

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1198/18-19

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 2018-2019 Legislative Council session. It will be tabled at the meeting of the Council on 3 July 2019 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 Wilson OR Chong-shing 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 2018 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 the 2018 Policy Address at its meeting on 29 October 2018.

5. Some members cast doubt on the Government's commitment to allocating 70% of housing units on the Government's newly developed land to public housing development and whether such adjustment of the public/private split of the new housing supply could effectively address the shortfall of PRH units to meet the demand. Members pointed out 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 public rental housing ("PRH") units, Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") flats and other Subsidized Sales Flats ("SSFs") to be provided at each of the 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. Some members considered that if the Administration could not identify and allocate adequate land for public housing development, the ten-year public housing supply target under the Long Term Housing Strategy ("LTHS"), 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. Considering that there were currently almost 280 000 cases on the waiting list for PRH and 210 000 people living in inadequate housing, members urged the Administration to accord priority to addressing the housing needs of the grassroots.

7. The Administration 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. The Panel passed a total of five motions offering various suggestions on housing issues urging the Administration to –

- (a) examine the introduction of tenancy control and rent subsidy targeting at housing for the grassroots, incorporate transitional housing into LTHS, and include the objective of "allocating a PRH unit within three years" as one of the parameters for adjusting the public/private split;
- (b) review the income declaration and income test arrangements with respect to PRH application by excluding

the Working Family Allowance ("WFA") from the calculation of PRH applicants' income;

- (c) 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 would be accorded to building PRH and the pressing needs of the grassroots would be addressed;
- (d) build a "housing protection ladder" to provide, in the first instance, sufficient transitional housing to those members of the public who had yet to be housed to PRH units; and
- (e) broaden resale restrictions, including considering separating the public and private housing markets, as well as allowing the reselling of new HOS and Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme ("GSH") flats only to Green Form applicants or applicants of the White Form Secondary Market Scheme for internal circulations.

Long Term Housing Strategy

9. The Panel discussed the LTHS Annual Progress Report 2018 on 7 January 2019.

Public/private split of new housing supply

10. Members expressed disappointment at the Administration's performance in catching up with the supply target since the formulation of LTHS, and considered that the shortfall might continue even though the Administration had adjusted the public/private split of new housing supply to 70:30. Some members opined that the Administration should tell the public the proportions of the various types of public housing supply, including PRH, GSH and HOS, and the underlying considerations for the proportions.

11. The Administration advised that of the total housing supply target of 450 000 units for the ten-year period from 2019-2020 to 2028-2029, the public/private split was 70:30. Among the public housing supply target of 315 000 units, the supply targets for PRH/GSH and other SSFs would be 220 000 units and 95 000 units respectively. The Administration/HA had all along emphasized that PRH was a

long-established safety net, and would continue to provide PRH to low-income families, with the target of providing the first flat offer to general applicants at around three years on average.

12. The Panel passed a motion requesting that among the proposed proportion of 70% for public housing in the new housing supply as recently announced by the Government in LTHS, 60% should be PRH.

Redevelopment of aged estates

13. Some members opined that the Administration should consider taking forward redevelopment of public housing estates such as Wo Lok Estate, Kwai Shing West Estate, etc., which were dilapidated with plot ratios of the sites not yet fully utilized. The redevelopment of aged estates could increase the medium-to-long term housing supply and improve the living environment of PRH residents.

14. The Administration advised that for the purpose of projecting the long term housing demand for the next ten-year period under LTHS, the estimated housing demand of households displaced by redevelopment had taken into account, among others, the estimated number of units in public rental estates that would reach the age of 50 years and above by the end of the projection period. The redevelopment of aged PRH would freeze a large number of PRH units that might otherwise be allocated to households in need, resulting in an immediate adverse impact on the average waiting time for PRH. The Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") would continue to consider redevelopment on an estate-by-estate basis in accordance with the principles under the established policy.

15. The Panel passed a motion urging the Administration to formulate and roll out territory-wide redevelopment projects on old public housing estates, with priority accorded to aged housing estates which were 30 years old or above and had the problems of unsatisfactory building conditions, dilapidated community facilities, failure to fully utilize the plot ratio, etc., and adjust upward the plot ratio as appropriate with a view to further increasing public housing supply and improving the living environment of residents of old housing estates.

