

**Minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting of  
Housing and Building Management Committee  
Yau Tsim Mong District Council (2012-2015)**

**Date :** 24 January 2013 (Thursday)  
**Time :** 2:30 p.m.  
**Venue :** Yau Tsim Mong District Council Conference Room  
4/F., Mong Kok Government Offices  
30 Luen Wan Street  
Mong Kok, Kowloon

**Present:**

Chairman

Mr CHONG Wing-charn, Francis

Vice-chairman

Ms KWAN Sau-ling

District Council Members

Mr CHUNG Kong-mo, JP	Mr HAU Wing-cheong,	Mr WONG Kin-san
	BBS, MH	
Ms KO Po-ling, BBS,	Mr LAU Pak-kei	Mr WONG Man-sing,
MH, JP		Barry, MH
Mr CHAN Wai-keung	Mr LEUNG Wai-kuen,	Ms WONG Shu-ming
	Edward, JP	
Mr CHOI Siu-fung,	Mr WONG Chung, John	
Benjamin		

Co-opted Members

Mr CHING Man-tai, Benny, MH	Mr LEE Chung-ming
Mr HO Fei-chi, Stephen	

Representatives of the Government

Mr LEUNG Chat-min	Senior Structural	Buildings Department
	Engineer/Existing	
	Buildings Division 2	

Ms TSO Pui-hing, Tammy	Housing Manager/Kowloon West 3	Housing Department
Mr Chan Chi-ching, Thomas	Senior Liaison Officer (Building Management), Yau Tsim Mong District Office	Home Affairs Department

**Secretary**

Mr Kwok Chun-chung, Josh	Executive Officer (District Council)2, Yau Tsim Mong District Office	Home Affairs Department
-----------------------------	--	-------------------------

**In Attendance:**

Mr SZETO Wing-kwok	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Assessment & Noise)6	Environmental Protection Department
Mr CHAN Che-bun, Anderson	Senior Building Surveyor	Buildings Department
Mr IP Pui-leung, Herman	Building Surveyor	Buildings Department
Ms MOK Yee-tuen, Zandra	Political Assistant to Secretary for Labour and Welfare	Labour and Welfare Bureau
Ms TANG Yuen-shan, Queenie	Senior Labour Officer (Statutory Minimum Wage)	Labour Department

**Absent:**

Mr NG Cham-sum, Charlie	Co-opted Member
Mr HO Siu-tak	Co-opted Member

## **Opening Remarks**

The Chairman welcomed participants to the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Housing and Building Management Committee (“HBMC”). He reported that Mr HUI Tak-leung had resigned from the HBMC. In addition, Mr HO Siu-tak and Mr Charlie NG were absent due to other commitments.

2. The Chairman proposed that Members who had submitted papers be given no more than two minutes to make supplementary remarks, and that each Member be allowed to speak twice on each item: three minutes for the first time and two minutes for the second time. Participants had no objection to the proposal.

### **Item 1: Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting**

3. The minutes of the last meeting were confirmed without amendment.

### **Item 2: Matter Arising:**

**To Request Government Departments to Provide Acoustic Windows for Residents Affected by Noise Nuisance from the Flyover Section of West Kowloon Corridor in Tai Kok Tsui  
(YTMHBMC Paper No. 11/2012)**

---

4. The Chairman said that the written response of the Environmental Protection Department (“EPD”) was attached as Annex 3 to the minutes of the last meeting. He then welcomed Mr SZETO Wing-kwok, Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Assessment & Noise)<sup>6</sup> of the EPD to the meeting.

5. Mr LAU Pak-kei wanted to know whether the vehicular noise level from the flyover section of West Kowloon Corridor in Tai Kok Tsui exceeded 70 decibels. He also requested the EPD to state whether it would install acoustic windows for residents of old buildings in the vicinity of the said section, in order to relieve vehicular noise nuisance to them.

6. Mr SZETO Wing-kwok responded as follows:

- (i) The vehicular noise level at the said section exceeded 70 decibels. In order to reduce noise, the Highways Department (“HyD”) had been studying applicable measures, including improving the design of connection points of the flyover and surfacing the roads with low-noise materials. The HyD had already arranged resurfacing the said section with low-noise materials. It was expected that works would be completed in April this year.
- (ii) The issue of providing subsidy for residents of private buildings to install acoustic windows was complicated. For the time being, the authority had no relevant policy that could provide subsidy in this regard.
- (iii) The design and practical effectiveness of the acoustic window jointly developed by the Housing Department (“HD”) and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (“PolyU”) remained to be seen. The HD would continue to study the feasibility of installing acoustic windows for new residential developments.

7. Ms WONG Shu-ming and Mr LAU Pak-kei said that the noise problem generated by the said section had been causing nuisance to residents for years. Apart from studying the technical feasibility of acoustic windows, they reckoned that the department should also consider providing subsidy for affected households to install acoustic windows under the Community Care Fund.

