

**Minutes of the 17th Meeting of
Housing and Building Management Committee
Yau Tsim Mong District Council (2012-2015)**

Date : 11 June 2015 (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 HUI Tak-leung
Ms KO Po-ling, BBS, MH, JP	Mr LAU Pak-kei
Mr CHAN Wai-keung	Mr WONG Chung, John
Mr CHOI Siu-fung, Benjamin	Mr WONG Kin-san
Mr HAU Wing-cheong, BBS, MH	Ms WONG Shu-ming

Co-opted Members

Mr LEE Chung-ming	Mr CHING Man-tai, Benny, MH	Mr CHIN Chun-wing
Mr HO Fei-chi, Stephen	Mr LEUNG Hang-fai	

Representatives of the Government

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

Secretary

Ms KWAN Ming-wai, Vivian	Executive Officer (District Council) 2 Yau Tsim Mong District Office	Home Affairs Department
--------------------------	---	-------------------------

In Attendance:

Mr POON Yui-chau, William	Senior Professional Officer/Signboard Control 1	Buildings Department
---------------------------	---	----------------------

Absent:

Mr TAM A-ray, Albert	Senior Structural Engineer/F1	Buildings Department
----------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed all to the 17th meeting of the Housing and Building Management Committee (“HBMC”).

Item 1: Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting

2. Minutes of the last meeting were confirmed without amendment.

Item 2: Progress Report on Handling of Signboards in Yau Tsim Mong District by Buildings Department (“BD”) (YTMHBMC Paper No. 10/2015)

3. The Chairman welcomed Mr William POON, Senior Professional Officer/Signboard Control 1 of the Buildings Department (“BD”) to the meeting.

4. Mr William POON briefed Members on the progress. He indicated that at the last meeting, Members had requested that cases of abandoned or dangerous signboards identified by staff of the BD and the consultants be listed out. The statistics concerned had already been included in the progress report for Members’ reference. During inspections from January to April 2015, staff of the BD and the consultants had found approximately 80 abandoned or dangerous signboards in total. The BD had already issued notices or warning letters to those signboard owners and would continue to follow up on those cases.

(Mr CHIN Chun-wing joined the meeting at 2:38 p.m.)

5. The Vice-chairman said that the BD had issued some 700 “Dangerous Structure Removal Notices” (“DSRNs”) in four years and handled over 600 cases within a couple of years. There were currently fewer than 100 outstanding cases. In this connection, she thanked the department for its efforts. She indicated that there used to be many abandoned or dangerous signboards that needed to be repaired or removed in Yau Tsim Mong (“YTM”) district in the past, posing potential danger to both members of the public and tourists. Now that the BD had accelerated the handling of problematic cases, the number of abandoned or dangerous signboards in the streets had been decreasing gradually. Members of the public and tourists could stroll and go shopping in the district with peace of mind. She hoped that the department would keep up its efforts on handling the outstanding DSRN cases as soon as possible, in particular those cases of signboards which posed danger to the public.

(Mr LAU Pak-kei joined the meeting at 2:40 p.m.)

6. Mr HAU Wing-cheong said the BD had proactively handled cases of dangerous or abandoned signboards, thus alleviating a long-standing problem in the district. The results were obvious.

7. The Chairman pointed out that during the large scale operation against large unauthorised signboards the BD carried out in 2013-14, 84 removal orders had been issued and a total of 72 large unauthorised signboards removed in the YTM district. He questioned

if those large unauthorised signboards were removed by the signboard owners, and how the department would handle the remaining 12 large unauthorised signboards.

(Mr CHUNG Kong-mo joined the meeting at 2:44 p.m.)

8. Mr William POON indicated that the majority of the said large unauthorised signboards were removed by the signboard owners themselves. However, it was not without difficulties along the process from the BD's issuing of a notice to the signboard owners' compliance. For example, signboard owners did not comply with the orders until prosecution was instigated against them. As regards the remaining 12 large unauthorised signboards, they were yet to be dealt with due to various reasons. For examples, some cases were undergoing legal proceedings, while some signboard owners applied for extension of time allowed. The BD would continue to follow up on these cases.

9. The Chairman said that at present there were 97 outstanding cases of dangerous or abandoned signboards which had not been removed pursuant to the DSRN. He questioned if the BD would issue removal orders to the owners concerned.