Transitional housing

16. Members expressed concerns about whether the Administration would include transitional housing in LTHS and set a supply target for it, and put in place a framework and resources including establishing a

dedicated fund for such housing. They also enquired about the function of the Task Force on Transitional Housing, and whether the Administration had set any target or timetable for its work.

17. The Administration advised that the Task Force on Transitional Housing sought to co-ordinate efforts of non-government organizations ("NGOs") and relevant government bureaux/departments on transitional housing. The task force was currently assisting more than 10 projects advocated by various NGOs, and would continue to explore ways to resolve obstacles from the policy perspective for increasing the provision of transitional housing.

18. The Panel passed a motion urging the Administration to formally include transitional housing in LTHS and set a supply target for transitional housing, the production of which should be taken charge of by the Government/HA; and to optimize the use of idle government sites or facilities.

Non-local buyers of private housing and holding of non-local properties by PRH households

19. Members noted that despite the reduction in private housing supply target for the next 10 years due to the revised public/private split, there was an increase in the projected non-local housing demands. Members also considered that the Administration was ineffective in their investigations into the holding of non-local properties by PRH households or applicants.

20. The Panel passed two motions: one requested the Administration to study imposing the "purchase restriction order" on non-local individuals and companies in buying residential properties in Hong Kong; and the other called on the Administration to seriously investigate whether PRH applicants/residents held non-local properties and impose severe punishment on failure to make true declarations.

Public Housing Construction Programme

21. 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 2018-2019 to 2022-2023 in December 2018.

Supply of public housing

22. Members were concerned that there would be a landslide decline in the supply of public housing in Hong Kong in the coming five years from 2018-2019 to 2022-2023, further prolonging the waiting time for PRH. Moreover, the production of PRH and HOS flats would drop significantly in the next few years. Some other members opined that in view of the public concern that converting PRH developments under planning to flats sold under GSH would reduce PRH supply, the Administration should make clear the respective production targets of new PRH units and GSH flats in each of the five years from 2018-2019 to 2022-2023.

23. The Administration advised that after securing a site for public housing, it took time to complete various processes including planning and consultation, statutory planning procedure, site formation and provision of infrastructure, etc. before the site could be delivered for housing construction. To expedite flat production, HA had improved the construction process through adopting the precast concrete technology and lean construction at sites. The Administration had identified some 210 sites with housing development potential for providing about 310 000 flats, and had rezoned over 100 of these sites.

24. The Panel passed a total of three motions demanding the following respectively –

- (a) the Administration to re-allocate more private housing sites for public housing, maximize the plot ratios of public housing development projects, establish an overall transitional housing supply target, and consult the public on the introduction of "tenancy control";
- (b) the Hong Kong Housing Society and the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") to assist in the production of more public housing, for the purpose of increasing the supply of PRH and subsidized housing; and
- (c) the Administration to provide a rental allowance for PRH waitlistees, so as to alleviate their rental burden while waiting for PRH allocation.

Measures to assist Hong Kong people to achieve home ownership

25. The Panel discussed the various Government's policies and measures consummating the housing ladder at the meeting on 5 November 2018.

Supply of subsidized housing

26. Some members expressed dissatisfaction with the ineffectiveness of the Administration's policies and measures in meeting the home ownership aspirations of members of the public. Members opined that the projected total production of 26 300 SSFs from 2018-2019 to 2022-2023 were far from adequate to meet the demand for such flats. There were doubts about whether more land sites originally earmarked for private housing would be allocated for public housing development, and whether the 2018 Policy Address initiative of introducing the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme could help provide more SSFs. Some members enquired whether the Administration/HA would provide more than 10 000 GSH flats in the coming five years in view of the shortfall of 13 000 SSFs against the LTHS supply target.