(Ms KWAN Sau-ling joined the meeting at 2:43 p.m.)

(Mr John WONG joined the meeting at 2:45 p.m.)

8. Mr LAU Pak-kei said that from time to time, there were vehicles travelling at high speed through the aforesaid section at night, making shrill noises. He urged the EPD and Police to combat these suspected illegal road racing vigorously.

(Mr Benny CHING joined the meeting at 2:50 p.m.)

9. Mr CHUNG Kong-mo said that heavy vehicles produced loud noises when passing connection points on road surfaces of the West Kowloon Corridor near the section of Ferry Street and Dundas Street, causing nuisance to residents living in old

buildings nearby (e.g. Shun Lee Building). He hoped that the HyD could consider resurfacing the said road section with low-noise materials.

10. Mr John WONG and Mr Benny CHING requested the EPD to solve the vehicular noise problem in Tai Kok Tsui section of the West Kowloon Corridor as soon as possible.

11. Mr HAU Wing-cheong said that if it was not feasible to install noise barriers at the Tai Kok Tsui section of the West Kowloon Corridor, the authority should examine other noise mitigation measures, including subsidising the affected households to install acoustic windows or resurfacing the road section with low-noise materials.

12. Mr Benjamin CHOI said that the use of acoustic windows was not a new technology and the EPD should spare no efforts to study how to install acoustic windows for households of old buildings.

13. Mr SZETO Wing-kwok responded as follows:

- (i) The acoustic window jointly researched and developed by the Polytechnic University and the EPD was an innovative design concept. The collaboration was invited by the HD, which was conducting a trial launch of those windows in a new residential development project. The HD would collect more information for reference upon completion of the project, in order to assess the design and practicality of acoustic windows.
- (ii) After the meeting, the EPD would liaise with the HyD to follow up on the vehicular noise problem faced by Shun Lee Building and its vicinity.
- (iii) The EPD would request the Police to take appropriate actions against speeding and illegal road racing.

14. The Chairman said that while the Government was implementing the Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme, the authority should take this opportunity to consider subsidising the affected households to install acoustic windows.

15. Mr Benny CHING enquired whether acoustic windows could effectively insulate noise when they were open.

16. Mr SZETO Wing-kwok said that the double-glazed acoustic windows were made up of two panes of glass separated by noise absorptive materials. The acoustic windows could reduce noise even when they were open. As these innovative acoustic windows were still under research and testing, it would be difficult to promote their use under the Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme which was launched recently.

17. Mr Edward LEUNG also believed that acoustic window was not an innovative concept and the authority should consider subsidising households of old buildings to install acoustic windows. He said that it was not reasonable to leave residents solving the noise problem caused by nearby transport facilities on their own.

18. Mr SZETO Wing-kwok said that the authority would improve vehicular noise problem through urban renewal and keep eyes on the latest technology, so as to minimise the impact of vehicular noise on members of the public.

19. There being no further comments, the Chairman closed the discussion on this item.

**Item 3: Introduction to Mandatory Building and Window Inspection Schemes  
(YTMHBMC Paper No. 1/2013)**

---

**Item 6: Urging Third Round of Operation Building Bright to Relieve Nuisance  
Caused to Residents due to Lack of Information on Mandatory  
Building and Window Inspection Schemes  
(YTMHBMC Paper No. 4/2013)**

---

20. The Chairman said that both Paper Nos. 1/2013 and 4/2013 were related to the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme and the Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme (“Two Schemes”). He proposed the two be discussed together. There was no objection to the proposal.

21. The Chairman said that the joint written response of the Development Bureau (“DEVB”) and Buildings Department (“BD”) in respect of Paper No. 4/2013 (Annex 1) had been placed on the table for Members’ reference. He then welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

- (a) Mr Anderson CHAN, Senior Building Surveyor of the BD;

- (b) Mr LEUNG Chat-min, Senior Structural Engineer of the BD; and
- (c) Mr Herman IP, Building Surveyor of the BD.

22. Mr Anderson CHAN introduced Paper No. 1/2013 to Members.

23. Mr John WONG wanted to know:

- (i) whether the Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme covered windows of private premises;
- (ii) when implementing the Two Schemes, how would the authority deal with cases in which no owners' corporation ("OC") had been formed for the building concerned; and
- (iii) whether the authority would provide subsidy to the OC and owners to pay for the maintenance expenses incurred by the Two Schemes.

24. Mr Benny CHING enquired whether the BD would issue the statutory notice of the Two Schemes ("Statutory Notice") to the OCs and owners simultaneously.

25. Mr Benjamin CHOI said that, to his knowledge, some buildings had just finished their maintenance works, however, their OCs and owners had recently received notice from the BD, requiring the performance of building and window inspection works under the Two Schemes. He and Ms KO Po-ling wanted to know BD's criteria for selecting target buildings.

26. The Vice-chairman said that the high building inspection cost would place a burden on elderly owners of old buildings. She hoped the authority could provide additional financial assistance to these owners, in order to alleviate their financial burden as a result of building and window inspection.