10. Mr William POON responded that the BD had already issued DSRNs to the owners of such dangerous or abandoned signboards. Upon receipt of DSRN, signboard owners were required to remove the signboards concerned within two weeks, which was a period shorter than that of a removal order. If the signboard owners failed to remove the signboards within two weeks, the BD would take initiative to arrange for the signboard removal works. As regards those 97 cases of dangerous or abandoned signboards mentioned in the paper, the BD could exercise the power conferred upon by the Ordinance to have the demolition works carried out by a contractor in the event that the signboard owners turned a blind eye to the DSRN. During the said period, signboard owners might arrange for the demolition works themselves. He indicated that since there could be new cases and the number of cases would keep fluctuating, the BD hoped that the backlog could be cleared as soon as possible so that resources could be freed up for new cases.

11. The Chairman enquired if the procedures the BD had for handling dangerous or abandoned signboards were different from those for handling large unauthorised signboards.

12. Mr William POON responded that large unauthorised signboards might not necessarily pose any immediate danger, but potential danger did nonetheless exist. Therefore, the BD would issue removal orders to the signboard owners so as to eliminate the large unauthorised signboards in question.

13. Mr CHUNG Kong-mo opined that the BD had been making good progress in handling the issue of problematic signboards in the district. He hoped that the department would keep up the good work. He continued that he had relayed to the representatives of the BD at a HBMC meeting that there was a large advertisement stand extending from the lower floor external wall of a building at Sai Yeung Choi Street South to the roadside, with one end of the stand supported by iron poles on the roadside. However, no action had been taken by the BD till now. He would like to know the progress of the follow up action on that structure by the BD.

14. The Chairman enquired of the BD representative if the said structure at Sai Yeung Choi Street South fell into the category of illegal structures that were dangerous and required immediate enforcement.

15. Mr William POON said that according to his understanding, representative of the owner concerned had lodged an appeal against the removal order issued by the BD. The owner had subsequently withdrawn the appeal and the BD immediately demanded that he remove the illegal structure concerned. He continued that since officers designated for YTM district were responsible for following up on this case, he would need to discuss with the related officers and would report to the HBMC at the next meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The BD provided the following supplementary information on 16 June 2015: “According to the department’s record, there was an unauthorised metal stand extending from the external wall of Mongkok Plaza at the above-mentioned address viz. 28 Soy Street. Part of the said metal stood on the pavement. The department had already issued a removal order to the owner concerned in July 2014 to demand that the said unauthorised metal stand be removed. The owner’s representative lodged an appeal thereafter. The Appeal Tribunal received in February this year a written notification from the appellant that he would like to withdraw the appeal in relation to the said removal order. The department immediately issued a warning letter to the owner concerned to urge him to comply with the removal order as soon as possible. The department had deployed our staff to conduct a site inspection in March this year and found that the said unauthorised building works had been removed. The owner concerned had complied with the removal order.”)

16. The Chairman thanked the BD representatives for joining the discussion on this item.

Item 3: Concern over Arrangements of the Housing Department (“HD”) for Submission of the Income Declaration Form (YTMHBMC Paper No. 11/2015)

17. The Chairman said that the written response from the HD (Annex 1) had been distributed to Members by email for information before the meeting. He then welcomed Ms Tammy TSO, Housing Manager/Kowloon West and Hong Kong 3 of the HD to the meeting.

18. Mr CHAN Wai-keung supplemented the contents of the paper.

19. Ms Tammy TSO responded as follows:

- (i) Hoi Fu Court was one of the Buy or Rent Option Courts of the Hong Kong Housing Authority and had already formed an owners' corporation. The HD had entrusted Creative Property Services Consultants Limited (“CPSC”)’s Tenant Service Management Office (“Management Office”) at Hoi Fu Court with the tenancy matters of five blocks, namely Hoi Lam House, Hoi Wen House, Hoi Yu House, Hoi Tai House and Hoi Yan House.