27. The Administration advised that the SSF supply target under LTHS referred to new flats only, and did not include flats in the HOS Secondary Market. The housing units to be provided under the URA's Starter Homes pilot project would count towards the supply target of private housing under LTHS. HA's estimated total public housing production for the periods from 2014-2015 to 2018-2019 and from 2018-2019 to 2022-2023 were about 79 300 and 97 500 units respectively, reflecting that the Administration and HA had been striving for the best to increase public housing supply. As announced in June 2018, the Administration would re-allocate nine private housing sites for public housing development and would continue to identify land for public housing. On the premise that the PRH production would not be compromised, the Administration would continue to provide SSFs to achieve the relevant supply target under LTHS. The Administration further advised that although GSH was a form of SSFs, GSH projects were mainly converted from PRH developments under planning and their target group was the same as that of PRH.

Resale restrictions on subsidized sales flats

28. Some members considered that the Administration should impose stricter resale restrictions on SSFs. These members opined that

the five-year resale restriction recently endorsed by HA for HOS was not stringent enough to prevent speculative trading of such flats. The resale restrictions on flats provided under new GSH projects or the URA's Starter Homes pilot project were likewise lenient. The Administration/HA should consider imposing a longer restriction period, say 10 years, and requiring that owners might resell their flats only to households which met the eligibility criteria of the subsidized housing scheme concerned.

29. The Administration advised that the revised alienation restrictions recently endorsed by HA for the new HOS flats offered for sale in 2018 in effect prevented owners from re-selling their flats in open market upon payment of premium within five years from first assignment from HA. HA would further discuss the alienation restrictions for GSH and future HOS flats. URA would soon announce the details of sale arrangements and alienation restrictions for the flats provided under its Starter Homes pilot project.

30. The Panel passed a motion requesting the Administration to allocate additional sites to increase the supply of various types of subsidized housing; examine the flat prices, sale arrangements, resale restrictions and mortgage guarantee arrangements, etc. in respect of various subsidized housing schemes; and consider providing stamp duty concessions to local first-time home buyers.

Review of income and asset limits for public rental housing

31. 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 2019-2020 at its meeting on 4 March 2019.

32. Members noted that low-income families would fall outside the PRH eligibility net as a result of applying for WFA. They generally expressed disappointment at the Administration's failure to follow up the exclusion of WFA from the calculation of the family incomes of PRH applicants. The Panel passed a motion urging the Administration to take measures expeditiously to safeguard the housing needs of low-income families.

33. The Administration subsequently advised that it had relayed the Panel's view to HA's Subsidised Housing Committee and the Committee

endorsed the PRH income and asset limits for 2019-2020 with WFA excluded from the calculation of PRH applicants' income starting from 1 April 2019.

34. Given that HA's revision of the income and asset limits for PRH for 2019-2020 would definitely further lengthen the waiting time for PRH, the Panel urged the Administration, by way of another motion passed at the meeting, to continue to re-allocate more "spade-ready" private housing sites (apart from the nine announced sites at Anderson Road and the Kai Tak Development Area) for public housing development, so as to fill the gap of insufficient land supply for public housing; meanwhile, the Panel called on the Administration to conduct an independent consultation exercise on the introduction of tenancy control and rent subsidy.

Measures to facilitate the mobility needs of elderly residents by the Hong Kong Housing Authority

35. The Panel discussed the measures to facilitate the mobility needs of elderly residents by HA at the meeting on 12 February 2019.

36. Members raised concerns on various issues including the applications of Universal Design, provision of elderly facilities in existing PRH estates, home modification/adaptation works for addressing the needs of the elderly tenants, provision of barrier-free access facilities, plot ratio restrictions in housing estates, housing for elderly persons, etc.

Threshold of old age PRH application schemes

37. Members noted that the number of people aged 60 or above living alone in PRH increased from 59 694 to 96 705 in the past 10 years, and the number of people aged 60 or above waiting for PRH increased from 21 942 to 33 726 in the past five years, reflecting the continuous and increasing demand for PRH by the elderly aged 60 or above. At present, the average waiting time of non-elderly people has increased from 4.7 years in 2017 to 5.5 years in 2018. If the Government policy of raising the age threshold of elderly Comprehensive Social Security Assistance from 60 to 65 was extended to apply to the age limit imposed on the elderly for making PRH applications, the PRH waiting time of the elderly aged between 60 and 64 would then be further lengthened.