27. Ms WONG Shu-ming and Mr WONG Kin-san considered that the public knew too little about the Two Schemes. Mr WONG Kin-san believed that the authority should inform the OCs and owners of the target buildings in advance, allowing them sufficient time to get well-prepared for the building and window inspection.

28. Ms KO Po-ling said that there were numerous maintenance items for old buildings and the repair costs were high. The Two Schemes would impose heavy financial burden on residents of old buildings.

29. Mr Stephen HO urged the government departments to combine the repair and

improvement works of old buildings, and to clearly explain application details of various relevant subsidy schemes to the residents, in order to avoid causing nuisance to residents.

30. Mr LEE Chung-ming considered that the Two Schemes were a waste of manpower and money, and causing nuisance to households of old buildings.

31. Mr Anderson CHAN responded as follows:

- (i) Eligible owners might obtain various forms of assistance and support from the Hong Kong Housing Society (“HKHS”), the Urban Renewal Authority (“URA”) and the Government at different stages of the Two Schemes.
- (ii) The BD would consider the allocation of the eligible buildings in the 18 districts on pro rata basis, as well as some relevant factors including the maintenance conditions and repair records of the buildings and windows, the traffic and pedestrian flows adjoining the buildings, location and building clusters, and the buildings nominated by District Councils (“DC”), in order to recommend target buildings, and the Selection Panel would make the final selection.
- (iii) Out of the 5 800 buildings being selected for the Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme, 2 000 buildings were needed to carry out the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme concurrently. The BD would issue Statutory Notices to the OCs and owners of the relevant buildings enabling the owners to carry out the inspection and maintenance works under the Two Schemes concurrently.
- (iv) In the first phase of the Government’s publicity campaign, the BD had launched an Announcement of Public Interest (“API”) in mid-February 2012, which mainly served to publicise the registration of registered inspectors. The API was broadcast on all television and radio stations, as well as public transport vehicles including buses and railways. In the second phase, which had begun in early May 2012, the BD had launched a dedicated webpage on its departmental website containing detailed information on the Two Schemes for public reference. A series of newspaper supplements introducing the Two Schemes was also published starting from mid-May 2012. Other publicity materials including another set of API targeting at the requirements of the Two Schemes,



leaflets, general guidelines, posters and outdoor advertisements were launched in late June 2012 to publicise the full implementation of the Two Schemes. The publicity leaflets had also been uploaded onto the BD's website and made available at the BD offices and the Public Enquiry Service Centres in various District Offices for public information. Moreover, since the first phase of the publicity campaign, the BD had all along participated in seminars organised by various professional organisations, the Home Affairs Department ("HAD"), DCs, HKHS, URA, property management companies and individual housing estates, with a view to further promoting the requirements of the Two Schemes and the Government's arrangement in the community. The BD had also invited the elderly to seminars through social welfare organisations in the community to strengthen the support to the elderly owners.

- (v) If buildings had already carried out repair works, then upon receipt of the pre-notification letter to target buildings, owners and OCs might provide BD with information about the repair works carried out recent years. The BD would consider deferring the issue of Statutory Notices under the Two Schemes to these buildings on a case-by-case basis.
- (vi) Under the Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme, the scope of inspection should cover all the windows in the common parts of and within individual premises of buildings.
- (vii) Translation of the relevant documents of the Two Schemes took time. The Chinese and English versions of the documents would be uploaded to the BD's website for public perusal when ready.
- (viii) As to buildings for which OCs had not been formed, an extra three months would be allowed for owners of these buildings to form OCs. These cases would be referred to the HAD for follow-up actions.
- (ix) The BD would issue in advance letters to the owners/OCs of the target buildings selected for the Two Schemes concurrently, advising the owners/OCs concerned to carry out all building services inspections and repair works as required by other government departments, including the works stipulated by the Fire Safety (Buildings) Ordinance regarding fire safety and fire service installations or equipment in order not to create any nuisance to residents. In this connection, if buildings that had been selected for the Two Schemes were due for the implementation of fire

safety improvement works as required by law-enforcement departments, or if the owners so requested, the BD and the Fire Services Department would arrange the issue of Fire Safety Directions to the buildings within the period of the notices of the Two Schemes.

- (x) Social workers from the BD would explain the Two Schemes to owners and help them to seek for support. Also, the BD hoped to invite ambassadors under the Resident Liaison Ambassador Scheme, which was launched by the HAD, to briefings arranged for building owners, for better understanding of details of the Two Schemes and various forms of assistance and support that they could obtain, so that they could provide support to owners of buildings under the Resident Liaison Ambassador Scheme.

32. Ms KWAN Sau-ling said that the unauthorised building works (“UBWs”) in old buildings had been a serious problem. She hoped that the BD could assist OCs and owners to take actions against UBWs. She also invited the BD to attend the Spring Reception organised by the DC in early March, and took the opportunity to introduce the Two Schemes to the representatives of OCs.