- (ii) Pursuant to the Housing Subsidy Policy (“HSP”), households who had been living in public rental housing for ten years or more were required to declare household income biennially, so that the HD could assess their rent payment level. This year, approximately 800 households in Hoi Fu Court needed to declare their income. The HD had already distributed the declaration forms to the households concerned by 1 April this year. Completed forms, together with the supporting documents, should be returned to the Management Office on or before 31 May. The Management Office had so far received more than 600 declaration forms.
- (iii) Outsourced property services agents were required to arrange for manpower to work at the Management Office according to the number of staff as stated in the contract. In order to cope with the increased workload during the above-mentioned period, CPSC had already deployed additional manpower to collect the declaration forms. According to the record, the daily average number of people submitting the declaration forms was 30 in May, while the average waiting time was approximately 15-20 minutes. Whenever there was a long queue, staff would give out number tags to tenants who were queuing up and ask them to come back at the assigned time instead of waiting at the Management Office. Besides, there was a collection box at the Management Office and tenants might drop their declaration forms into the collection box. All declaration forms would be examined by the staff on the same day they were received. In the event that any errors or omissions were found, tenants would be contacted and an appointment would be made for amending the forms.
- (iv) From June onwards, there were barely several tenants submitting their declaration forms to the Management Office per day. They did not have to wait and were attended to immediately.

20. The Chairman thanked the HD representatives for joining the discussion on this item.

**Item 4: How would HD Handle Families in Public Rental Housing which have Far Exceeded the “Income and Total Net Assets Limits”?
(YTMHBMC Paper No. 12/2015)**

21. The Chairman said that the written response from the HD (Annex 2) had been distributed to Members by email for information before the meeting. He then welcomed Ms Tammy TSO, Housing Manager/Kowloon West and Hong Kong 3 of the HD to the meeting.

22. The Chairman supplemented the contents of the paper. He said that as shown in the written response from the HD, households whose assets value exceeded the prescribed Net Assets Limits (“Assets Limits”) for Public Rental Housing (“PRH”) tenants were required to surrender their PRH flats. Legislative councillor Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung had been receiving a monthly remuneration of over \$70,000 since 2004, which far exceeded the maximum income limit for 1-person household by three times (three times of \$10,100, i.e. \$30,300). He could not appreciate why the HD had not demanded Hon LEUNG to surrender his PRH flat. He continued that some members of the public had filed applications to the High Court for judicial review in relation to the HSP. He opined that it was a major public

policy issue that income and assets of PRH tenants seriously exceeded the “Income and Total Assets Limits”. He hoped that the HD representatives could explain why no enforcement action was taken in the case of Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung.

23. Ms Tammy TSO responded as follows:

- (i) Pursuant to the HSP, households who had been living in public rental housing for ten years or more were required to declare household income biennially. Those with a household income exceeding the corresponding Subsidy Income Limits (SILs), or those who chose not to declare their household income were required to pay 1.5 times or double net rent plus rates as appropriate.
- (ii) Households paying double net rent plus rates under the HSP had to declare, pursuant to the Policy on Safeguarding Rational Allocation of Public Housing Resources (SRA), their household assets biennially if they wished to continue living in public housing.
- (iii) Total Assets Limits for households currently living in PRH flats were calculated by multiplying the number of persons by the maximum income limit per month. Taking a 1-person household as an example, the maximum amount of assets the tenant might possess was \$850,000. If the tenant in question was 55 years of age, his total assets limit, in other words the total value of his property, could not exceed some \$2.1 million. If the value of the tenant’s assets did not exceed the aforementioned assets limits, the said tenant might continue to rent a PRH flat.

24. The Chairmain wished to know if there was any relationship between the assets a tenant possessed and his income.

25. Ms Tammy TSO indicated that the tenant’s income referred to his recurrent income while assets referred to the property the tenant possessed, such as land, deposits, cars and so on. In the event that the household income exceeded the prescribed SIL for PRH tenants whereas the assets the tenant possessed did not exceed the total asset limits, the tenant concerned would be required to pay 1.5 times or double net rent plus rates as appropriate. If the household assets value exceeded the prevailing prescribed assets limits, or the tenant chose not to declare his assets, the tenant concerned would be required to surrender his PRH flat.

26. The Chairman asked if the HD would merely consider whether or not the household assets value exceeded the prevailing prescribed assets limits when demanding the tenant to surrender the PRH flat in which he was living.

27. Ms Tammy TSO responded that those households who were paying double net rent plus rates under the HSP were required to declare, pursuant to the SRA, their household assets biennially if they wished to continue renting their existing PRH flats.