38. In this connection, the Panel passed a motion urging the Government to maintain the threshold of old age in PRH application schemes for the elderly at 60, so as to enable grassroots elderly people to move into PRH units as early as possible and achieve the objective of "ageing in place".

39. The Administration advised that HA had no plan at this stage to change the age thresholds for the use of HA's programmes/services provided for the elderly tenants. In considering whether the thresholds should be adjusted in future, HA would take into account relevant government policies, the development of society and the community views.

"Special Rates" on vacant first-hand private residential units

40. At the meeting on 1 April 2019, the Panel discussed the Administration's proposal to introduce "Special Rates" on vacant first-hand private residential units by amending the Rating Ordinance (Cap. 116) to encourage more timely supply of such units by developers.

Effectiveness of the "Special Rates" regime

41. Noting that the number of unsold first-hand private residential units in completed projects was currently limited, some members queried the effectiveness of the proposed "Special Rates" regime in helping to increase the private flat supply.

42. The Administration advised that the total projected supply in the past few years of first-hand private residential units for the coming three to four years was about 90 000 units. However, the number of unsold first-hand private residential units in completed projects had been increasing in recent years, from around 4 000 units at end-March 2013 (around 6% of the then projected supply) to 9 000 units at end-March 2018 (around 9% of the then projected supply), and had since maintained at this level. The Government considered that the trend was undesirable in the face of an acute housing shortage, and effective measures had to be taken to encourage developers to expedite the supply of first-hand private residential units in completed projects.

Vacancy situation of unsold first-hand private residential units in completed projects

43. In view that some of the 9 000 unsold first-hand private

residential units might be serviced apartments or units used for leasing purposes, some members expressed scepticism about the seriousness of the vacancy problem as purported by the Administration.

44. The Administration advised that of the 9 000 unsold units, 6 000 were completed in 2017 or the first quarter of 2018 while the remaining 3 000 units had been completed between 2011 and 2016. These 9 000 units might be vacant units, units rented out by developers (e.g. serviced apartments) or units occupied for self-use by developers. The Administration said that it did not have information on how many of these units have been rented out.

Level of "Special Rates"

45. Some members expressed the view that the proposed annual "Special Rates" payment, which was two times the rateable value of the first-hand residential units concerned, would be a significant cost and developers may transfer such cost to customers, resulting in higher first-hand flat prices. Some members considered that to more effectively discourage developers' hoarding of unsold first-hand private residential units in completed projects, the Administration should levy the "Special Rates" on vacant units on an incremental scale based on the length of the vacancy period.

46. The Administration advised that the objective of "Special Rates" was to encourage developers to sell or rent out first-hand private residential units in completed projects within a reasonable period of time. A uniform yet forceful tax rate was conducive to achieving the objective, and would also be easier to understand and to administer compared to progressive tax rates.

Suggestion of introducing vacancy tax on residential properties owned by non-local residents

47. Some members suggested that to deter speculation of residential properties by non-Hong Kong residents, which had contributed to soaring property prices and a large number of vacant units, the Administration should examine the introduction of vacancy tax on second-hand residential properties held by non-Hong Kong residents (including companies owned by non-Hong Kong people).

48. The Administration advised that under the existing stamp duty regime, the acquisition of residential property by a non-Hong Kong

permanent resident (including any companies) was subject to the Buyer's Stamp Duty and the New Residential Stamp Duty, both at a flat rate of 15%, i.e. a stamp duty of 30% in aggregate. In the first four months of 2018, the number of residential property transactions involving non-local individuals and non-local companies accounted for only 1% of the total number of transactions, which was lower than 4.5% recorded during the period from January to October 2012 (i.e. before the introduction of the Buyer's Stamp Duty). This indicated that the demand-side management measures had been effective in curbing external and investment demands.

49. Notwithstanding the Administration's explanation, the Panel passed a motion urging the Government to examine the introduction of vacancy tax on second-hand residential properties held by non-Hong Kong residents in order to deter speculation of residential properties by non-Hong Kong residents.