33. Ms WONG Shu-ming enquired if there were any OCs checking details with the BD after receipt of pre-notification letter for target buildings. She requested the department to provide the number of enquiries made by OCs, if any. Moreover, she wanted to know whether the BD would concurrently issue orders for removal of UBWs to the OCs and owners who had received Statutory Notices, so that the residents concerned could comply with both together.

34. Mr John WONG said that OCs and owners would normally employ the same qualified person to inspect windows in the common and private parts of their buildings. The process involved problem of sharing cost of window inspection and might result in disputes between owners and OCs. In addition, he wanted to know by what means would social workers and resident liaison ambassadors assist residents to carry out the relevant works under the Two Schemes.

35. Mr Benny CHING considered that the Two Schemes should be carried out concurrently with other repair and improvement works of buildings, such as improvement works for fire safety facilities in common area, in order to minimise any inconvenience caused to residents.

36. Mr CHUNG Kong-mo agreed with the practice of having the BD to collaborate with other departments to combine repair and improvement works of buildings. He said that many repair and maintenance works were related to the structure of buildings, it was better for the BD to coordinate such works. He also said that the caps of some old building subsidy schemes were determined by the number of flats without taking into account the actual situation of major housing estates. Moreover, he believed that the public's knowledge about the Two Schemes was limited, and suggested the BD deploy additional staff to help the OCs and owners to carry out the required works under the schemes.

37. Mr Hau Wing-cheong believed that the authority should consider launching the third phase of the Operation Building Bright ("Operation") to provide more subsidies, in order to help residents of the old buildings in handling maintenance issues of their buildings.

38. Mr Anderson CHAN responded as follows:

- (i) To enhance building safety, the BD would deal with UBWs in accordance with the prevailing enforcement policy. It would take priority enforcement actions against UBWs constituting obvious hazard or imminent danger to lives and properties, UBWs that were newly constructed and other UBWs which were actionable items under the enforcement policy, requiring owners to demolish the same. The BD would consider including the concerned buildings in large-scale clearance operations on a case-by-case basis (including all UBWs on the exterior of buildings (including UBWs on rooftops and podiums, and in yards) and lanes of buildings). Therefore, the department might issue Statutory Notices of the Two Schemes and orders for removal of UBWs to OCs and owners concurrently.
- (ii) The BD would continue to attend briefing sessions organised by OCs and introduce the Two Schemes to OCs and residents. During briefing sessions, the department would collect contact information of building representatives and approach them after briefing sessions for understanding of conditions of individual buildings.
- (iii) The BD would consider sending representatives to attend the Spring Reception organised by the DC, and took the opportunity to introduce the Two Schemes to the representatives of OCs.

- (iv) The BD would adopt differentiated approaches to explain the details of the Two Schemes to various target groups. More technical information would be provided to authorised persons.
- (v) The BD had also invited the elderly to seminars through social welfare organisations in the community in order to strengthen its support to the elderly. Social workers of the BD would also provide supportive and counselling services to parties affected by the inspection schemes.
- (vi) The BD would not immediately announce the list of target buildings primarily selected for the Two Schemes. But after the issuance of Statutory Notices, the list of buildings selected for the Two Schemes would be uploaded to the BD's website for public inspection. District Councillors could refer to the BD's website at the end of January for the list of target buildings.
- (vii) In May 2009, the Government, in collaboration with the HKHS and URA, launched the Operation to provide subsidies and one-stop technical support to assist eligible owners of old and dilapidated buildings, which were aged 30 years or above, to carry out repair and maintenance works.

Owners had the responsibility for timely repair and maintenance of their buildings, which was also a continuous work for the owners. As a specific measure for "Preserving Jobs" amidst the financial tsunami, the Operation at a total commitment of \$3.5 billion was a special one-off program with an aim to achieving the dual objectives of creating more job opportunities for the construction sector and improving building safety and the cityscape. The Government had no plan to launch a new round of Operation at this moment.

Although application for the Operation had been closed, the BD, HKHS and URA would continue to render technical and financial support to private building owners to enhance repair and maintenance works of buildings through other existing schemes, such as the Mandatory Building Inspection Subsidy Scheme, Building Safety Loan Scheme, Building Maintenance Grant Scheme for Elderly Owners and Integrated Building Maintenance Assistance Scheme, etc.

39. Mr John Wong and Mr CHUNG Kong-mo said that the BD should notify District Councillors about which buildings within their constituencies had the department issued with Statutory Notices, so that District Councillors of the subject constituencies could take actions to follow up on the relevant cases.

40. The Chairman and Ms KO Po-ling enquired whether the authority would request buildings under the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme to inspect drainage systems inside subdivided flats.

(Mr Barry WONG joined the meeting at 3:57 p.m.)

41. Mr Anderson CHAN stated that the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme covered only drainage systems located at external walls and in common parts of buildings, excluding drainage systems inside building flats.