28. The Chairman enquired whether a household would, in addition to paying 1.5 times or double rent as appropriate, need to surrender the PRH flat if its income was below the maximum income limit per month at the time it applied for a PRH flat, but subsequently

exceeded the said limit due to an increase in the household income after moving into the PRH flat.

29. Ms Tammy TSO reiterated that if the household assets value of a tenant exceeded the prevailing prescribed assets limits, or the tenant concerned chose not to declare his assets, he would be required to surrender the PRH flat in which he was living. If tenants indicated to the HD that they would need to extend their tenancy of the PRH flats due to particular reasons, the HD would consider the application on a case-by-case basis. Nevertheless, tenants were required to surrender their PRH flats in the end.

30. The Chairman opined that it was a loophole in the policy that as long as they possessed no assets, PRH tenants whose monthly income exceeded the maximum income limit were required to pay no more than 1.5 times or double rent without the need of surrendering the PRH flats. The original intent of the HSP was to offer accommodation to those members of the public who were not well off financially, rather than allowing PRH flats to be occupied by those with high income who could afford more.

31. Ms Tammy TSO responded that pursuant to the HSP, PRH tenants with a household income exceeding the prescribed SIL for PRH tenants, or chose not to declare their household income were required to pay 1.5 times or double net rent plus rates as appropriate. At present, the HD had no policy which required high-income tenants without assets to surrender their PRH flats.

32. The Chairman pointed out that Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung received a monthly remuneration of over \$70,000 but was only required to pay double rent. He asked if the HD would need to review the existing policy as regards such cases.

33. Ms Tammy TSO said that the Public Housing Resources Management Sub-section (PHRM) of the HD was responsible for checking on tenants' assets. The PHRM also closely examined the declarations of income and assets made by PRH tenants according to the existing policy and established mechanism, and handle each case in a serious and fair manner. If a tenant could prove that his assets did not exceed the total assets limit, he would be eligible for renting a PRH flat. As regards individual cases which were undergoing judicial review, the HD was not in a position to respond. The HD would be open to any opinions which members of the public had regarding the HSP, and would relay their views to the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") for its consideration.

34. Mr Stephen HO recalled having received a complaint in which the complainant alleged that a certain PRH tenant had a handsome monthly income and demanded that the HD check on the case. The tenant in question, however, proved that the amount of money concerned was not a recurrent income. Thus, the HD could not recover the PRH flat of the said tenant solely on grounds of the income of a certain month. He concluded that the Government should review such policy in the long run.

35. Mr WONG Kin-san said that at present, there were people with high income living in PRH flats, while quite a number of grass-roots people whose living environment was poor had been waiting for years for an allocation of PRH. Besides, the HSP seemed not to encourage young people to live with the elderly since once young people started to work after having finished their studies, their income would have to be included in the calculation of the total household income, in which case they might need to pay higher rent because of the increase in

household income. He continued that one of the reasons for the current housing supply shortage was that the HSP did not encourage members of the public to have large families. Therefore he agreed that the existing policy should be reviewed.

36. Mr CHAN Wai-keung said that as far as he knew, quite a number of Members also, in principle, opined that the Government should review the comprehensive means test under the existing HSP. He recalled that in the previous year, the former and the incumbent Permanent Secretaries for Transport and Housing (Housing) (“THB”) as well as the Director of Housing had visited the YTMDC. During the visit, some Councillors had requested that the HSP be reviewed. However, none of the representatives of the related departments had committed to review the Policy at that time. Hence, he wished to request once again at the HBMC meeting that the existing HSP be reviewed, so that representatives of the HD could relay the views to the department. He continued that the HD’s comprehensive means test was poles apart from the taxation principles adopted by the Inland Revenue Department. He wished to know what criteria the HD had adopted when the comprehensive means test was designed then.

37. The Vice-chairman said that having listened to how the HD assessed the income and assets of PRH tenants, she could not help pondering if there was room for reviewing the HSP. She indicated that the way in which income and assets were being assessed now did not encourage tenants with high income to put aside a portion of their income as saving since they would need to avoid possessing too many assets if they wished to continue renting PRH flats. She suggested that the HD consider adding a by-law to the HSP that a PRH flat should be surrendered if the income and assets of the tenant exceeded a certain level, so that the flat could be made available to people in need.