Total Maintenance Scheme of the Hong Kong Housing Authority

50. The Administration briefed the Panel on the progress of HA's Total Maintenance Scheme ("TMS") at the meeting on 12 February 2019.

51. Some members expressed concern about the quality of TMS works as reflected in the complaints which they received from PRH tenants. They enquired whether and how the Administration/HA followed up the relevant recommendations in the audit conducted by the Audit Commission in 2016 in which it was found that of 133 PRH units chosen for inspection by the HA's surprise check teams from February 2014 to March 2016, unsatisfactory repair works were found in 118 flats, and on average, about three items of repair works in each of these 118 flats required replacement/rectification works.

52. The Administration advised that, to encourage continuous improvement of quality of works, HA conducted surprise checks to monitor TMS teams' performance and remind TMS contractors the importance of maintaining the quality of works. Of the 385 unsatisfactory items found by the HA's surprise check teams as mentioned in the audit, most were minor defects requiring only minor rectifications. In view of the Director of Audit's recommendation in the report that the access rate of in-flat inspections should be improved, HA would arrange in-flat inspection ambassadors ("IIAs") to reach out to tenants during non-office hours for making appointments to enable more tenants to participate in the scheme. To assure quality of TMS works, IIAs would inspect the works completed by contractors against the

standards, and surprise check teams would perform surprise inspections. To gauge tenants' satisfaction level on TMS, HA had commissioned independent consultants to conduct surveys to collect tenants' opinions.

Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in Public Housing Estates

53. 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 6 May 2019, the Panel received an update on the latest position of the implementation of the Marking Scheme.

Throwing objects from height

54. Members enquired whether and how HA would step up its measures to detect throwing objects from height by PRH residents. The Administration advised that since 2009 it had proactively tackled the misdeed by measures which included promoting the message against throwing objects from height through the Housing Channel, posters, and partnering functions by Estate Management Advisory Committees and NGOs; deployment of Mobile Digital Closed Circuit Television sets, Mobile Surveillance System sets and Special Operation Teams to detect suspected offenders; and intensified patrols and inspections by estate staff at regional level.

Noise nuisance

55. Members enquired about whether the small number of point-allotment cases for causing noise nuisance in 2018 was because of the difficulty for HA in substantiating complaints about noise nuisance. The Administration advised that HA adopted a "reasonable man approach" in handling noise nuisance complaints. After estate management staff had visited the alleged PRH unit to ascertain that it was the source of noise nuisance, households nearby would be consulted on whether the noise level was unacceptable. As a warning system was in place for this misdeed, first offenders would receive a written warning, and the Housing Department ("HD") would allot points if an offender committed the same misdeed for a second time or again thereafter.

Link Real Estate Investment Trust's disposal of properties divested by the Hong Kong Housing Authority

56. The Panel has been closely following up Link Real Estate Investment Trust ("Link")'s management of the facilities divested by HA, particularly regarding matters relating to people's livelihood and services that residents could use in the communities concerned. Link has since 2014 sold 56 of the 180 HA's divested properties to other owners. The Panel held a hearing to receive public views on relevant issues at the meeting on 1 April 2019.

Regulation of divested properties

57. Some members opined that the disposal of divested properties had adversely affected the provision of retail and car parking facilities in public housing estates. Members expressed concerns about the high vacancy rate of the retail facilities in the divested properties and suspected breaches of land lease conditions by owners of the divested properties. They questioned the effectiveness of, and sufficiency of manpower for, the lease enforcement work of the Lands Department ("LandsD") in the divested properties and HD's monitoring of divested properties owners' day-to-day compliances with the provisions/terms in Deeds of Mutual Covenants and relevant restrictive covenants in the assignment deeds.

58. The Administration advised that if it was confirmed that the owner concerned was in breach of any land lease conditions, LandsD would take appropriate actions, such as issuing warning letters to the owner, registering the warning letters at the Land Registry (commonly known as "imposing an encumbrance"), and invoking the Government Rights (Re-entry and Vesting Remedies) Ordinance (Cap. 126) for re-entry of the land concerned.