42. The Chairman considered that the authority should extend coverage of the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme to regulate drainage systems inside subdivided flats.

(Mr Benjamin CHOI left the meeting at 4:05 p.m.)

43. Mr Thomas CHAN said that the HAD launched the Resident Liaison Ambassador Scheme to recruit owners or tenants who lived in building of 30 years or above and without any residents' organisations as Resident Liaison Ambassadors. These Ambassadors served mainly as contact points to assist in promoting messages about proper building management. They would also assist government departments in contacting residents and engaging them in discussion and handling of daily building management matters.

44. Ms KO Po-ling said that the major function of Resident Liaison Ambassadors was to act as contact points. It would be difficult to implement the Two Schemes through the assistance of Resident Liaison Ambassadors.

(Ms WONG Shu-ming left the meeting at 4:12 p.m.)

45. There being no further comments, the Chairman closed the discussion on this item.

46. The Chairman said that he had to leave earlier due to other commitments. The

meeting would then be hosted by the Vice-chairman.

(The Chairman and Mr Edward LEUNG left the meeting at 4:30 p.m.)

**Item 5: To Request the Government to Subsidise Management Expenses of Private Buildings in Light of Upward Adjustment of Statutory Minimum Wage**  
**(YTMHBMC Paper No. 3/2013)**

---

47. The Vice-chairman said that the written responses of the HKHS and URA (Annexes 2 and 3) had been faxed to Members for perusal before the meeting, and the written response of the HAD (Annex 4) had also been placed on the table for Members' reference. She then welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

- (a) Ms Zandra MOK, Political Assistant to Secretary for Labour and Welfare; and
- (b) Ms Queenie TANG, Senior Labour Officer (Statutory Minimum Wage), of the Labour Department ("LD").

48. Mr WONG Kin-san supplemented the paper with some additional information.

49. Ms Zandra MOK responded as follows:

- (i) The Chief Executive in Council adopted the recommendation of the Minimum Wage Commission earlier to adjust the statutory minimum wage ("SMW") rate from \$28 per hour to \$30 per hour. Subject to the Legislative Council's approval of the relevant subsidiary legislation, the revised SMW rate would come into force on 1 May this year. She said that the implementation of SMW, since its introduction more than one year ago, had generally been smooth. The income of low-paid employees had improved in real terms.
- (ii) The existing building maintenance assistance schemes provided by the Government mainly catered for the maintenance of common parts and structural elements of buildings, which served to protect safety of households of buildings and the public. The recommendation on the

provision of subsidy by the Government to assist owners to meet additional management expenses as a result of the implementation of SMW did not fall within the scope of the SMW policy.

- (iii) The LD would continue to promote SMW and assist employers and employees in understanding their respective obligations and entitlements under the SMW system. In-person consultation and conciliation services would be provided to employers and employees if necessary.

50. Mr WONG Kin-san hoped that the Government could make reference to the present mode of subsidy and provide management expenses subsidy to owners who had financial difficulties.

51. Mr Benny CHING said that he was not optimistic that the Government could subsidise management expenses of buildings. He indicated that since the implementation of the SMW, management expenses of buildings had been on the rise due to the pay adjustment of caretakers. Owners had to bear the consequences of SMW unwillingly.

52. Mr LEE Chung-ming said that under inflation, the SMW could not improve the livelihood of grassroots workers.

53. Mr Barry WONG said that public interest would be involved when providing management expenses subsidy to owners of private properties by public money and it would be difficult to determine the assessment criteria for such subsidy, hence the recommendation should be left to the extensive discussions in the community.

54. Ms Zandra MOK responded as follows:

- (i) According to the Minimum Wage Ordinance, the SMW rate must be reviewed biennially, in order to enhance flexibility of the review. It would be beneficial to both employers and employees, as well as the society as a whole.
- (ii) As revealed by statistics from October to December 2012, total employment increased more than 147 000, when compared with the pre-SMW situation. Figures from September to November 2012 also showed that the average employment earnings of the full-time low-income employees registered a year-on-year increase of 1.7% after discounting

inflation, outpacing the overall average pay rise. Apparently, the implementation of SMW had improved the earnings of low-income employees in real terms.

55. There being no further comments, the Vice-chairman closed the discussion on this item.

**Item 4: Missing Person Notice: In Search of Director of Housing  
(YTMHBMC Paper No. 2/2013)**

---

-----  
56. The Vice-chairman said that the written response of the HD (Annex 5) had been faxed to Members for perusal before the meeting. She then welcomed Ms Tammy TSO, Housing Manager (Kowloon West 3) to the meeting.

57. Mr CHAN Wai-keung supplemented the paper with some additional information.

58. Ms Tammy TSO said that the Director of Housing and other heads of department would attend DC meetings according to the arrangement of the HAD. However, the Director of Housing was not able to attend meetings of the HBMC due to his busy schedule. The department had reminded her to take record of this meeting and reflect Members' views on housing-related issues to the department. She added that the Director of Housing and HD staff always paid visit to various public housing estates to understand the situation of public housing tenants and sent frontline staff to conduct regular flat inspections.