38. Mr Benny CHING opined that the HSP had been in force for many years, but times had changed and the society now was different. It was indeed necessary to revise the HSP to address the housing demand nowadays.

39. The Chairman pointed out that while vetting the eligibility of PRH tenants to continue renting their PRH flats, the HD took into consideration the assets limits primarily. Even if the monthly income of a PRH tenant exceeded the maximum income limits, he would not need to surrender the PRH flat as long as he was willing to pay 1.5 times or double rent. He was of the view that there was a loophole in such policy and hoped that representatives of the HD would relay the views of the Members to the department.

40. Ms Tammy TSO responded that households who had been living in public rental housing for ten years or more were required to declare household income biennially. Those with a household income exceeding the prescribed SILs, or those who chose not to declare their household income were required to pay 1.5 times or double net rent plus rates as appropriate. Those households who were paying double net rent plus rates according to the HSP were required to declare, pursuant to the SRA, their household assets biennially if they wished to continue renting their existing PRH flats.

41. Ms KO Po-ling indicated that as far as she knew, the HD first stipulated that households who had been living in public rental housing for ten years or more were required to declare household income biennially. The reason for such decision was that the HD was of the view that after having rented a PRH unit at a low price for ten years, some tenants might have saved sufficient money to improve their living conditions and could surrender

their PRH flats as a result. In order to accelerate the turnover of PRH flats, in addition to assessing the income of tenants, the Government at that time also demanded that households who were paying double rent declare their assets. In her opinion, the HD should demand that those households whose income and assets value exceeded the respective limits vacate their PRH flats after the grace period for relocation expired. She said that if Members agreed to this proposal, the HBMC could write to the HD to request that the department take into account the HBMC's opinion when reviewing the said policy.

42. The Chairman asked if Members agreed to the proposal of writing to the HD.

43. Mr LAU Pak-kei pointed out that the HSP was an important livelihood issue which would need to be studied carefully. He agreed that the HSP would need to be revised, but was of the view that Members of the HBMC had not reached any consensus at this meeting yet. He had reservations about writing to the HD hastily to demand that related policies be reviewed on the grounds of the discussion at a single meeting.

44. The Chairman opined that since the HSP as a whole involved a wide scope of issues, it would be difficult to reach a consensus at the meeting, let alone writing to the HD to reflect the HBMC's views. Moreover, quite a number of Members had already voiced their opinions on this item. He considered it more appropriate for the representatives of the HD to relay to the department the views they had listened to at the meeting. He reiterated that the HD only required PRH tenants whose income level exceeded the prescribed limit to pay a higher rent without having to surrender their PRH flats as long as their net assets value did not exceed the total assets limits, such practice fell short of helping those members of the public in need be allocated PRH flats.

45. Ms Tammy TSO said that the HD would welcome opinions put forward by Members at any time.

(Ms WONG Shu-ming left the meeting at 3:25 p.m.)

46. Mr CHUNG Kong-mo pointed out that as reflected in the cases cited in the paper submitted, individual tenants could continue to stay in their PRH flats despite their handsome incomes as long as they paid double rent. He suggested that the HD make a sharp rise in rent for such tenants when reviewing the policy in the future. For example, by cancelling the cap on double rent, such tenants would need to pay an amount of rent multiplied in proportion to the level of their income. It was hoped that such tenants would as a result surrender their PRH flats of their own accord.

(Mr Benjamin CHOI joined the meeting at 3:28 p.m.)

47. Mr Stephen HO asked if the HBMC would vote on the proposal instead if it decided not to write to the HD. Besides, he pointed out that the THB was the policy bureau to decide on the HSP while the HD was only the executive arm. Hence, the HBMC should relay the views in relation to reviewing the policy to the THB. He also agreed to the proposal that tenants should pay an amount of rent multiplied in proportion to the level of their income.

48. The Chairman indicated that Members had already put forward quite a number of opinions on this topic to the representatives of the HD. However, no consensus could be reached at the meeting. Hence, the HBMC did not intend to write to demand that the

Government review the policy. If individual Members would like to contribute other opinions to the Government, they might contact the department themselves.