Provision of facilities and services for public housing residents

59. Members stressed the need of public housing residents for markets that provided fresh meat and fish, and the insufficiency of supermarkets in meeting their daily shopping needs. They enquired how the Administration/HA would monitor owners' management of the divested properties and secure the provision of adequate amenities and facilities for public housing residents.

60. The Administration advised that it had been mindful of the needs of public housing residents for more fresh food retail channels. In the 2018 Policy Address, there were initiatives of building new public markets in Tung Chung and Tin Shui Wai, and carrying out studies for identifying suitable sites for public markets in Tseung Kwan O and Kwu Tung North New Development Area. In view that it took time to develop new public markets, the Administration/HA would continue to provide more retail facilities in HA's estates, taking into account the needs and actual circumstances of the estates. For instance, to provide a wider choice of goods and services for residents, the Administration/HA had been securing the provision of more facilities in its estates, such as parcel lockers for online shopping deliveries, various kinds of mobile facilities, etc.

Members' bill to regulate commercial facilities in properties divested by the Hong Kong Housing Authority

61. For the purpose of ensuring the reasonable provision of amenities and facilities in properties divested by HA to Link (including those that Link sold to other owners), two Panel members, Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye and Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, have proposed the Regulation of Commercial Facilities in Public and Subsidized Housing (Legislative Provisions) Bill ("the Bill"). On 3 June 2019, the Panel discussed the Bill, which sought to introduce measures such as a mechanism for regulating the rate of rent increase, the right of first refusal to renew existing lease and vacancy tax, etc. for regulating these properties.

62. Regarding the measures proposed in the Bill, the Administration held that it could not interfere with the lawful right of the divested property owners to use their properties so long as the legal requirements and land lease conditions were complied with. However, if the owner concerned was in breach of any laws or any land lease conditions, the relevant government departments would certainly pursue the matter seriously and take appropriate actions. As for HA, provided that the owner concerned did not contravene the relevant restrictive covenants with HA in the assignment deeds, HA had no legal basis and would not interfere with the day-to-day operations and commercial decisions of the owner, including disposal of properties, letting arrangements, etc.

63. The Administration also cast doubt on whether the proposed measures in the Bill might contravene the principle of free and fair competition, triggering legal challenges by these property owners.

Tenancy control should not be introduced lightly unless the market power of a certain owner or retailer could not be restrained in the course of normal market competition. In addition to giving priority consideration to various measures that promote market competition, the Administration emphasized the need to carefully look into and strike a balance between the cost and benefits of introducing tenancy control. In conclusion, the Administration considered that there was insufficient basis for the Government to support the proposed measures and the Bill.

Other issues

64. The Panel has scheduled a meeting for 9 July 2019 to discuss a funding scheme to support transitional housing projects by NGOs. During the session, the Panel was consulted on the following Public Works Programme items –

- (a) construction of a community health centre cum residential care home for the elderly at Tuen Mun Area 29 West¹;
- (b) site formation and infrastructure works for public housing developments at Yan Wing Street, Yau Tong² and Pok Fu Lam South; and
- (c) transport infrastructure works for development at Diamond Hill.

Meetings

65. From October 2018 to June 2019, the Panel held a total of 10 meetings.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
25 June 2019

¹ Funding for the project was approved by the Finance Committee on 11 January 2019.

² Funding for the project was approved by the Finance Committee on 1 March 2019.

Appendix I

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 2018-2019 session *

Chairman	Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
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 Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP Hon WU Chi-wai, MH Hon CHAN Chi-chuen Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, 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 CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP 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
Hon CHAN Hoi-yan

(Total : 36 members)

Clerk Mr Derek LO

Legal Adviser Miss Linda CHAN

* Changes in membership are shown in Annex.

Annex to Appendix II

Panel on Housing

Changes in membership

Member	Relevant date
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP	Up to 14 October 2018
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP	Up to 15 October 2018
Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP	Up to 16 October 2018
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP	Up to 16 October 2018
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP	Up to 16 October 2018
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS	Up to 19 October 2018
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, SBS, JP	Up to 22 October 2018
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP	Up to 23 October 2018
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP	Up to 26 October 2018
Hon Tanya CHAN	Up to 29 October 2018
Hon CHAN Hoi-yan	since 5 December 2018