59. Mr CHAN Wai-keung did not understand why the Director of Housing had only attended two DC meetings since he had assumed office.

60. The Vice-chairman and Mr HAU Wing-cheong hoped that the Director of Housing could attend Yau Tsim Mong ("YTM") DC meetings to exchange views with Members.

61. Ms Tammy TSO said that she would reflect Members' request to the department.

62. Mr Barry WONG asked whether the HAD had invited the Director of Housing to attend YTM DC meetings.



63. Ms KO Po-ling believed that the HD was in charge of public rental housing policies, which were relevant to local property market and the management of public housing, thus involving public interest. She suggested sending a letter to the Director of Housing in the name of the HBMC to invite him to attend meetings of the HBMC.

64. In response to Mr Barry WONG's enquiry, the Secretary advised that the HAD was responsible for coordinating heads of departments to attend DC meetings. The Secretariat would reflect to the HAD that some HBMC Members hoped the Director of Housing could attend YTM DC meetings.

65. The Vice Chairman agreed with Ms KO Po-ling's suggestion of sending a letter to the Director of Housing, inviting him to attend meetings of the HBMC. There was no objection to the proposal.

(PMN: The Chairman had sent a letter to the Director of Housing in the name of the HBMC on 26 February 2013 (Annex 6), inviting him to attend meetings of the HBMC. Also, the Secretariat had sent an email to the HAD on 22 February 2013, enquiring about the arrangement required for inviting the Director of Housing to YTM DC meetings. Please refer to Annex 7 for the email reply from the HAD to the Secretariat on 25 February.)

66. There being no further comments, the Vice-chairman closed the discussion on this item.

#### **Item 7: Any Other Business**

67. There being no other business, the Vice-chairman closed the meeting at 5:15 p.m. The next meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 14 March 2013.

Yau Tsim Mong District Council Secretariat  
February 2013

油尖旺房屋事務及大廈管理委員會第4 / 2013號文件  
書面回應

**回覆油尖旺區議會房屋事務及大廈管理委員會**

**2013年1月24日會議討論文件**

就房屋事務及大廈管理委員會的討論文件所提出的問題，發展局及屋宇署的綜合回應如下：

1. 為協助業主履行「強制驗樓計劃」及「強制驗窗計劃」的法定要求，香港房屋協會(房協)及市區重建局(市建局)推出「強制驗樓資助計劃」(資助計劃)，向合資格樓宇的業主或業主立案法團(法團)就強制驗樓計劃下為樓宇公用部分進行首次檢驗所需的費用提供資助，包括“三無”大廈(即沒有法團、沒有任何居民組織及沒有管理公司的大廈)。資助款額會根據有關樓宇的單位數目計算，由 25,000 元至 100,000 元不等。

房協和市建局亦會就檢驗計劃為有需要的業主提供技術支援，包括協助業主組織進行籌劃檢驗的工作、協助業主招標和委任註冊檢驗人員及承建商等事項。屋宇署會向業主發出預先知會函件，告知他們其樓宇已被選定為檢驗計劃的目標樓宇。屋宇署亦會聯同房協和市建局為業主安排簡介會，向他們講解有關檢驗計劃及配套支援的詳情。

至於根據檢驗所得而須要進行的公用地方維修工程，政府、房協和市建局會通過現有的樓宇維修支援計劃為有需要和合資格的業主及法團提供財政支援，包括由房協和市建局共同管理的「樓宇維修綜合支援計劃」、由屋宇署管理的「樓宇安全貸款計劃」及由房協管理的「長者維修自住物業津貼計劃」。業主只需填妥一套綜合申請表格，便能作出多項申請。

為加強公眾對強制驗樓計劃和強制驗窗計劃的認識，屋宇署已開展其宣傳計劃，分兩個階段進行。在首個階段，屋宇署已在 2012 年 2 月中推出了一輯政府宣傳短片／聲帶，主要用作宣傳註冊檢驗人員註冊的事宜，並在所有電視台和電台，以及包括巴士和鐵路等公共交通工具上播放。第二階段則由 2012 年 5 月初展開，屋宇署已於其網站設立專題網頁，載有檢驗計劃的詳情供公眾參考。一系列的報章特刊亦由 2012 年 5 月中開始出版。另外，為宣傳計劃的全面實施，屋宇署已在 2012 年 6 月底推出另一輯有關檢驗計劃規定的政府宣傳短片／聲帶、小冊子、一般指引、海報及戶外廣告等宣傳工具。市民可透過屋宇署的網頁及於各屋宇署和民政事務處的辦事處參閱有關的宣傳小冊子。另一方面，自第一階段的宣傳計劃開始，屋宇署一直參與各專業團體、民政事務總處、區議會、房協、市建局、物業管理公



