, so that low-income families will not fall outside the eligibility net of PRH as a result of applying for WFA."

33. The Chairman put to vote the motion moved by Mr Andrew WAN. 12 members voted in favour of the motion, no members voted against the motion, and no members abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

Action

*Motion moved by Mr Vincent CHENG and seconded by Mr LAU Kwok-fan:*

"鑒於有超過 20 萬市民窩居於不適切房屋，而公屋輪候冊個案及新一期居屋申請宗數分別達 27 萬及 25 萬，就此，本事務委員會要求當局：

1. 研究引入針對基層住房的租務管制及租金津貼；
2. 將過渡性房屋納入《長遠房屋策略》，以增加資源投入及供應數量；
3. 研究調整《長遠房屋策略》的公私營房屋比例，如7:3比，以增加公營房屋供應，並將公屋"三年上樓"作為調整公私營比例的參數之一。"

(Translation)

"Given that there are more than 200 000 people living in inadequate housing, and that the numbers of cases on the waiting list for public rental housing ("PRH") and applications for Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") flats under the latest HOS sale exercise have reached 270 000 and 250 000 respectively, in this connection, this Panel requests the authorities to:

1. examine the introduction of tenancy control and rent subsidy targeting at housing for the grassroots;
  2. incorporate transitional housing into the Long Term Housing Strategy ("LTHS"), with a view to allocating additional resources for and increasing the supply of this type of housing;
  3. study adjusting the public/private split for housing supply under the LTHS to, for example, 70:30, so as to increase the supply of public housing, and include the objective of "allocating a PRH unit within three years" as one of the parameters for adjusting the public/private split."
34. The Chairman put to vote the motion moved by Mr Vincent CHENG. 14 members voted in favour of the motion, no members voted against the motion, and no members abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

Action

*Motion moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick:*

"香港目前有超過9萬戶居於劏房，政府的新增公營房屋供應追不上需求，本委員會促請政府建立"住屋保障階梯"，對於未入住出租公屋的市民，先提供足夠的過渡性房屋，讓他們盡快脫離劏房困境。"

(Translation)

"As there are more than 90 000 households living in sub-divided units ("SDUs") in Hong Kong at present, the Government's new supply of public housing falls short of demand, this Panel urges the Government to build a "housing protection ladder" to provide, in the first instance, sufficient transitional housing to those members of the public who have yet to be housed to public rental housing units, so that they can extricate themselves from the plight of living in SDUs as soon as possible."

35. The Chairman put to vote the motion moved by Mr CHU Hoi-dick. 13 members voted in favour of the motion, no members voted against the motion, and no members abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

*Motion moved by Mr Gary FAN:*

"鑒於在新居屋及綠置居新定價機制下，仍然吸引潛在炒家入市，在幾年後轉售圖利，本委員會要求政府增加轉售限制，包括考慮分隔公營及私營房屋市場，新居屋及綠置居只容許轉售予綠表或"白居二"申請者作內部流轉，以杜絕這些單位成為投機牟利工具，保障香港市民的住屋權利。"

(Translation)

"Given that under the new pricing mechanism for new Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") and Green Form Subsidized Home Ownership Scheme ("GSH") flats, potential speculators are still attracted to enter the market, hoping to resell such units for the pursuit of profits after several years, this Panel calls on the Government to broaden resale restrictions, including considering separating the public and private housing markets, as well as allowing the reselling of new HOS and GSH flats only to Green Form applicants or applicants of the



Action

White Form Secondary Market Scheme for internal circulations, in order to prevent these units from becoming speculative tools for making profits, thereby safeguarding the public's right to housing in Hong Kong."

36. The Chairman put to vote the motion moved by Mr Gary FAN. 11 members voted in favour of the motion, no members voted against the motion, and one member abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

*(Post-meeting note: The wording of the motions passed was issued to members vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1)125/18-19(01) to (05) on 31 October 2018. The Administration's response to the motions was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)354/18-19(01) on 17 December 2018.)*

**II. Any other business**

37. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:33 pm.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
27 March 2019