49. The Chairman thanked the HD representatives for joining the discussion on this item.

Item 5: Any Other Business

50. There being no other business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 3:35 p.m. The next meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 13 August 2015.

Yau Tsim Mong District Council Secretariat
July 2015

油尖旺房屋事務及大廈管理委員會
第 11/2015 號文件

**2012 至 2015 年度油尖旺區議會
房屋事務及大廈管理委員會**

回應房屋署海富苑公屋居民遞交入息申報表

海富苑屬香港房屋委員會「可租可買計劃」下的屋苑，並已成立業主立案法團。當中五座樓宇，包括海嵐閣、海韻閣、海裕閣、海泰閣及海欣閣五幢樓宇的租約事務工作，房屋署已聘任物業管理公司「創毅物業服務顧問有限公司」(簡稱「創毅」)駐海富苑租戶服務辦事處(下稱「辦事處」)執行。

根據「公屋住戶資助政策」下，凡在公屋居住滿十年的租戶，必須每兩年申報其家庭入息一次，作為房屋署審定他們應繳的租金水平。每年房屋署會於 4 月 1 日前將有關表格派發給到期申報的住戶，住戶需於 5 月 31 日或之前將填妥的表格連同有關文件交回所屬辦事處。今年海富苑約有 800 戶到期申報，現時辦事處已收回超過 600 份的申報表。

根據房屋署與外判物業管理公司簽訂的合約，辦事處開放時間為星期一至五，每日上午 8 時 45 分至下午 6 時正，緊急服務除外。為方便住戶投遞文件，海富苑辦事處門外設有信箱，供收集之用，部份住戶經已習慣透過上述方式向辦事處遞交文件。一般情況下，辦事處收到文件後會向住戶發出收妥確認回條，如發現申報資料有錯漏，職員會立即通知住戶作出修正。

外判物業管理公司必須按合約訂明的員工數目安排人手派駐辦事處工作。為應付上述期間額外增加的工作量，「創毅」經已額外增派人手接收申報表。根據記錄，五月份內每日平均約有 30 人次遞交申報表，「創毅」每日安排兩名職員處理，住戶一般輪候時間平均約為 15-20 分鐘。一旦發現輪候人數過多，職員會向等候的住戶派發籌號，通知住戶按既定時間返回，以縮短在辦事處輪候的時間。此外，辦事處內亦設有收集箱，如住戶未能等候，可以將申報表投放入收集箱，職員會於當日審閱所有申報表，如發現有錯漏會聯絡住戶另約時間作出修改。

從 6 月份起，每天只有數戶向辦事處遞交申報表，他們已無須等候可獲即時接待。

房屋署

2015 年 6 月

油尖旺房屋事務及大廈管理委員會
第 12/2015 號文件

2012 至 2015 年度油尖旺區議會
房屋事務及大廈管理委員會

回應怎樣處理「公共租住房屋」的住戶家庭
嚴重超出「入息及總資產淨值限額」的情況

根據「公屋住戶資助政策」，凡在公屋居住滿十年的租戶，必須每兩年申報其家庭入息一次。若家庭收入超逾指定公屋住戶資助入息限額，又或租戶選擇不申報入息，有關租戶便須按實際情況繳交倍半或雙倍淨租金另加差餉。

凡在「公屋住戶資助政策」下正繳交雙倍淨租金另加差餉的租戶，如欲繼續租住現居公屋單位，便須按「維護公屋資源的合理分配政策」每兩年申報家庭資產一次。如租戶的家庭資產超逾當時的指定公屋住戶資產淨值限額，又或租戶選擇不申報資產，有關租戶便須交還所居住的公屋單位。

公屋住戶資助入息限額及資產淨值限額會按每年的公共租住房屋入息及總資產淨值限額而作出相應調整。本署職員按照上述政策和既定的機制去審查公屋租戶所申報的入息及資產，並會嚴肅和公正地處理每一宗個案。

如有關租戶符合上述政策的要求，房屋署無權刪除他們的公屋戶籍或強行收回其單位。

2013/14 年度繳交倍半和雙倍租金租戶數目如下：

年度	繳交倍半租金 租戶數目*	繳交雙倍租金 租戶數目*	總數*
2013/14	18 200	2 400	20 600

* 數字四捨五入至百位。

房屋署
2015 年 6 月