司及個別屋苑自行舉辦的多個講座，以加強在社區推廣強制驗樓計劃和強制驗窗計劃，讓市民更了解計劃的要求及政府的安排。為加強對長者的支援工作，屋宇署亦有透過社區的社福機構邀請長者出席講座。

2. 屋宇署已向 153 座位於油尖旺區的樓宇發出強制驗樓及強制驗窗預先知會函件，其中包括旺角區的 63 座樓宇(有法團和無法團的比例為 5:4) 及大角咀的 23 座樓宇(有法團和無法團的比例約為 3:1)。屋宇署預計會於本月底向所有位於油尖旺區(包括部份大角咀區)的目標樓宇發出強制驗樓及強制驗窗法定通知。

由於被揀選的目標樓宇其後可能基於各種原因而由名單中剔除(例如，若屋宇署並無有關樓宇的維修記錄，一些剛完成維修的樓宇可能仍會被揀選進行強制驗樓及驗窗計劃。就這些個案，業主收到屋宇署的預先知會函件後可聯絡屋宇署以提供其樓宇近年的維修資料，屋宇署會因應個別情況，考慮延後向這些樓宇發出強制驗樓及驗窗的法定通知)，屋宇署不會將被揀選進行強制驗樓計劃及強制驗窗計劃的樓宇名單即時公佈。不過，屋宇署會將已發出強制驗樓或強制驗窗法定通知的樓宇名單上載到屋宇署的網頁，供公眾查閱。公眾亦可於房協的物業管理諮詢中心及市建局的「市建一站通」資源中心查閱有關資料。

3. 業主／法團如無合理辯解而不遵從強制驗樓的法定通知可被檢控；一經定罪，可被處第 5 級罰款（即最高罰款 50,000 元）及監禁 1 年。另一方面，業主／法團如無合理辯解而不遵從強制驗窗的法定通知，當局可送達定額罰款 1,500 元的罰款通知書；屢犯者可被檢控。一經定罪，可處罰款 25,000 元及監禁 3 個月。此外，屋宇署或會安排其委任的顧問公司及承建商進行所需的檢驗和修葺工程，然後向業主／法團收回檢驗及修葺工程的費用加上監督收費，以及徵收不超過有關費用 20% 的附加費。

4. 政府在 2009 年 5 月與房協和市建局合作，推行「樓宇更新大行動」（更新行動），提供津貼及一站式技術支援，協助樓齡達 30 年或以上，並符合指定資格準則的破舊樓宇業主進行維修及保養工程。

適時維修和保養樓宇是業主本身應有的責任，亦是一項持續的工作。作為一項在金融海嘯下推出的「保就業」針對性措施，總額達 35 億元的更新行動是一次性的特別計劃，旨在為建造業界創造更多就業機會，並達致促進樓宇安全和美化市容的雙重目標。政府現時沒有打算推出新一輪的更新行動。

雖然更新行動已截止申請，屋宇署、房協和市建局仍會繼續透過其他現有的計劃，包括以上所提及的「強制驗樓資助計劃」、「樓宇安全貸款計劃」、「長者維修自住物業津貼計劃」和「樓宇維修綜合支援計劃」等，向參與計劃的私人樓宇業主提供技術和財政支援，促進樓宇維修及保養工作。

屋宇署

2013 年 1 月



**HONG KONG  
HOUSING SOCIETY**  
香港房屋協會

油尖旺房屋事務及大廈管理委員會第 3 / 2013 號文件  
書面回應(1)

Our Ref : SP/PMAC/2013-001/ew

Your Ref : ( ) in YTMDC 13/30/4/1 Pt.

21 January 2013

Yau Tsim Mong District Council  
Housing & Building Management Committee  
4/F, Mong Kok Government Offices  
30 Luen Wan Street  
Kowloon

Attention : Mr. Josh Kwok  
Secretary, HBMC of YTMDC

Dear Mr. Kwok,

We refer to your letter of 14 January 2013 to our Chief Executive Officer and Executive Director, Mr. Wong Kit Loong; and are authorized to reply on his behalf.

Regarding to your invitation to attend the 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Housing & Building Management Committee (HBMC) of Yau Tsim Mong District Council (YTMDC) on 24 January 2013 in relation to the paper prepared by District Councilor of YTMDC, Mr Wong Kin San (黃建新), on statutory minimum wage, please be advised that the Hong Kong Housing Society has no comment on the proposed issue and will not attend the said meeting.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours sincerely  
For and on behalf of  
Hong Kong Housing Society

  
Sanford Poon

General Manager (Property Management)

Property Management Division : 2/F, Dragon Centre, 23 Wun Sha Street, Tai Hang, Hong Kong Tel : 2839 7888 Fax : 2882 2432  
物業管理部: 香港大坑洗紗街23號龍灣苑2樓 電話 2839 7888 傳真 2882 2432 www.hkhs.com

油尖旺房屋事務及大廈管理委員會第 3 / 2013 號文件  
書面回應(2)

本函檔號：CCD/CDD/YTMDC-HBMC



九龍

聯運街三十號

旺角政府合署四樓

油尖旺區議會

房屋事務及大廈管理委員會

秘書處

(經辦人：郭振宗先生)

傳真：2722-7696

郭先生：

關於：邀請市建局代表出席 1 月 24 日的會議

謝謝閣下來信邀請本局代表出席上述會議。由於有關會議所討論的議題並非屬於本局政策措施範圍，本局將不會派員出席。

如有查詢，請賜電 2588-2766 與本局徐曉彤女士聯絡。

謝謝！



市區重建局

高級社區發展經理蘇毅朗

2013 年 1 月 21 日



Only Chinese Version is available

Annex 4

附件四

油尖旺房屋事務及大廈管理委員會第 3 / 2013 號文件  
書面回應(3)

2012 至 2015 年度  
油尖旺區議會  
房屋事務及大廈管理委員會

要求政府因應「最低工資」調升  
向私人住宅樓宇提供管理開支補貼

民政事務總署的書面回應

政府在大廈管理方面的政策，是擔當推動者的角色，通過多管齊下的措施和制定適用的法律框架，及透過民政事務總署提供適當的支援和諮詢服務，鼓勵業主成立業主立案法團，協助業主履行管理大廈的責任。由於民政事務總署並非向私人樓宇提供財政資助及津貼的部門，因此對黃建新議員的建議沒有補充意見。

民政事務總署  
二〇一三年一月

附件五

油尖旺房屋事務及大廈管理委員會第 2 / 2013 號文件  
書面回應

油尖旺區議會  
房屋事務及大廈管理委員會  
邀請房屋署署長出席會議

非常感謝陳偉強議員邀請房屋署署長出席 2013 年 1 月 24 日會議。由於署長公務繁忙，當日未能出席會議，謹此致歉。房屋署已委派房屋事務經理/西九龍三曹佩卿女士屆時出席會議，以收集各議員及委員對房屋事務的意見。

房屋署署長拜訪區議會，是先由民政事務總署統籌及制訂出合適的時間表。房屋署一向非常重視油尖旺區議會各議員的意見，定期派出職員參予各個會議及與地區代表保持溝通。本署職員亦會定期巡視管理的屋邨，並就房屋事宜向署長及高層職員匯報。

房屋署  
2013 年 1 月





油尖旺區議會

YAU TSIM MONG DISTRICT COUNCIL

Our ref. : ( ) in YTMDC 13/30/4/1 Pt.

Tel. : 2399 2557

Fax : 2722 7696

26 February 2013

Mr. Duncan Warren PESCOD, JP  
 Director of Housing  
 Housing Authority Headquarters  
 33 Fat Kwong Street  
 Ho Man Tin, Kowloon

By post and fax  
 (Fax: 2762 1110)

Dear Mr. PESCOD,

**Invitation to Attend Meetings of Housing and Building  
 Management Committee of Yau Tsim Mong District Council**

At the 5th meeting of the Housing and Building Management Committee (HBMC) of the Yau Tsim Mong District Council (YTMDC) held on 24 January 2013, committee members discussed the impacts of public housing policies on the property market and public life in Hong Kong.

2. It was agreed that a direct exchange of views with the Director of Housing would be conducive to in-depth discussion of the subject. On behalf of HBMC, I am writing to invite you to attend one of our meetings for an early dialogue with the committee members. Enclosed please find the schedule of HBMC meetings from April 2013 to March 2014 for your reference.

3. We look forward to your favourable reply. Should you have any enquiries, please do not hesitate to call Mr. Josh KWOK, Secretary of HBMC, at 2399 2557.

Yours sincerely,

CHONG Wing Charn, Francis  
 Chairman, HBMC, YTMDC (2012-2015)

Encl. *70 x 40 on 26.2.2013 AM*

c.c. Housing Department (Attn: Ms. Tammy TSO / Housing Mgr/KW3) (Tel. 2748 7093)

2012 至 2015 年度油尖旺區議會

房屋事務及大廈管理委員會

民政事務總署就邀約房署署長出席  
油尖旺區議會會議所作的書面回覆(中文譯本)

民政事務總署(“民政總署”)備悉在油尖旺區議會房屋事務及大廈管理委員會(“房管會”)第五次會議上，委員要求房屋署(“房署”)署長出席油尖旺區議會會議，另有一名委員指房署署長已有一段時間未有到訪油尖旺區議會，而房署代表在會議上回應說，部門首長出席區議會會議，需經民政總署安排。

2. 就上述事宜，民政總署已建議運輸及房屋局常任秘書長(即房署署長)出席油尖旺區議會會議，該局並已答允在 2013 年 10 月到訪油尖旺區議會，房署方面亦已獲通知。

民政事務總署

2013 年 2 月